

sellers. Promotions, Mr Wilkes as high as he can go<sup>9</sup>—apropos he was told Lord Chancellor<sup>10</sup> intended to signify to him that the King did not approve the City's choice; he replied, 'Then I shall signify to his Lordship that I am at least as fit to be Lord Mayor as he to be Lord Chancellor'<sup>11</sup>—this being more gospel than everything Mr Wilkes says, the formal approbation was given.<sup>12</sup>

Mr Burke has succeeded at Bristol,<sup>13</sup> and Sir James Peachey<sup>14</sup> will miscarry in Sussex.<sup>15</sup> I fear it costs the Duke<sup>16</sup> a great sum<sup>17</sup>—but what care you, Madam, about our Parliament; you will see the *rentrée* of the old one,<sup>18</sup> with songs and epigrams into the bargain. We do not shift our Parliaments with so much gaiety. Money in one hand, and abuse in t'other—those are all the arts we know. *Wit and a gamut* I don't believe ever signified a Parliament, whatever the glossaries may say,<sup>19</sup> for they never produce pleasantry and harmony<sup>20</sup>—perhaps you may not taste this Saxon pun, but I know it will make the Antiquarian Society die with laughing.

Expectation hangs on America. The result of the General Assem-

9. As lord mayor of London.

10. Henry Bathurst (1714–94), cr. (1771) Bn of Apsley; 2d E. Bathurst, 1775; lord chancellor 1771–8.

11. HW records in *Mem. Geo. III* iv. 174 that the legal profession punned on Lord Apsley's ignorance, calling him 'Lord *Absque*'; Wraxall says of him that he 'may probably be considered as the least able lawyer to whom the Great Seal of this country was confided, in the course of the eighteenth century' (*Historical Memoirs of His Own Time*, 1836, ii. 203).

12. 3 Nov. (*Daily Adv.* 4 Nov.).

13. He was returned for Bristol 3 Nov. with Henry Cruger (Namier and Brooke i. 283–6).

14. (1723–1808), 4th Bt, 1765; cr. (1794) Bn Selsey; M.P. Seaford 1755–68.

15. He finished third and last in the poll 20 Oct. (*ibid.* i. 388); see n. 17.

16. Of Richmond.

17. In supporting Sir Thomas Spencer Wilson against Peachey. The Duke and Thomas Pelham, the leading patrons in the county, had promised to be neutral, agreeing that they and their adherents would give one vote to Richmond's brother, Lord George Lennox, while the other two candidates, Peachey and Sir Thomas Spencer Wilson, were to contest the re-

maining seat unaided (*ibid.*). However, Richmond, at least, appears not to have observed the neutrality; Lady Mary Coke, who was for Peachey, writes in *Journals*, iv. 425, *sub* 6 Nov., that 'the Duke of Richmond has behaved most shamefully: he promised a neutrality, since which his Grace's servants have voted for Sir Thomas Willson, and the Duchess took a meal man into her coach because he was a friend to Sir Thomas.' John Baker Holroyd wrote on 25 Nov. 1774 to congratulate Wilson on having freed the country from 'lordly nominations,' presumably referring to the support Peachey received from the Court (Namier and Brooke, *loc. cit.*, iii. 255–6); it was perhaps in opposition to this outside support that Richmond took up Wilson's cause, Wilson having been nominated by an assembly of Sussex freeholders (*ibid.* iii. 646–7).

18. The old Parliament of Paris, banished in 1771, was restored by a *lit de justice* of 12 Nov. (Mann viii. 55, n. 5).

19. The Witenagemot was the assembly of the Witan, the King's council of wise men in Anglo-Saxon times; the term has been used by transference to denote the assembly of modern parliaments (OED).

20. HW by 'gamut' means the musical gamut or scale; see *ibid.*