

Lord Thurlow: A Chancellorship in Caricature through New College's Collection of Gillrays, Part II

In my previous examination of the depictions of Edward, 1st Baron Thurlow (1731–1806) in New College's excellent collection of prints by the famous satirist James Gillray (1756–1815), I identified eight depictions of that long-serving eighteenth-century lord chancellor. One of these attributions I argued was inconclusive but likely not to be Lord Thurlow.¹ Following a deeper examination of the collection, I have identified an additional five Gillray prints held by New College containing depictions of Lord Thurlow, bringing the total number to twelve. This article will delve into an analysis of each of these newly uncovered prints and assess their significance to the life and career of Lord Thurlow. An additional two prints supposedly containing depictions of Thurlow in the collection at New College have been mistakenly attributed to Gillray and I argue that in one of these prints a figure has been misidentified as Thurlow. These latter two prints will be analysed in the same manner as the abovementioned Gillrays.

New College's collection of Gillray prints contains over two-thirds of his known political cartoons.² Lord Thurlow was a frequent victim of Gillray's art, being depicted no fewer than twenty times and mentioned by name in one other. New College's collection of Gillrays contains thirteen out of the twenty-one Gillray prints containing either depictions of or references to Thurlow. The prints examined herein range in date from 1787 to 1792—the exact same chronological range as those in the previous study. This relatively short timeframe is due in part to the fact that Thurlow was only depicted in a single satirical print before the year 1780, even though he had served prominently as solicitor general (1770–71), attorney general (1771–8), and lord chancellor (from 1778). I have not been able to determine why Thurlow was not depicted more frequently in satires before this time. It could not have been a sense of his unimportance. Newspapers and pamphlets frequently highlighted the prominent role Thurlow played in parliament in defence of the North administration's coercive measures towards the rebellious colonies in America—itsself a heavily satirised topic—among numerous other issues. His features and mannerisms had already been a frequent topic of textual satire and, unlike relatively bland albeit significant government figures like Charles Jenkinson, who rarely featured in graphic satire, Thurlow's characteristics were well adapted for the caricaturist's pen. Gillray first depicted Thurlow in caricature in 1782 and only included him in two satires before the year 1787.³ After 1792, when Thurlow ceased to be lord chancellor, Gillray never again depicted him in a political cartoon. In some ways, this is hardly surprising because Thurlow ceased to be a major political figure after his dismissal from office. Although he continued to be looked upon as a possible cabinet member in the many failed attempts to set up a ministry in place of William Pitt the Younger in the 1790s and early 1800s, this was only depicted in one satire by James Sayers.⁴ His other major contribution to political life in his later years was as a kind of elder statesman in the House of Lords, in which he played a large role in many of the legal cases that were brought before the peers upon appeal. His activity in this regard is probably the basis for his depiction in the anonymous caricature 'A Trial for a Rape!!!'

¹ See Ben Gilding, 'Lord Thurlow: A Chancellorship in Caricature through New College's Collection of Gillrays', *New College Notes* 15 (2021), no. 10. For a more extended examination of Lord Thurlow's life and career, see my monograph published last month, *The Great Pillar: The Political Career of Lord Thurlow 1731–1806*, New College Library & Archives Publications no. 5 (Oxford: New College Library & Archives, 2023).

² New College's collection of Gillray prints were gifted to the college by Mrs Winifred Burger, widow of Samuel George H. Burger sometime between 22 February 1961 and 3 June 1970. How they came to be in the possession of the Burgers, however, and why they were gifted to the college is not known.

³ Gillray's first depiction of Thurlow was in 'Banco to the Knave', 12 April 1782, BM Satires 5972 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1851-0901-71>; the second of Gillray's depictions of Thurlow in 1782 and the only other one before 1787 was in 'Britania's Assassination. Or the Republicans amusement', 10 May 1782, BM Satires 5987 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1851-0901-78>.

⁴ James Sayers, 'Achitophel, an old Jew Scribe lately turned Greek. Greeks Persians (stowed together) worshipping the rising sun', 11 July 1804, BM Satires 10258 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_Y-10-166>.

but the identification of Thurlow in this print can only be described as probable but inconclusive.⁵ All this to say, Gillray was far from alone in choosing not to portray Thurlow in any satires after 1792. In total, Thurlow has been found to be the subject of 150 graphic satires. However, only seven of these were created between his dismissal as lord chancellor in 1792 and his death in 1806. In contrast, in the six years covering the period from 1787 to 1792, Thurlow was depicted 104 times, which constitutes almost 70 percent of his total depictions in graphic satire.

Although their chronology is the same, the subjects of the images analysed herein are narrower than those examined in the previous article. Two of them depict issues concerning the prince of Wales, in particular the enormous debts he contracted and his relationship with the opposition party led by Charles James Fox. Fox's clamour for power and his use and abuse of libels forms the subject of another. The impeachment trial of Warren Hastings, the former governor general of Bengal is the subject of a further three prints. The final satire analysed in this paper concerns the rather personal issue of Lord Thurlow's daughter Caroline eloping with an army officer without her father's permission, which was designed to underline his hypocrisy in blaming her despite having supposedly engaged in similar behaviour himself.

A longer background of Edward Thurlow, 1st Baron Thurlow was provided in the previous study. However, because he is a figure that may not be known to all readers, a short outline of his life and career may be useful before proceeding to analysing the prints in chronological order. Thurlow was the son of a relatively obscure Norfolk clergyman. He attended Caius College, Cambridge but was forced to leave without a degree because of 'the *vivacity* of his conduct'.⁶ He was afterwards admitted to the Inner Temple and gained notoriety through his successful advocacy in a growing number of prominent legal cases. Through his increased reputation and mutual connections with the prominent courtier and politician Lord Weymouth, he was brought into parliament as member for the borough of Tamworth in 1765. Thurlow quickly established himself as a prominent parliamentary speaker in defence of the government. When his patron Weymouth and his allies joined the cabinet, Thurlow was rewarded first with appointment as solicitor general in 1770, and then promotion to attorney general in 1771. As attorney general under Prime Minister Lord North, Thurlow was one of the strongest advocates for the policy of bringing the rebellious American colonies to heel through tough legislation and even violence, if necessary. Having gained the notice of the king for his advocacy on this issue among others, by 1778 the king repeatedly called upon North to appoint Thurlow as lord chancellor. Thurlow's close relationship with the king, which developed as a result of his appointment as lord chancellor in 1778, was the main reason for his being involved with the disputes between King George III and his wayward son George, the Prince of Wales (later George IV) which are depicted in two of the prints analysed herein. Upon his appointment as chancellor in 1778, Edward Thurlow was elevated to the peerage as 1st Baron Thurlow of Ashfield in the county of Suffolk (the place of his maternal ancestry). As lord chancellor, he also became Speaker of the House of Lords. In this role, Thurlow, with his deep learning, coarse manners, domineering presence, and sonorous voice dominated the proceedings of the House and, according to one hostile commentator treated the peerage 'as if he were the schoolmaster of a set of boys, instead of the speaker of an august assembly'.⁷ This dominance of the Upper Chamber is vividly depicted in Gillray's 'Market Day' analysed below.

Thurlow remained lord chancellor from 1778 to 1792, barring a nine-month spell out of office during the short-lived and unpopular Fox-North coalition ministry in 1783. During the later 1780s he presided as lord high steward at the famous impeachment trial of Warren Hastings, who stood accused of various acts of oppression, bribery, and embezzlement while in office. While

⁵ Unknown, 'A Trial for a Rape!!!' 8 February 1799, BM Satires 9347 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-6819>.

⁶ *The Gentleman's Magazine: and Historical Chronicle* 76 (2) (July–December 1806), 882.

⁷ Edward Foss, *The Judges of England; with Sketches of their Lives, and Miscellaneous Notices Connected with the Courts at Westminster, from the Conquest to the Present Time. Volume VIII. Containing the Reigns of George I., George II., and George III. 1714–1820* (London: John Murray, 1864), p. 380.

presiding at this trial, Thurlow was widely pilloried in the press and in graphic satire for his well-known support for Hastings, which was frequently depicted to be the result of bribery.⁸ Thurlow's connection with the Hastings trial is the subject of three of the satires below and is also among the reasons why I argue that one other print does not actually contain a depiction of the lord chancellor.

In May 1792, Thurlow was finally dismissed as lord chancellor after attacking his own government's flagship legislation to amend William Pitt's sinking fund mechanism that was designed to pay down the national debt. After his dismissal as lord chancellor, Thurlow never again entered high political office. He largely stepped back from the centre stage of Westminster politics altogether and, as mentioned above, was very rarely depicted in graphic satire as a result. What follows is an analysis of the five additional Gillrays depicting Thurlow in New College's collection, as well as correctives for two other prints in the possession of New College, both misattributed to Gillray and only one of which contains a depiction of Lord Thurlow.



James Gillray, 'The Prince at Grass' / 'The Prince in Clover' (2 June 1787)
New College, Oxford, NCO 193109

This and all following images © Courtesy of the Warden and Scholars of New College, Oxford

⁸ See, for instance, my analyses of Gillray's 'Blood and Thunder', in Gilding, 'Lord Thurlow'; and Unknown, 'The Diamond Eaters, Horrid Monsters!', in Gilding, *Great Pillar*, pp. 310–11.

The earliest of New College's additional Gillray prints depicting the Lord Chancellor Thurlow is a double print with two companion pieces published on the same plate. The titles 'The Prince at Grass' and 'The Prince in Clover' portray the process of negotiation concerning the prince of Wales's debts that took place between 1786 and 1787.



James Gillray, 'The Prince at Grass' (2 June 1787)
New College, Oxford, NCO 193109

The first of the prints in terms of chronology, 'The Prince at Grass,' depicts the prince standing outside the gates of his residence at Carlton House. His back is turned to the activity in the background and his hand covers his eyes in an attempt to avoid watching as the Prime Minister William Pitt and several of his ministers pull down the scaffolding that was covering Carlton House. Thurlow, depicted as usual in his chancellor's robe, full bottom wig, and dark bushy eyebrows, beats away with a brush the artisans who were at work on the expensive renovations at Carlton House, and who drop their tools in terror in their flight. One figure, seemingly being trampled by the lord chancellor, drops a hod—a builder's tool with a tray or trough mounted on a pole to carry loads of mortar or brick. In its companion piece, 'The Prince in Clover,' Thurlow is depicted carrying this same instrument. Henry Dundas, Pitt's right-hand man, also dressed in legal attire, befitting his position as lord advocate of Scotland, assists Thurlow in chasing away the artisans with a whip. The prince's allies, Charles James Fox, the playwright Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Edmund Burke, and Lord North stand beside the prince, but look towards the sun rising over Carlton House, with a figure representing liberty standing in front of it, suggesting better times were to come. There is some cheeky irony, too, in that Fox is holding a paper entitled 'Magna Charta' and Sheridan holds one labelled 'Bill of Rights', and that they hold these documents towards 'liberty' atop the roof of Carlton House. In other words, they each hold constitutional documents that were designed to place restrictions on the power of the monarchy, despite the fact that at the time they were advocating for parliament to grant a huge sum to the prince to allow him to pay down his debts and continue his lavish lifestyle, of which Fox and Sheridan in particular were among the chief beneficiaries.

The title 'Prince at Grass' hints at the prince of Wales's decision in 1786—forced upon him by the enormity of his debts—to stop the renovation works at Carlton House, shut up his apartments there, and sell his racehorses at public auction.⁹ It was surely these measures, and the prince's retirement to Brighton to live as a 'private gentleman', that inspired the title of this satire. The idiom 'put to grass', meaning either being forced to retire or sent out (as with livestock) to graze, is an apt way of characterising the prince's circumstances after the summer of 1786. Whether the prince's horses were retired and put 'at grass' or simply returned to work by another owner is not clear, but certainly the prince aimed to make it appear that he had been forced to retire from public life.



James Gillray, 'The Prince at Grass' (2 June 1787)
[detail, showing Thurlow and Dundas] New College, Oxford, NCO 193109

In this print, Thurlow is depicted working cooperatively with the Pitt administration. He and Dundas fight away the artisans while Pitt and others tear the scaffolding down. However, this only tells part of the story, and it may have been the only part available to most of the public and therefore also even to Gillray, who was ever attentive to the scandalous rumours of the day. We now know that Thurlow had been employed from as early as 1784 as a kind of go-between for the king and the prince of Wales.¹⁰ While he clearly sympathised with the situation of the king and did the bidding of his royal patron, he also seems to have assisted the prince of Wales in the hope of reconciling the two. For instance, he helped the prince draft his messages to the king in order to at least facilitate communication between the pair and perhaps to obtain for the prince *some* relief from his extraordinary debts, which by 1786 were computed at over £270,000.¹¹ In 2017, this amount would be the equivalent of some £23 million.¹² In the companion print, 'The Prince in Clover' the scene is almost diametrically opposite. It depicts the scene around the time that the print was eventually published, in May/June of 1787, by which time Pitt had persuaded the king to grant the prince an additional £10,000 per year alongside a further sum of £161,000 to alleviate some of his debts and £60,000 to pay for the completion of Carlton House.¹³

⁹ E. A. Smith, *George IV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), pp. 42–3.

¹⁰ King George III to Lord Thurlow, 31 August 1784, in Royal Archives, GEO/MAIN/16462.

¹¹ William Pitt to King George III, 13 April 1787, in Royal Archives, GEO/MAIN/16563; William Pitt to King George III, 3 May 1787, in Royal Archives, GEO/MAIN/16568. For the computation of his debts in 1786, see Smith, *George IV*, p. 40.

¹² According to the National Archives' Currency Converter: 1270–2017 <<https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency-converter/>> (Accessed 13 September 2023).

¹³ Smith, *George IV*, pp. 42, 44.



James Gillray, 'The Prince in Clover' (2 June 1787)
New College, Oxford, NCO 193109



James Gillray, 'The Prince in Clover' (2 June 1787)
[detail, showing Thurlow]
New College, Oxford, NCO 193109

The prince, standing confidently in front of Carlton House, and donning the coronet that was previously in his hands, receives two purses of cash. Pitt, Dundas, and Sydney kneel behind the king, virtually prostrate, with Pitt about to kiss the prince's *derrière*. Fox, Sheridan, Burke, and North stand behind, watching with obvious glee. The artisans who were being beaten and trampled in the previous print, are now cheering, having had their jobs restored. In the background, the scaffolding has been replaced on Carlton House. The duke of Richmond, standing on the scaffolding, labours away with a trowel. Thurlow still dressed in his chancellor's robes, is climbing a ladder while holding the hod from the previous print against his shoulder. As one might expect, while climbing the ladder Thurlow wears a stern expression on his face. The fact that Thurlow is depicted working on the construction at Carlton House does not necessarily suggest any knowledge on Gillray's part that Thurlow was working with both the king and the prince. Rather, the fact that both he and the duke of Richmond, who was pulling down the scaffolding in the previous print, are represented working while the artisans are celebrating seems more likely to be simply emphasising the view that they came out as losers.

Given that Thurlow was attempting to bring about a compromise between father and son, the outcome would not have been as contrary to his wishes as Gillray seems to suggest. Continuing the trend of grazing livestock in the naming of these companion prints, Gillray, by describing the prince of Wales as being 'in clover', is emphasising the fact that the additional income would allow

him to return to his life of extravagance and luxury—similar to a cow eating clover. As the famous lexicographer Dr Johnson described it, '*To live in CLOVER*, is to live luxuriously; clover being extremely delicious and fattening to cattle'.¹⁴

The settlement between the king and prince of Wales over the latter's debts, however, was predicated on a lie—not that Gillray seems to have implied it in this print. Rumours had spread that the prince of Wales was not only in a relationship with Maria Fitzherbert but that they had actually married in a clandestine ceremony. It was only the public denial of the marriage rumours by Fox on behalf of the prince of Wales in the House of Commons that enabled the compromise to occur.¹⁵ The resulting public announcement essentially branded Fitzherbert as the prince of Wales's mistress, a fact that, quite understandably, infuriated her. In response, she cut her ties with the prince and refused to have anything to do with him.



James Gillray, 'The Sick Prince' (16 June 1787)
New College, Oxford, NCO 193114

Fitzherbert's temporary rejection of the prince sent him into the dangerously 'feverish' state depicted in the next Gillray print depicting Lord Thurlow, 'The Sick Prince', which was published just two weeks later.¹⁶ In this print, Gillray is satirising the typical 'deathbed' scene. The

¹⁴ Samuel Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language: In Which The Words are deduced from their Originals, and Illustrated in their Different Significations by Examples from the best Writers*, 4th ed., 2 vols (London: W. Strahan, 1773).

¹⁵ Speech of Charles James Fox, 30 April 1787 in *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, xxvi, cols. 1065–70.

¹⁶ *The Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Wrexall 1772–1784*, ed. Henry B. Wheatley, 5 vols (London: Bickers & Son, 1884), v, 362.

prince lies in his bed, surrounded on one side by his faithful adherents Fox, Burke, North, and Sheridan, who stand beside a lady representing liberty. They are all in prayer, looking towards the rays of sunlight that have burst in upon the prince of Wales. On the other side of the prince's bed stand Thurlow, Pitt, and the Duke of Richmond, partially concealed behind the bed hanging. Thurlow, recognisable through his wig, robes, and brows, is poised to strike the prince with a dagger. Pitt stands beside him, also with a dagger in hand. Several details in the scene seem to suggest that Gillray was aware that the prince's ailment was caused more by his sense of rejection than his bodily condition or at least that it was not as dangerous as some reports seemed to suggest.¹⁷ The prince, while lying flat on the bed, does not appear particularly ill, and rather looks in wonder at the rays of sunlight shining upon him. A figure representing 'Father Time' has also barged past the apothecary and a rather strange and racist depiction of 'Death' as a naked black man, knocking them both over with his scythe. Both of these seem to suggest that the prince is being saved or will be saved from whatever it is that has confined him to his bed.



James Gillray, 'The Sick Prince' (16 June 1787) [detail, showing Thurlow, Pitt, and Richmond]
New College, Oxford, NCO 193114

The portrayal of Thurlow as the first would-be assassin, the one closest to striking a blow against the prince, is again an interesting one. It underscores the fact that Gillray, and probably much of the public, were unaware not only of the role that Thurlow was playing as a go-between for the monarch and his heir-apparent, but also of the relationship between Thurlow and the prince of Wales, which was in fact quite cordial. Thurlow is depicted in these prints, alongside Dundas, Pitt, and Richmond, as a figure doing the bidding of the Pitt administration, which masks over the well-known animosity between Thurlow and the prime minister. However, if the general public saw them as acting together so frequently, it is no wonder that when it came to the king's illness in 1788–9, when Thurlow's good relations with the prince became more widely known, he was seen to have betrayed Pitt and even the king with his duplicitous conduct. The reality was that

¹⁷ Thomas Orde to the Duke of Rutland, 28 May 1787, in Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Fourteenth Report, Appendix, Part 1. The Manuscripts of his Grace the Duke of Rutland, K.G. Preserved at Belvoir Castle*, 4 vols (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1894), III, 392.

he was neither as close to Pitt nor as distant from the prince of Wales as these satires would appear to suggest.



James Gillray, 'There's More Ways Than One' (18 February 1788)
New College, Oxford, NCO 191248

The following print, 'There's More Ways Than One', subtitled 'Vide Coalition Expedients', was published just under a year later in February 1788. It depicts a fox, clearly intended to represent Charles James Fox, climbing a gibbet-shaped signpost for an inn with an emblem of a crown hanging from it. Wound around the signpost are grapevines full of fruit which the fox is attempting to pull down and eat. Pitt stands at the door of the inn, represented as he often is as a tall, emaciated—almost skeletal—figure. He is dressed in an apron, suggesting that, as prime minister, he is the proprietor of the 'Crown Inn'. Pitt looks surprised and shocked to see the fox and has dropped his mug of beer, emblazoned with the symbol of a crown. Thurlow stands behind Pitt, half concealed by the darkness of the doorway, looking sternly towards the fox, with none of the surprise or fear exhibited by Pitt. The fox, literally clambering for the 'fruits' of office, represents the greedy ambitions attributed to Charles Fox and the opposition to Pitt's government. In order to reach the fruit, Fox stands on a pile of papers labelled 'libels'. At the top of the pile is a pamphlet, entitled 'Review of the Charges against Warren Hasting[s]'. Published by Stockdale.' This pamphlet had

only recently been printed and several days before this satire was published, on 14 February 1788, Fox had denounced the pamphlet in the House of Commons as 'a gross and scandalous libel on the Committee appointed by that House to manage the prosecution of Mr. Hastings, as well as a libel upon the House itself, upon his Majesty, and upon the whole legislature'.¹⁸ A day later, after the pamphlet was allowed to remain on the table of the House for the perusal of MPs, Fox tabled a motion to the same effect, prompting Pitt to suggest that the pamphlet 'did not strike him as conveying any imputation against the King'.¹⁹ The Gillray print, therefore, depicts Fox attempting to ingratiate himself to the Crown by appearing to defend the king against libels. Pitt is 'shocked' because his support was seen to emanate from the Crown and he sees a fox trying to steal a march on him.

Thurlow, standing behind Pitt, appears unimpressed with Fox's actions. This perhaps represents the fact that, despite his problems with Pitt, he would be much more comfortable in a cabinet with him and might have even lost his office if somehow the king were duped into inviting Fox to form an administration.²⁰ Rather than being shocked or scared of Fox's actions, Thurlow's demeanour suggests it is almost beneath him to act upon it. The difference in reaction between Pitt and Thurlow is also representative of the fact that they found themselves on opposite sides of the debate on Hastings's impeachment. Fox and Pitt both voted for the articles of impeachment against Hastings in the House of Commons. Thurlow, on the other hand, was well known to be an opponent of Hastings's impeachment. As lord chancellor, Thurlow also served as lord high steward, overseeing the trial which began on 13 February 1788. As early as 1780, Thurlow was reported to have had a 'just and friendly Estimation' of Hastings's 'abilities and Public services'.²¹ Thurlow had developed a greater sympathy for Hastings's plight during his attacks on the Fox-North coalition's East India Bill in late 1783, which sought to assert parliamentary control over the Company's operations and would have resulted in its vast patronage falling into the hands of the British ministers of the day.²² When the Fox-North coalition attacked Hastings's conduct as a justification for the necessity of their East India reforms, Thurlow made contact with Hastings's London agent John Scott in order to inform himself prior to the parliamentary debates in which he defended the governor-general.²³ There is some irony in the fact that Thurlow's defence of Hastings's conduct in late 1783 was part of the concerted plot to have the Fox-North coalition dismissed after the defeat of their India Bill in the Lords—a dismissal that resulted in the formation of William Pitt's ministry. Indeed, such was the influence of Hastings and his agent in the defeat of Fox's India Bill that Earl Gower, a close friend and political ally of Thurlow's, referred to Pitt's government as the Hastings administration.²⁴ P. J. Marshall has also suggested that Thurlow's positive attitude towards Hastings may have had something to do with Hastings's promotion of Robert Pott to the post of resident at Murshidabad on Thurlow's recommendation.²⁵ However, it is unlikely that it played much of a role in governing Thurlow's views and actions in defence of Hastings. Thurlow requested that Hastings place Pott under his protection in 1780 and Pott's

¹⁸ Speech of Charles James Fox, 14 February 1788, in *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, xvii, cols. 1–3.

¹⁹ Speech of William Pitt, 15 February 1788, in *ibid.*, cols. 7–8.

²⁰ Fox had been instrumental in having Thurlow removed as lord chancellor during the Fox-North coalition, see Gilding, *Great Pillar*, pp. 105–120.

²¹ John Macpherson to Warren Hastings, 17 June 1780, in BL, Hastings Papers, Add MS 29145, f. 201.

²² On Fox's India Bill, see John Cannon, *The Fox-North Coalition: Crisis of the Constitution 1782–84* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); and P. J. Marshall, *Problems of Empire: Britain and India, 1757–1813* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1968), introduction.

²³ John Scott to Warren Hastings, 16 December 1783, in BL, Hastings Papers, 29161, ff. 169–70; for the accounts of debates citing Hastings, see *An Authentic Account of the Debates in the House of Lords, on Tuesday, December 9, Monday, December 15, and Wednesday, December 17, 1783. On the Bill "For establishing certain Regulations for the better Management of the Territories, Revenues, and Commerce of this Kingdom in the East-Indies."* (London: J. Debrett, 1783) and *A Full and Accurate Account of the Debates on the East-India Bill in the House of Lords, on Tuesday the 9th, on Monday the 15th, Tuesday the 16th, and Wednesday the 17th of December, 1783* (London: J. Stockdale, 1784).

²⁴ Major John Scott to Warren Hastings, 11 January 1784, in BL, Hastings Papers, Add. MS. 29161, ff. 321–9.

²⁵ Lord Thurlow to Warren Hastings, 24 June 1780, in BL, Hastings Papers, Add. MS. 29145, f. 254.

promotion did not occur until 1785, after which Thurlow had already defended Hastings in the House of Lords and had been shown in multiple reports to have 'approv'd [of Hastings's] politics'.²⁶

As a result of his sympathy towards Hastings, Thurlow may well have supported the pamphlet attacking the impeachment charges that Fox considered to be a libel on the House and against the king. After all, Thurlow himself had been accused by Edmund Burke of ridiculing the reports of the select committee that examined the affairs of the East India Company between 1781 and 1783, upon which many of the charges against Hastings had been based. Thurlow, apparently not a fan of Daniel Defoe, had claimed that he would 'pay as much attention' to the reports as he 'would to the adventures of Robinson Crusoe'.²⁷



James Gillray, 'The Westminster Hunt' (27 April 1788)
New College, Oxford, NCO 191200

The impeachment trial of Warren Hastings was a favourite topic of Gillray's. Just two months after 'There's More Ways Than One', he published 'The Westminster Hunt' on 27 April 1788. This print alludes far more overtly to the Hastings trial. It takes the form of a hunt, in which a hyena (rather than a fox) is being chased by a pack of hunting dogs and seeking safety within the gates of St James's Palace. Thurlow sits upon a donkey, appearing to lead the hunt while brandishing a whip which he ought to be using to urge his hounds forward. All, however, is not as it seems. Each of the animals depicted in the print have human heads representing various individuals involved in the Hastings impeachment. The hyena fleeing the hunt has the head of Warren Hastings with his stylised 'oriental' headdress and has a large bag tied to its tail labelled

²⁶ Richard Barwell to Warren Hastings, 15 September 1780, in BL, Hastings Papers, Add. MS. 29145, f. 519.

²⁷ Speech of Lord Thurlow, 9 December 1783, in *Parliamentary Register*, 2nd series, XIV, 18, 20.

'Diamonds & Rupees'. Because a hyena would probably be difficult to distinguish from dogs in graphic satire, Gillray has helpfully written 'Hyena' on the collar around Hastings's neck.²⁸



James Gillray, 'The Westminster Hunt' (27 April 1788)
[detail, showing Hastings's depiction as a hyena] New College, Oxford, NCO 191200

Hastings's depiction as a hyena is an interesting one. In 1786, Hastings reportedly had several tropical birds imported for King George III and a hyena for the prince of Wales. These, it was supposed, were among his several attempts to bribe the royal family into supporting him in his impeachment trial.²⁹ The hyena was described in the British press at the time as an 'obscene' scavenger which devoured the bodies of the dead.³⁰ The comparisons between the behaviour of hyenas and figures like Hastings, who were labelled as 'nabobs' and were accused of enriching themselves through the abuse of their offices and oppression of the populations under their care, would not have been lost on contemporaries. If anything, they were grossly unfair to the poor hyena! The dogs chasing Hastings are portrayed with the heads of many of those who were involved in the prosecution of Hastings (though not necessarily those of the managers of his impeachment trial). Leading the pack is the playwright Richard Brinsley Sheridan with a collar labelled 'Drury-Lane'. He is followed by Fox, whose unmistakable dishevelled and portly appearance apparently required no collar; nor did Burke, who is the bespectacled hound being trampled by Thurlow's donkey. Behind Fox is Philip Francis, with a collar creatively inscribed 'Francis'. He was once Hastings's colleague and rival in the Bengal Supreme Council but, upon his return to Britain, Francis gave vital evidence resulting eventually in impeachment charges being levelled against Hastings. In the background behind Francis is Michael Angelo Taylor, whose collar is labelled 'Law-Chick', apparently a reference to the fact that he once unfortunately described

²⁸ In several of the coloured etchings of 'The Westminster Hunt' held by the British Museum, the National Portrait Gallery, and Yale University's Lewis Walpole Library, the colours of the dogs and especially the hyena (Hastings) vary significantly. See <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1851-0901-399>, <www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw61322/The-Westminster-hunt>, and <<https://collections.library.yale.edu/catalog/16192409>> (Accessed 14 September 2023).

²⁹ Tillman W. Nechtman, 'Mr Hickey's Pictures: Britons and their Collectibles in Late Eighteenth-Century India,' in *The Cultural Construction of the British World*, ed. Barry Crosbie and Mark Hampton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016), pp. 180–97, at p. 188; see also Nechtman, *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 182. For other depictions by Gillray of Hastings's alleged bribery, see James Gillray, 'The Bow to the Throne, -alias- The Begging Bow,' 6 May 1788. BM Satires 7312 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-5726>.

³⁰ Nechtman, 'Mr Hickey's Pictures', p. 188.

himself as a 'a chicken in the [legal] profession'.³¹ Taylor was one of the managers of the Hastings impeachment. The final dog, which appears to have already been trampled to death, has the face of Lord North. The donkey upon which Thurlow rides has the face of George III, and his saddle bears the symbol of a crown. The king also wears a ribbon around his neck with a diamond hanging from it—purportedly that which was given to him by Hastings as a bribe.³² The monarchical donkey, rather than chasing Hastings, is trampling its own hunting hounds, preventing them from catching their prey. Riding the donkey and controlling it with oversized stirrups is Lord Thurlow. He is dressed in an odd mixture of both hunting attire and the regalia of the lord chancellor. His robe and wig remain, but he wears a hunting cap and riding boots. With whip in his hand, he is brandishing it and yelling 'Back! Back!' to his dogs, trying to allow Hastings to make his escape. The hounds, while still running in Hastings's direction, look back in terror at the whip of the lord chancellor and the hooves of his monarch.



James Gillray, 'The Westminster Hunt' (27 April 1788)
[detail, showing Thurlow riding George III] New College, Oxford, NCO 191200

Gillray's portrayal of Thurlow as the central figure in this print is significant. It is designed to suggest that he was the primary protector of Warren Hastings. The absurdity of this position on the part of the presiding magistrate of the trial, Gillray is suggesting, is akin to a hunter actively preventing his hounds from chasing their prey. The king may have been bribed, but he is depicted as a donkey, entirely under the control of his rider, Lord Thurlow. While this satire does not contain a direct reference to Thurlow himself being bribed by Hastings, the sack of 'Diamonds &

³¹ Speeches of Michael Angelo Taylor and Richard Brinsley Sheridan, 9 February 1785, in *Cobbett*, XXV, cols. 42–8.

³² See 'A Full and True Account of the Wonderful Diamond Presented to the King's Majesty, By Warren Hastings, Esq., on Wednesday, the 14th of June, 1786', in *The English Chronicle*, 15 July 1786.

Rupees' tied to Hastings's tail was designed to suggest that the allure was ever present. Gillray was certainly not wrong about the views of Thurlow and the king towards Hastings. Once he was dismissed as lord chancellor, and also therefore as Lord High Steward, Thurlow took upon himself the role of leading Hastings's defence when the Lords were coming to their final decision. Despite the accusations of bribery, George III seems to have remained surprisingly tight-lipped during the course of the impeachment trial and does not appear to have intervened in its process, even indirectly.³³



James Gillray, 'Market Day' (2 May 1788)
New College, Oxford, NCO 190431

The final genuine Gillray print depicting Lord Thurlow that I have identified in New College's collection is also on the subject of the Hastings impeachment. Published on 2 May 1788, just five days after 'The Westminster Hunt', 'Market Day' contains several similar themes. The setting, rather than being the exterior of the royal palace at St James's, is a cattle-pen in the famous Smithfield meat market.³⁴ Thurlow, dressed this time in the hybrid attire of a farming lord chancellor, stands watch over the pens of cows with human heads who are clad in the scarlet and ermine robes of peers. The peers who are not already in the pens (those associated with the opposition such as the Duke of Portland, the Duke of Norfolk, and Lord Carlisle) are being forcibly driven into the pens by an unidentified drover and a dog wearing a peer's gown with a collar labelled 'Mountford'. Hastings appears on the extreme left of the print, also dressed in hybrid attire—his usual stylised Eastern costume mixed with that of a butcher. Hastings, riding a pitiful-looking white horse (supposed to represent the horse of Hanover, and thereby the state of the royal House of Hanover in Britain) carries with him a calf with the face of George III, whose feet

³³ P. J. Marshall, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings* (London: Oxford University Press), pp. 26–7.

³⁴ James Campbell, 'Cow Lane', in *The Map of Early Modern London*, ed. Janelle Jenstad (Victoria: University of Victoria) <<http://mapoflondon.uvic.ca/COWL1.htm>> (Accessed: 20 June 2018).



James Gillray, 'Market Day' (2 May 1788)
[detail, showing Thurlow as a farmer]
New College, Oxford, NCO 190431

written 'Good Entertainment for Man & Beast', suggesting that the patronage of the Crown was even available to the noble cattle. The second phrase is the latin motto '*Sic itur ad astra*' which roughly translates to 'thus one goes to the stars' and is derived from Virgil's *Aeneid*, IX, 641. Unlike the first phrase, which represents the cynicism of the parliamentary manager, *sic itur ad astra* seems either to be an advertisement for the peers to accept the patronage of the Crown and so to find themselves in the 'divine dwelling-place' described by Virgil, or perhaps a statement from the peers themselves explaining why they had accepted the patronage so offered.

In addition to the obvious suggestion that Hastings has managed to bribe his way to acquittal through the venality of the peerage, the satire is also a statement on the management of the House of Lords. Again, Thurlow's central place in the image is significant. As lord chancellor he was also Speaker of the House of Lords and he is depicted herein very much as the leader of the upper chamber—which he effectively was until the elevation of Lord Grenville in 1790. Regardless of whether he actually had the title, Thurlow dominated the House of Lords, producing a transformation in the style of its proceedings from 1778. His doing so, however, did not go unchallenged. Several peers called into question his relatively humble origins, his impolite manners, and argued that he had 'lowered and tarnished . . . the dignity of that House' through introducing his lawyerly style of argument which was described as 'low, pettifogging chicanery'.³⁵ By July 1788, however, just after the publication of Gillray's 'Market Day', the archbishop of Canterbury declared that without Thurlow 'the House of Lords would be a wretched, insupportable place'.³⁶

³⁵ Speech of the Duke of Grafton, 24 March 1779, in *Parliamentary Register*, XIII, 188; speech of Lord Fortescue, 17 May 1779, in *ibid.*, 371–2; Speech of Lord Fortescue, 3 May 1782, in *Parliamentary Register*, 2nd series, VIII, 283.

³⁶ Archbishop of Canterbury to William Eden, 4 July 1788, in *The Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland*, with a preface and introduction by the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells, 4 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1861–2), II, 217.

James Bland Burges, the famous undersecretary in the Foreign Office, described the way that sheer numbers alone were not sufficient to produce true parliamentary management. 'Thurlow's 'talents as a lawyer . . . had taken from Administration a considerable part of the weight of affairs' in the House of Lords. He had 'for so many years, carried things in the House of Lords with a high hand . . . he obtained an influence there, which, when employed on the side of Government, greatly facilitated every measure which was brought forward'. This influence, he concluded, was at times the only thing 'inducing the rest of the king's ministers to put up with a variety of unpleasant traits in his public character'.³⁷ Gillray's likening Thurlow's command over the House of Lords to that of a farmer over his cattle was—as with all caricature—not without its deliberately exaggerated features, but at its core it is revealing of one of the most important aspects of Lord Thurlow's political career. Gillray was also correct in identifying, even at this early stage, that the peers were sympathetic to Hastings. Of the twenty-nine peers who delivered verdicts at the conclusion of his trial in 1795, the highest number to declare Hastings guilty on any one of the sixteen charges was six.³⁸ He was thereby acquitted by large majorities in each case.



Johann Heinrich Ramberg, 'Sublime Oratory—A Display of it' (5 March 1788)
New College, Oxford, NCO 191213

Having analysed the genuine Gillrays depicting Thurlow in New College's collection, it is necessary to turn to two others whose work has been misattributed to him. The first, 'Sublime Oratory—A Display of it', is another print on the topic of the Hastings trial. It was published on 5 March 1788 near the beginning of the trial proceedings in the Lords. In style, it bears resemblances to Gillray. Hastings's dress and his portrait are quite similar. So, too, is the style of the background, which is clearly recognisable as part of Westminster Hall, the location where the

³⁷ James Bland Burges to Lord Auckland, 10 July 1792, in *Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland*, II, 414–5.

³⁸ Marshall, *Impeachment of Warren Hastings*, p. 85.

trial took place. The portraits of Fox and Burke are similar in terms of the features they depict—Burke as a bespectacled Jesuit, and Fox as a dishevelled rotund figure—but they are executed quite differently. The Yale Center for British Art, the Library of Congress, and the British Museum all attribute the print to Johann Heinrich Ramberg, a Hanoverian artist who came to England in 1781, and reportedly became a pupil of Sir Joshua Reynolds, Francesco Bartolozzi, and Benjamin West.³⁹ He regularly exhibited his work at the Royal Academy before leaving Britain for the continent in 1788 and eventually returning to Germany.⁴⁰ He is known to have produced several other graphic satires during his seven-year stay in Britain, including at least one on the topic of British India, and was particularly prolific in the genre in 1787 and 1788.⁴¹ It may also be significant that several of Ramberg's known works were published by T. Harmer, who published none of Gillray's known output.



Johann Heinrich Ramberg, 'Sublime Oratory—A Display of it' (5 March 1788)
[detail, showing two lawyers] New College, Oxford, NCO 191213

Not only is the work probably that of Ramberg rather than Gillray, it does not appear to contain any depiction of Lord Chancellor Thurlow. There are two lawyers on the left side of the print but neither of them bears any particular resemblance to Thurlow. Furthermore, they wear shorter wigs than Thurlow is customarily depicted in and wear plainer legal gowns. Besides the

³⁹ See <<https://collections.britishart.yale.edu/catalog/tms:42515>>, <www.loc.gov/item/2002714485/>, and <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-5502>.

⁴⁰ R. E. Graves and Annette Peach, 'Ramberg, Johann Heinrich [John Henry] (1763–1840)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (23 September 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23068>> (Accessed 12 December 2023).

⁴¹ J. H. Ramberg, 'Confucious the Second; or, a new sun rising in the Asiatic world!' 12 December 1783. BM Satires 6277; Ramberg, 'Military recreation in Holland' 24 October 1787. BM Satires 7179; Ramberg, 'Rehearsal in Holland 1787' 18 October 1787. BM Satires 7176; Ramberg, 'Performance in Holland in Sept & Octr 1787' 18 October 1787. BM Satires 7177; Ramberg, 'The meeting of the legion club' 23 January 1787. BM Satires 7132; Ramberg, 'Age and Luxury' 10 January 1803; Ramberg, 'Moses chusing his cook' 11 February 1788. BM Satires 7424; Ramberg, 'Politics inside-out—a Farce' 21 October 1787. BM Satires 7178; Ramberg, 'The Triumph' 17 January 1788. BM Satires 7425.

detail of the representation of the lawyers, however, their actions also do not suit Thurlow's situation as lord chancellor and lord high steward of the impeachment proceedings. The lawyer closest to Warren Hastings is leaning over and stealing a gold purse from his pocket, while wiping away a tear—presumably in response to the emotional speeches delivered by Burke or Fox on the part of the prosecution. The lawyer's tears suggest that he believes the rhetoric of the prosecution and is simply fleecing Hastings. As we have seen, however, Thurlow seems genuinely to have believed Hastings to be innocent of the charges brought against him and, to my knowledge, is never accused of or depicted as stealing from Hastings. Although Thurlow is depicted once by Gillray shedding tears at the proceedings of the Hastings trial in Gillray's satire it is more likely intended to convey that he had to be bribed into supporting Hastings and was inadvertently acknowledging his guilt. A stealthy theft of the kind depicted in this satire simply does not fit with Thurlow's role in the trial nor does it correspond well with Gillray's consistent emphasis on Hastings's bribery. What is more, Mary Dorothy George of the British Museum claimed, with a great degree of plausibility, that the lawyers depicted on the extreme left of the print were 'probably two of Hastings's three counsel, Law and Plumer or Dallas'.⁴² For all of these reasons, I do not think that Thurlow is depicted in this print and it is far more likely to be the work of Ramberg rather than Gillray.



Isaac Cruikshank, 'A Ward of Chancery' (8 February 1792)
New College, Oxford, NCO 193113

The final print under consideration in this article, 'A Ward of Chancery' is not a Gillray print but certainly contains a depiction of Lord Thurlow. Its style and representation of the lord chancellor are so completely different to Gillray's that it is unnecessary to point to individual details. Furthermore, the copy in the British Museum contains a signature of 'I[saac]. Cruikshanks',

⁴² Mary Dorothy George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires in the British Museum*, 11 vols (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1870–1954), VI, 461.

which is more commonly written as Cruikshank.⁴³ The print was published several years after the ones previously examined herein, on 8 February 1792. It depicts a young lady, Caroline Thurlow, riding on the back of a stag with the head of her lover, Samuel Brown, 'a young man with fancy manners and no education'.⁴⁴ On the tail of the stag is tied the purse containing the Great Seal of the Realm, one of the instruments of the lord chancellor's office and which is used to mark the monarch's approval of state documents. Chasing after Caroline and her lover are eight judges who accompany Thurlow. Although the identities of the judges are not known, the most prominent of them, standing immediately behind Thurlow and carrying a cane, bears some resemblance to the portraiture of Lloyd Kenyon, 1st Baron Kenyon, who at this time was Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, and was among Thurlow's closest friends. At this time, Thurlow seems to have confided in Kenyon and enlisted his help in bringing Caroline back from her elopement and preventing her marriage. The title of the print 'A Ward of Chancery' refers to the fact that, as lord chancellor, Thurlow presided at the head of the Court of Chancery. Wards of the Court of Chancery were individuals, usually minors but also those deemed to be 'lunatics', who were placed under the protection of the court. In the case of this print, Caroline Thurlow was around twenty years old, and, in spite of her father's disappointment, seems to have been in full control of her mental faculties. The suggestion that she was a 'Ward of the Chancery', therefore, is simply a humorous reference to the fact that her father happened to be the presiding judge of that court.



Isaac Cruikshank, 'A Ward of Chancery' (8 February 1792)
[detail, showing Caroline Thurlow and Samuel Brown] New College, Oxford, NCO 193113

Caroline Thurlow was Lord Thurlow's eldest daughter with his partner Polly Humphreys (or Hervey) who was the daughter of the proprietress of Nando's Coffee-house on Fleet Street near Temple Bar. In a scandal to the mores of the time, Thurlow and Polly never married, despite living together for over three decades and having three children. Why Thurlow never married Polly is not entirely clear, but it may have had something to do with previous relationships. In the early 1760s he married Kitty Lynch, daughter of the dean of Canterbury, and she died shortly after

⁴³ Isaac Cruikshank, 'A Ward of Chancery' 8 February 1792. BM Satires 8164 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-6157>.

⁴⁴ Robert Gore-Browne, *Chancellor Thurlow: The Life and Times of an XVIIIth Century Lawyer* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1953), p. 292.

giving birth to his son Charles.⁴⁵ There is also some suggestion that before this he may have been engaged to Elizabeth Gooch, daughter of a Norfolk surgeon, whose family were close to his, but she reportedly changed her mind on the day of the wedding.⁴⁶ Whether these episodes influenced his decision never again to marry is unclear, but his success in winning the affections of Polly, the popular barmaid at Nando's, caused quite a stir among the advocates of the Inns of Court⁴⁷ Indeed, it caused such a stir that it is referenced multiple times in Cruikshank's print. For instance, Samuel Brown, who looks back endearingly at Caroline, says 'Aye Aye I've Tip't you the Nando old beetle Brow, never fear my Love Ill put *in a Good Plea*.' To the modern eye almost the entire sentence requires decoding. By 'tipping', he may be claiming that he has informed Thurlow and possibly her mother of their courtship—as in 'tipping the wink'.⁴⁸ However, it is also almost certainly a reference to her mother's former role as a barmaid at Nando's, where she would have received tips from customers for her service. 'Nando' is probably referring to her mother and 'old beetle Brow' is a name commonly given to Thurlow on account of his prominent and dark bushy eyebrows. Caroline's response, 'My Father did so before me', is clearly recalling Thurlow's courtship with her mother, although whether Polly left Nando's without her mother's permission is not clear. On the other side of the print, one of the judges exclaims that 'old Bugabo[o] forgets Rob[b]ing the Bar at N—s'. Expressing a similar sentiment, Cradock in his memoirs, noted that Polly 'was always admired at the Bar, and by the Bar'.⁴⁹

Thurlow in this image is depicted with an unusually prominent brow, perhaps because of the 'beetle-brow' label, whereas Gillray tended to emphasise his eyebrows rather than the shape of his brow. He chases after his daughter on foot, holding the lord chancellor's mace raised in his right hand, urging his fellow judges 'D— your Eyes you B—rs why don't you mend your pace'. Such foul language (by the standards of the time) as Thurlow is portrayed as using in this print was regularly ascribed to him in the press, with 'damn' and the 'devil' being among his most frequently uttered 'oaths'.⁵⁰ The depiction of the purse carrying the Great Seal attached to the tail of the stag was presumably an accusation that Thurlow was mixing public and private business by having the judges help him catch his daughter. It may also recall the famous episode on 24 March 1784, when Thurlow's house on Great Ormond Street was broken into and the Great Seal, among other items, was stolen.⁵¹ The implication of the latter is that Thurlow was careless with things entrusted to his care, whether that be the instruments of his public office or the virtue of his daughter. The idea that Thurlow had enlisted the aid of the judges in helping him locate his daughter and prevent her marriage to Samuel Brown may well have been a reference to the fact that he was assisted in this task by Lord Kenyon and his family.⁵² Lord Kenyon *happened* to be the Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, at the time that he was assisting Thurlow, but he was not doing so because of his professional relationship with him. The extant correspondence shows that the Thurlows

⁴⁵ Charles Thurlow, who would presumably have inherited his barony, died in 1786 whilst a student at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

⁴⁶ A. Batty Shaw, 'Benjamin Gooch, Eighteenth-Century Norfolk Surgeon', *Medical History* 16 (1) (1972), 40–50, at pp. 41–2; Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England*, ed. John Allan Mallory, 10 vols (New York: James Cockcroft, 1875), VII, 181.

⁴⁷ See, for instance, 'History of the Tete-a-Tete annexed; or Memoirs of the Amorous Advocate, and the Temple Toast' in *Town and Country Magazine* (1772), 569–71; see also 'Law and equity. Or a peep at Nando's' 14 May 1787. BM Satires 7164 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-5645>.

⁴⁸ *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "to tip the wink" in tip, v.4, sense P.b' (September 2023) <www.oed.com/dictionary/tip_v4> (Accessed: 12 December 2023).

⁴⁹ Joseph Cradock, *Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs*, 4 vols (London: J. B. Nichols, 1826–8), I, 71.

⁵⁰ See, for instance, *St. James's Chronicle or the British Evening Post*, 27–29 September 1787; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, 14 August 1790; *Morning Post*, 13 April 1797; *The Ipswich Journal*, 9 March 1805. Cruikshank also depicted Thurlow's foul language in 'The Progress of Passion', 4 June 1792. BM Satires 8104 <www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1868-0808-6210>.

⁵¹ *Historical and Posthumous Memoirs of Wraxall*, III, 328; Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, VII, 88.

⁵² Lord Thurlow to Lord Kenyon, 11 February 1792, in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/149/7; Lord Thurlow to Lady Kenyon, [April 1792], in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/149/15.

and the Kenyons were extremely close, making frequent visits to one another's houses in the country. The print, therefore, exaggerates Thurlow's recruitment of judges to aid his cause, but Lord and Lady Kenyon did provide significant assistance. Thurlow had not met the groom-to-be but had been told that '[h]e is the most offensive Coxcomb' his informant had ever seen. For Thurlow, Brown had 'not figure and manner enough to recommend Him to the Place of a Groom.'⁵³ He could not believe that Caroline 'a girl of good sense and decent Pride . . . should have entered, even in the slightest degree, into so unworthy an acquaintance'.⁵⁴ He acknowledged that his daughters, being technically illegitimate, laboured under 'disadvantages', but took great care with their education and desired them to marry in such a way that befitted the daughters of the lord high chancellor and a baron of the peerage of Great Britain. His other two daughters, Catherine and Maria, married Alexander Fraser, 17th Lord Saltoun and Sir David Cunynghame, respectively. In the end, Caroline did marry Samuel Brown, who went on to pursue a career in the army.⁵⁵ Thurlow, for his part, almost immediately disinherited Caroline, amending his will so as to leave her with nothing.⁵⁶

By late 1802, something of a rapprochement appears to have taken place between father and eldest daughter. Thurlow fell ill in December of that year and never seems to have fully recovered. Caroline Brown, whose husband was serving overseas, remained in Brighton to take care of her father and was there at his death in 1806. In spite of this seeming reconciliation, however, Thurlow does not seem to have made great emendations to his final will, except that Caroline would receive £600 a year on the condition that she agrees to live 'separate from her Husband'.⁵⁷ Ultimately, the issue was resolved by the kindness of Catherine and Maria, who requested their cousin Edward, who succeeded his uncle as the 2nd Baron Thurlow, to grant the annual £600 to Caroline without condition. Even with this, Caroline received only a fraction of the fortunes provided to her sisters.⁵⁸

The additional five Gillray prints examined herein, portraying Lord Thurlow's relationship with the prince of Wales and his participation in the impeachment trial of Warren Hastings, have provided a foundation for highlighting several aspects of Thurlow's career that were not present in the previous analysis. In doing so, these graphic satires shed light on important episodes in the career of a lord chancellor who has generally been neglected by historians. Such caricatures provide a window into the world of rumour and gossip that circulated through the arterial lanes of the metropolis. Few figures were so frequently the target of apocryphal vignettes as Lord Thurlow. By analysing the visual manifestations of such stories alongside the textual archival record, we can obtain a valuable glimpse into the intersections between myth and reality in eighteenth-century Britain.

Ben Gilding
former Don King Junior Research Fellow
New College, Oxford

⁵³ Lord Thurlow to Lord Kenyon, 11 February 1792, in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/149/7.

⁵⁴ Lord Thurlow to Lady Kenyon, [April 1792], in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/149/15.

⁵⁵ They married on 31 May 1792 in the church of St Martin-in-the-Fields, Westminster. City of Westminster Archives Centre, Westminster Church of England Parish Registers, STM/PR/6/16.

⁵⁶ 'Will of Edward Lord Thurlow, 28 April 1792', in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/149/17.

⁵⁷ Catherine Thurlow to Lady Kenyon, 29 September 1806, in Lancashire Archives, Kenyon Papers, DDKE/1/1/162/58.

⁵⁸ They were reported to have received the enormous sum of £70,000 each in his will. See *Gentleman's Magazine* 76 (2) (July–December 1806), 975.