

This formed the nucleus of the magnificent national collection of ancient sculpture in the British Museum. The next grand addition was that of the series of reliefs which had adorned the Temple of Apollo Epicurius, near Phigaleia, and which the Prince Regent bought at a cost of nearly 20,000*l.*, and presented to the nation in 1815. These rilievi, though falling short of the highest excellence of Greek art, are believed to be the work of some of the best scholars of Phidias. They are of great beauty, and of greater interest, as illustrating the history of Greek art. But the most important of the collections was that of the sculpture of the Parthenon, commonly known as the Elgin Marbles, for the purchase of which parliament voted, in 1816, the sum of 35,000*l.* These wonderful works are by far the finest extant examples of Greek sculpture when at its greatest perfection—the sculpture of the time of Pericles, executed by Phidias, or by his scholars under his immediate superintendence. For years the Earl of Elgin, who whilst ambassador to the Porte obtained the firman through which he was enabled to remove the sculpture from the Parthenon, was assailed with the bitterest invectives for this act of Vandalism as it was termed. But in truth, the earl by their removal saved these marvellous works from utter destruction; he was not in time to save them from grievous mutilation. The Parthenon had been shattered in the Venetian bombardment; afterwards, the eastern pediment, with its matchless statuary, was thrown down to fit the building for the service of the Greek Church; later, and up to the hour when they were rescued by Lord Elgin, the statues were used as targets by the Turkish soldiers; and finally, in the war of Greek independence (1827), the building received great additional injury during the bombardment of the city, but the best of the sculpture was then happily safe in the British Museum, preserved for ever for the free study of all.

A national collection of sculpture was thus formed; but it was not till 1824 that a national gallery of painting was founded. Something had, however, been done towards clearing the way for such a consummation. In 1805, a small body of noblemen and gentlemen who felt an interest in art, succeeded in establishing the British Institution, the primary object of which was declared to be “to encourage the talents of the artists of the United Kingdom; and with this view the Shakspeare Gallery, built by Alderman Boydell, was purchased and appropriated to the exhibition and sale of the productions of British artists, and the exhibition of pictures by the old masters. This last was the grand novelty in the scheme. Most of the directors, and many of the subscribers, were them-

selves the possessors of collections of paintings by the old masters, and from their galleries, and the collections of other liberal amateurs, has been obtained annually enough pictures of a high class to make a most interesting and always varied exhibition. These exhibitions for the first time afforded to the general public the opportunity of seeing at their leisure paintings by the great masters; and there can be little doubt that to them is to be ascribed a large measure of the interest in art which resulted in the formation of the National Gallery. The directors at the same time sought to encourage living artists, not only by providing a gallery for the sale as well as exhibition of their works, but by offering annual premiums for pictures of a high character, and by occasionally purchasing their pictures. Among the painters to whom premiums were awarded were Hilton, Haydon, Alston, Bird, Linnell, Martin, and others whose names will be remembered, but as may be supposed more whose names are already forgotten. Up to 1820 the Society had only purchased four pictures, first among which was Benjamin West's “Christ Healing the Sick,” for which the directors gave the painter 3000 guineas, and which they presented to the National Gallery immediately after its formation. The interest in art no doubt also received a considerable impulse from the opening to the public in 1812 of the collection of paintings, chiefly of the Dutch and Flemish schools, bequeathed to Dulwich College by Sir Francis Bourgeois, and for the reception of which a gallery was built by Sir John Soane. The Dulwich Gallery does not rank among the great picture galleries, but it has done good service to art in this country, and not least as a precursor of the National Gallery. It is understood that the pictures now forming the Dulwich Gallery, and which were collected by Mr. Noel Desenfans, were offered to the government during the ministry of Mr. Pitt on condition that a gallery should be built for their reception. The offer was declined.

After a few years of enfeebled health, Reynolds finally laid down his pencil in 1787, and died in 1792. From this time till the year at which this chapter closes, West, as president of the Royal Academy, was nominally at the head of the British school of painting. During these years he continued to paint pictures of large dimensions, and treating of the loftiest themes in sacred and profane history. But his style underwent no change, and we have nothing to add to the summary printed in a former volume. His friendly rival was John Singleton Copley, whose manner is favourably shown in his “Death of Chatham,” now a leading ornament of the British section of the National Gallery. Fuseli, too, painted,

lectured, and taught; but his spasmodic compositions now scarcely excite a passing remark; and though critics termed them sublime, it may be doubted whether they ever were in any degree popular. His greatest effort was his Milton Gallery, a series of fifty paintings illustrative of the poetry of Milton. The pictures were publicly exhibited in 1799, and again in the following year, but the receipts at the doors were insufficient to defray the expenses, and the painter would have been seriously embarrassed had not private admirers come forward to purchase enough of the pictures to save him from the consequences of his temerity.

Among the younger aspirants for immortality in "high art," the unfortunate Haydon was in the latter years of the regency the most conspicuous. His "Macbeth," "Judgment of Solomon," "Christ's entry into Jerusalem," and other gallery paintings, had aroused equal admiration and criticism, and Haydon in an evil hour was tempted to defend his own theories of art and to denounce those of his adversaries. Controversy has irresistible fascinations for some minds. Haydon was one of her victims. To his private and personal quarrels he added one with the Royal Academy. The result was what might have been predicted. He became a fluent speaker, and a piquant if not a very correct or altogether trustworthy writer. In his proper calling he made no advance. His earliest works were indeed his best. And as he found once ardent admirers grow cold, and timid friends fall away, his bitterness increased, and from this time to his unhappy death he was a disappointed man. Yet he might have been a good painter, and he was certainly a good teacher, if we may estimate a teacher's ability by the success of such pupils as Eastlake, Lance, and the Landseers. Hilton was elected an Academician in 1820, but he had as yet chiefly painted classical subjects, and had altogether failed of popular recognition. Etty had at present scarcely made his name at all known. Martin had startled the critics and fascinated the public by his "Joshua" (1814), and his still more extraordinary "Fall of Babylon" (1819). Stothard was delighting a narrow circle with his elegant but rather feeble paintings; and spending his real strength in making vignettes of almost matchless grace for engraving, at the rate of half a guinea or a guinea a-piece.

In portraiture, from the early part of the nineteenth century to his death in 1830, Lawrence was regarded as the undisputed successor to Reynolds. Northcote, Opie, Hoppner, Beechey, and Jackson, portrait painters of considerable ability and followers more or less of Reynolds, enjoyed a fair share of royal or popular patronage, but none obtained like Lawrence universal favour. Per-

haps Lawrence owed somewhat of his good fortune to the very contrast afforded by his easy superficial elegance to the more sombre splendour of his predecessor. It would be foolish to compare Lawrence as a painter with Reynolds, but Lawrence was undoubtedly in his way an admirable artist. His sitters were the noblest and fairest in the land, and, whilst preserving the likeness, he seldom failed in the expression of manly intellect, and never in that of female beauty. His grand series of portraits of the distinguished actors in the affairs of 1814 and 1815 now in the Waterloo Gallery, Windsor Castle, could probably not have been so well painted by any contemporary artist. In a certain broad and vigorous delineation of a male head, however, Lawrence was surpassed by Raeburn, at this time the principal portrait painter in Scotland. But Raeburn was a supremely national painter. It was the hard-featured shrewd Scottish head he gloried in painting and painted so well. The southron fared but indifferently under his vigorous pencil. Of a wholly different stamp was the elegant Harlow, who might in time perhaps have rivalled his master, Lawrence, but who died in opening manhood. His "Trial of Queen Katharine," despite its popularity, gave little promise of greatness as a painter of history; it was in fact rather a group of portraits of the Kemble family, and as such it should be estimated.

Portraiture in the hands of Lawrence assumed a new phase at this period. But a far greater change was made in the painting of scenes of domestic life by David Wilkie. Hogarth had painted both high life and low life, but it was with the pencil of a stern and relentless satirist, and in order to point a moral. Bird had still more recently depicted scenes of humble life, but with a halting and unequal touch. Wilkie was the first to paint with thorough artistic skill, and a gentle genial humour and quiet appreciation of character, the pleasant side of the everyday life of the peasant and the yeoman. His earlier pictures, "The Village Politicians," "The Blind Fiddler," "The Card Players," "The Village Festival," "The Cut Finger," "Blindman's Buff," "The Penny Wedding," and the like, were all of this homely cheerful character. It was not till 1815 that he touched a more pathetic chord in his "Distraint for Rent." From the outset Wilkie achieved an almost unbounded popularity. His pictures told a story that all could understand; expressed a sentiment with which all could sympathize; and were in all respects painted with a truthfulness which every one could recognize. They won, therefore, the general suffrage; and at the same time their conformity, in composition, colour, and other obvious technical qualities, to the princi-

ples of the Dutch masters who excelled in similar subjects, was equally efficacious with the *cognoscenti* who then gave the law in pictorial criticism. Up to the close of the period before us, Wilkie continued to paint carefully studied subjects of the healthy homely class in which he first acquired fame. Two or three years later he visited the continent, and from that time he entirely altered his manner of painting and range of subjects. But that change we need not here anticipate. At the time we now leave him he was undoubtedly the most generally popular painter in England.

Far greater and probably more permanent was the influence on English art of the genius of Turner than that of either of the painters we have yet noticed. Landscape painting towards the close of the last century was fast falling into conventionalism and inanity. The authority of the men who had just passed away, and the imitation of the old masters, paralyzed individual effort. Turner commenced his career by making coloured drawings, in which he aimed at little more than correct topographical representation. Long after he began to paint in oil he continued to study and imitate the manner of his predecessors,—Wilson, Louthborough, and occasionally Gainsborough, in English scenery; Van-develde in representations of the sea; whilst Claude was his guide in classical compositions. But year after year he showed more and more self-reliance and originality; and ever increasing knowledge of the capabilities of landscape art, and extended acquaintance with the phenomena of nature. The wonderful range of Turner's powers as a landscape painter were not wholly developed in the period before us. He visited Italy for the first time in 1819, and his Italian pictures were consequently as yet unpainted. But his power as a painter of English scenery had reached its farthest extent. The "Crossing the Brook," the noblest English landscape of its kind ever painted, was exhibited in 1815. It now forms one of the choicest of the Turner treasures in the National Gallery. Its hitherto unapproached expression of space, magical aerial perspective, quiet beauty of colour, and poetical feeling, gave it a standing quite apart from the work of any previous painter of English scenery. Gainsborough doubtless excelled Turner in a poetic rendering of close home scenery; Wilson perhaps excelled him in a certain classical elevation of style. But neither Wilson nor Gainsborough could have painted a picture like this. Nor did Turner ever equal it. "Richmond Hill," painted in 1819, was a grievous falling off; and he never again painted English scenery on a grand scale, for of course such pictures as "Rain, Steam, and Speed" are to be classed as poetic fancies rather than English scenes.

But it was not merely as a painter of English landscape scenery that Turner was pre-eminent. In his "Shipwreck," now in the National Gallery; "A Gale at Sea," in the gallery of the Earl of Ellesmere; "The Wreck of the Minotaur," belonging to the Earl of Yarborough, and some others, he had painted a stormy sea with a force and majesty such as no previous painter had ever reached. In such works again as the "Garden of the Hesperides" (1806); "Apollo and Python" (1810); "Building of Carthage" (1815); and "Decline of Carthage" (1817); he had treated classical subjects with singular brilliancy and vigour of imagination. And not only these but a multiplicity of other pictures showed at once his wonderful versatility and poetic feeling, as well as his close observation of nature, especially of every variety of atmospheric phenomena, and his unrivalled knowledge of effect.

It is sometimes said that it was not till towards the close of his life that Turner's greatness as an artist was recognized. But this is a mistake. From almost the very outset of his artistic career, his superiority was admitted both by his professional brethren and such of the public as then took an interest in art. He was elected an associate of the Royal Academy at the earliest age (24), at which, by the laws of the academy he could be elected; and again, at the earliest legal age (27), he was elected a full member. Collectors bought his pictures at constantly increasing prices; and engravers and publishers eagerly outbid each other for his drawings, knowing well that engravings after Turner were more popular than engravings after any other landscape painter. He had indeed by the time at which we are arrived become a wealthy man by the exercise of his art,—which is certainly more than at that time could have been said of any other English landscape artist,—and in a country like England pecuniary success is at least an evidence that a man is admired by those to whom he addresses his efforts. There were differences of opinion respecting Turner's works, as there always are differences of opinion respecting the works of a man of original genius, but his genius was not without recognition. It was not till later, when his pictures had become to the ordinary observer unintelligible eccentricities, that his popularity as a painter began to wane.

During the later years of this period there were several other admirable landscape painters:—Callcott, a pleasing and graceful artist, coming sometimes close to the quieter manner of Turner, sometimes approaching the manner of the landscape painters of the Netherlands, but never very original or very vigorous; Constable, both original and vigorous—a hearty, unsophisticated delin-

eator of homely English scenery, and especially of the scenery of the eastern counties—but a good deal of a mannerist, and somewhat confined in his range; Nasmyth, the best of the minute copyists of our woodlands and commons, ill-understood, and little appreciated in his life, and now perhaps a little overrated; Hofland, a genuine lover of quiet river scenery; and Collins, the ablest painter of his day of coast and inland scenery in combination with rustic groups.

Animal painting had in George Morland, at the early part of this period, a representative of great ability, but of coarse intemperate habits, and the character of the man too often found expression in his pictures. He was succeeded by James Ward, only lately passed from among us at a patriarchal age, a clever painter, but superseded while still young, by a yet younger rival, Landseer, and falling, perhaps as a consequence, into hopeless and most eccentric mannerism. Edwin Landseer, though yet a youth, had attained celebrity before the close of this period, but his real artistic career was hardly commenced.

The essentially English art of Water-colour Painting dates its rise from this period. In the catalogues of the earliest exhibitions of the Royal Academy we find entries of "stained drawings." These belong to the first crude stage of the art. They were produced by the entire drawing being in the first instance made in light and shadow, with a gray or neutral tint. Over this the several local colours were passed in thin transparent washes, the ground tint softening the harshness of the superposed local colours. The sharp markings of the details were then added, usually with a reed pen. In this manner, modified by the habits of the respective artists, some very pleasing drawings were made by Paul Sandby, Hearne, and especially Cozens, a landscape draftsman of refined feeling and considerable power. Turner and his friend and fellow student, Thomas Girtin, for some time practised in this manner; but they were led gradually to abandon it, and adopt the method — which originated with them — of painting every object in the first instance in its proper local colour, and by subsequent shades and tints, and various manipulatory processes, modifying this first painting till the whole picture is brought to the desired appearance. By this improved method, water-colour painting acquired an exquisite freshness and transparency quite its own, and which in the opinion of many almost atoned for the absence of the depth, force, and richness of oil. Girtin was a landscape painter of considerable ability if not genius, and some of his water-colour paintings are of exceeding beauty; but he died young, and it is mainly to Turner

that the infant art owed its early culture and vigorous growth. His sketches and finished pictures in water-colours are extremely numerous and extremely fine; and in them may be traced at least the germs of almost every improvement or modification of the water-colour process. Turner early turned aside to oil painting, though he continued to execute his vignettes for the engravers in water-colours; but many able artists devoted themselves wholly to the rising art; and brought it to the perfection which it ultimately reached. Among these may be mentioned Prout, unrivalled as the delineator of picturesque old houses and fragments of crumbling ruins; and David Cox, one of the boldest, and at times one of the grandest, painters of English hills, meadows, and sandy coasts, under the influence of storm and rain. So rapidly did the new art become popular, and so confident were its professors in their own strength and resources, that in 1805 they formed themselves into a Society of Painters in Water Colours, which has ever since continued to hold with unflinching success an annual exhibition of the works of its members.

The great extension of a taste for art was in no way more clearly shown than in the increased demand for engravings and for illustrated publications. The higher branches of engraving were however hardly so successfully cultivated. There was no engraver like Strange or Woollett, and the prints called for by the public were of a less elevated class of subjects. But engravers of unquestionable ability were very numerous, and an unparalleled number of excellent prints was published. Boydell's Shakespeare was issued towards the close of the century at a vast expense. To such works as this, the folio Milton, Macklin's Bible, the Poet's Gallery, and the like, succeeded a host of topographical works, editions of the poets, essayists, and novelists, with small vignettes, and handsome folios and quartos of antiquarian and architectural subjects. In the former class the drawings of Turner may be said to have formed a school of landscape engravers, neat, refined, and brilliant beyond previous example in the execution of small plates, but wanting in grandeur and vigour, when grappling with plates of a large size. The architectural publications, especially those of John Britton, and the elder Pugin, aided by the singular talent of the Le Keuxes in engraving mediæval buildings, did much to arouse that strong interest in Gothic architecture which has in our own day led to such remarkable results.

The demand for illustrated works had however an inevitable tendency to stimulate their more rapid and cheaper production. Engravers, instead of executing their plates throughout with their

own hands, employed pupils and assistants on the earlier and less important parts. Further to expedite the process machines were at this time invented, the best being that of Mr. Lowry, by which the skies, plain backgrounds, and the like, could be ruled in, and thus the work of weeks be accomplished in a few hours. The tendency of this employment of mechanical appliances, and of the system of journeywork, was undoubtedly to interfere with the development of the highest individual excellence; but the increasing of the quantity and cheapening the cost of works only inferior to those of the first class in the higher refinements of the art, assisted largely to diffuse a knowledge and a love of art. The use of steel plates instead of copper, which carried this cheapening process so much farther, was introduced early in the century; but steel plates were not tried for fine art purposes till about 1818, and did not fairly come into use till five or six years later.

At the head of the line engravers, at the commencement of this period, was William Sharpe, who has left some good prints from the works of the old masters, but who was greatest as a portrait engraver: his print of John Hunter after Reynolds, is of its kind a masterpiece. Other line engravers of ability, his contemporaries and successors, and like him engravers of subject pieces and portraits, were Fittler, Sherwin, Warren, John Landseer the father of the painter, James and Charles Heath, Raimbach, who engraved the earlier prints after Wilkie, and John Burnet, like Raimbach, best known by his prints after Wilkie, but like him an excellent engraver of general subjects. The landscape engravers in line were very numerous, and the later ones especially brilliant executants. Among them were Middiman, Byrne, Cooke, John Pye, a thoroughly conscientious and able artist, the Findens, and others. In mezzotinto engraving, landscape was most successfully cultivated during this period, as portraiture had been in the preceding. Earlom, who engraved the *Liber Veritatis* of Claude; Lupton, who engraved many plates in the *Liber Studiorum* and the Rivers of Turner; Charles Turner, who in his plate from Turner's Shipwreck produced the noblest print of its class yet published; and S. Reynolds, were eminent in this branch of art. Aquatinta, now almost a lost art, was at this time successfully practised by F. C. Lewis, Daniell, and others. Bartolozzi at the beginning of the period was in the height of popularity for his engravings in the dotted or chalk manner, but they were really of a very meretricious character. William Blake was also an engraver in various manners, some of them peculiar to himself. But Blake is best known by his designs, full of the wildest extravagances, yet with constantly recurring quaint,

graceful, and suggestive fancies, always however running along the narrow line which proverbially divides genius from madness.

Wood Engraving dates its revival from this period. Thomas Bewick, to whose rare application and ability this revival is almost entirely to be ascribed, began to engrave on wood while apprentice to a general engraver; and he received from the Society of Arts a prize for a wood-cut of a "Huntsman and Hounds," almost as soon as his apprenticeship had terminated. Bewick resided all his life at his native place, Newcastle-on-Tyne; drew most of his designs, and engraved them with a combined vigour and delicacy of line, power of expression, and felicitous characterization of surface, that came with all the freshness of novelty upon his contemporaries. Bewick published his "General History of Quadrupeds," the work by which he acquired celebrity, in 1790. It passed through several editions, and secured a ready reception for all his subsequent publications. In finish it was surpassed by later works, but only his "British Birds" (1797-1804) equalled it in design. Among single prints, the finest was his "Chillingham Bull." Bewick was always happiest in drawing and engraving objects of natural history. But his little tail-pieces, especially those illustrative of the effects of cruelty to animals, have some of them touches of a grim humour that would have done no discredit to Hogarth's pencil.

Lithography was invented by Alois Senefelder towards the end of the 18th century. It was introduced into England in 1801 by M. P. H. André, under the designation of Polyautography. André's chief publication was a series of thirty-six prints from sketches by West, Stothard, and other eminent artists; but his rude and blurred impressions were regarded as mere curiosities. In 1805 he transferred his business to a Mr. Volweiler, who was equally unsuccessful. The art seems then to have been neglected for some years, till Mr. R. Ackerman established a press, from which was issued in 1819 the illustrations to his translation of Senefelder's "Complete Course of Lithography." These prints, though much better than André's, were still very deficient in strength and clearness. It was not till the subject was taken up by Mr. Charles Hullmandel, who to the training of an artist added some chemical knowledge and great manipulative dexterity, that the capabilities of the art were fairly developed in this country. A really good lithograph can, however, hardly be said to have been produced in London as early as 1820.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.

1820.—LIST OF THE KING'S MINISTERS.

CABINET MINISTERS.

Earl of Harrowby	Lord President of the Council.
Lord Eldon	Lord High Chancellor.
Earl of Westmoreland	Lord Privy Seal.
Earl of Liverpool	First Lord of the Treasury.
Right Hon. Nicholas Vansittart	Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Viscount Melville	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Duke of Wellington	Master General of the Ordnance.
Viscount Sidmouth	Secretary of State for the Home Department.
Viscount Castlereagh	Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Earl Bathurst	Secretary of State for the Department of War and the Colonies.
Right Hon. George Canning	President of the Board of Control for the Affairs of India.
Right Hon. C. B. Bathurst	Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.
Right Hon. W. W. Pole	Master of the Mint.
Right Hon. F. J. Robinson	Treasurer of the Navy, and President of the Board of Trade.
Earl of Mulgrave	Without office.

NOT OF THE CABINET.

Viscount Palmerston	Secretary at War.
Right Hon. Charles Long	Paymaster-General of the Forces.
Earl of Chichester	} Joint Postmaster-General.
Marquess of Salisbury	
Right Hon. C. Arbuthnot	} Joint Secretaries of the Treasury.
S. R. Lushington, Esq.	
Right Hon. Thomas Wallace	Vice-President of the Board of Trade.
Right Hon. Thomas Plumer	Master of the Rolls.
Right Hon. Sir John Leach	Vice-Chancellor.
Sir Robert Gifford	Attorney-General.
Sir John Copley	Solicitor-General.

GREAT OFFICERS OF STATE.

Marquess of Cholmondeley	Lord Steward.
Marquess of Hertford	Lord Chamberlain.
Duke of Montrose	Master of the Horse.
His Royal Highness the Duke of York	Commander-in-Chief.
Sir Hildebrand Oakes	Lieut-General of the Ordnance.
Right Hon. William Huskisson	First Commissioner of Woods and Forests and Land Revenue.

IRELAND.

Earl Talbot	Lord Lieutenant.
Lord Lanners	Lord High Chancellor.
Right Hon. Charles Grant	Chief Secretary.
Right Hon. Sir G. F. Hill	Vice-Treasurer.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Meeting of Parliament on the demise of George III.—Prorogation and dissolution.—The Cato-street Conspiracy.—Debate on the subject of Queen Caroline.—Differences between the King and the Cabinet regarding the Queen.—The ministerial propositions finally agreed to.—Opening of the new Parliament.—Preparations for the Coronation of the Queen expected.—Her arrival.—Green bag containing papers laid before Parliament.—Adjournment.—Conferences for averting a public proceeding.—Failure of the negotiation.—The Bill of Pains and Penalties.—Scenes in the streets.—Scenes in the House of Lords.—The Third reading of the Bill carried by a small majority.—The Bill finally abandoned.—Joy of the country.—Discussions on the subject of the Queen in the next Session.—The Coronation of the King.—The Queen vainly endeavours to be present.—Her death and funeral.

UPON the Accession of George the Fourth there were the same Ministers in the Cabinet as those which formed the Administration of the Earl of Liverpool at the close of the war; with the exception of Mr. Canning, who in 1816 succeeded the earl of Buckinghamshire as President of the Board of Control.*

The Statutes of William and of Anne provided that the demise of the Crown should not interfere with the regular course of Constitutional government. Under these Statutes the Parliament, although adjourned to the 15th of February, assembled on Sunday morning the 30th of January; adjourned till the next day; and then proceeded to the swearing in of members. On the 17th of February, the Houses having again assembled, a message was delivered from the King, recommending that such measures should be adopted by the House of Commons as were necessary to provide for the exigencies of the public service, during the short period that must elapse between the termination of the present Session and the opening of a new Parliament, which it was his Majesty's intention to call without delay. The Houses sat till the 28th of February. During a few days after the death of his father, the King had been seriously ill, not without some apprehension that this would be the shortest reign in English history. When the Parliament was prorogued, with a view to its immediate dissolution, the Speech of the Royal Commissioners alluded to

* See volume vii. p. 576. The List in the opposite page of the King's Ministers, of the Great Officers of State, of the Law officers, and of the Irish Administration, is of the date of June, 1820.