



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

**A** 476396

DUPL













I. THE CLAIMS OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS, K. B.,  
TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF 1787:5  
JUNIUS'S LETTERS,  
DISPROVED:

II. SOME ENQUIRY INTO THE CLAIMS OF  
THE LATE CHARLES LLOYD, ESQ.

TO THE COMPOSITION OF THEM:

III. *Observations on the Conduct, Character, and Style of  
the Writings, of*

THE LATE RIGHT HON. EDMUND BURKE:

IV. EXTRACTS

FROM THE WRITINGS OF SEVERAL EMINENT PHILOLOGISTS,  
ON THE  
LACONIC AND ASIATIC, THE ATTIC AND RHODIAN  
STYLES OF ELOQUENCE,

---

*Nonnulli, tardio investigandæ penitus veritatis, cuilibet opinioni temere potius  
succumbunt, quam in explorando pertinaci diligentia perseverant.*

Cf. Thucyd. 1, 20.

MINUCIUS FELIX, Oct. 5.

---

By <sup>done</sup> E. H. BARKER, ESQ.,  
*Of Thetford, in Norfolk.*

---

LONDON:

JOHN BOHN, HENRIETTA-STREET, COVENT-GARDEN,  
AND T. RODD, 2 GREAT NEWPORT-STREET, LONG-ACRE.

---

1828.

11527

020419 S. S.

# PREFACE.


THE following book contains five *Letters*, on the authorship of Junius's *Letters*, which were addressed, four of them to gentlemen, whom the writer has the good fortune to number among his friends, CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ., the REV. DR. MARTIN DAVY, M. D., GODFREY HIGGINS, ESQ., and SIR UVEDALE PRICE, with a fifth addressed to SIR JAMES MACKINTOSH, with whom he has not the honour of being acquainted. These five *Letters* were privately circulated among the friends and acquaintance of the Author, and sent to such strangers, as were known, or thought likely, to take an interest in the discussion of a question, which has for so many years exercised the understandings of intelligent and wise, the acuteness of ingenious and sagacious men, and the curiosity of the literary public. The Author had conceived that he should be able, by a strict process of reasoning, by extensive researches, by a wary examination into facts, by a diligent survey of what had been written on some parts of the subject, and by uniform impartiality and candour, to throw some light on the question, and to furnish others with some safe and certain means of pursuing their enquiries to a successful termination. He had not miscalculated in this respect, if he may be allowed to judge from the numerous communications, which he has received from persons, who are well qualified to give an opinion, from their acquaintance with the subject, and their

Recd. Mr. . . .

powers of discrimination ; and the reader will find some proofs of this fact in the book itself. Emboldened by their “ words of encouragement,” “ smiles of favour,” and “ acts of assistance,” he now lays before the public these compositions with many alterations and considerable additions. He trusts that the reader will discover in them the marks of a mind accustomed to investigate without prejudice, to refute without bitterness, and to decide without dogmatism ; and, whatever criticisms his performance may receive from the public censors of literature, he will be ready to acknowledge any errors, which they may detect in his arguments, and to rectify any mistakes, which he may unintentionally have made in matters of fact.

The reader will perceive from the dates of the *Letters* that they were written at different times, as the Author found intervals of leisure amidst literary pursuits of a weightier and very different nature. This circumstance will account for several repetitions, which may be found in them, and for the same argument being supported by different facts and different reasoning in different parts of the book, which in other circumstances would have been methodised into one paragraph.

The general opinion of those, to whose perusal his papers have been submitted, is that he has completely succeeded in subverting the claims of Sir Philip Francis to the authorship of Junius's *Letters*, which the ingenuity of Mr. John Taylor had, in his book entitled *The Identity of Junius with a Distinguished Living Character. Established*, apparently placed on a solid basis. A few weeks before the decease of Dr. John Mason Good, who



was the editor of Mr. Woodfall's edition of Junius's *Letters*, and the writer of the *Preliminary Essay*, which is contained in it, the Author received from the Doctor the following *Note*: —

“ *Guildford Street, Oct. 13, 1826.*

“ DEAR SIR,

Accept my thanks for your obliging copy of your first *Letter* on the subject of Junius and Sir Philip Francis.

“ Many years ago, as perhaps you may be aware, I entered at full speed into this research, and beat the bush in every direction. At that time, however, the claims of Sir Philip Francis had not been advanced, at least not before the public. But, had they been brought forward, the arguments, by which it is obvious they may be met, and many of which you have yourself ably handled, would, I think, have succeeded in putting him as completely out of the list as all the other competitors appear to be put, whose friends have undertaken to bring them forward.

“ The question is, nevertheless, one of great interest, as well on the score of national history, as of literary curiosity. Yet, like many other *desiderata*, I am afraid it is likely to lie beyond the fathoming of any line and plummet, that will be applied to it in our days.

“ I shall always be happy to hear of your success, and am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

J. M. GOOD.”

“ To E. H. Barker, Esq.”

The reader will observe, in the above *Letter* of Dr. J. M. G., his indirect acknowledgment of the authorship of



the *Preliminary Essay* in Woodfall's edition of Junius, and therefore the contents of the *Letter* merit preservation.

One or two friends of the Author are so satisfied with some single arguments against the claims of Sir Philip Francis, that they consider him to have taken on himself superfluous labour in accumulating proof on proof that the credit of these compositions does not belong to Sir Philip. The Author has told to them in reply that he perfectly agrees with them in thinking that there are some single arguments, which establish his case; but diversity of minds requires variety of proofs — that argument, which will satisfy one judgment, will not satisfy another, and yet that other person may be convinced, if he be met on his own ground. The Author has cunningly called their attention to the story, which the learned and eloquent Sir Thomas Browne tells to us in his *Religio Medici* 1, 21. p. 56. : — “ I remember a Doctor-in-physick of Italy, who could not perfectly believe the immortality of the soul, because Galen seemed to make a doubt thereof. With another I was familiarly acquainted in France, a divine, and a man of singular parts, that on the same point was so plunged and gravelled with three lines of Seneca,\* that all our antidotes, drawn from both Scripture and Philosophy, could not expel the poison of his error.”

When we are told, (as the Author was told by an intelligent Barrister, on *March 28, 1827.*) that Sir Vicary

\* “ After death there is nothing, and death itself is nothing. Death is an unavoidable corruption of the body, and does not suffer the soul to inhabit it. We die entirely, and nothing of us remains.”



Gibbs said of Mr. Taylor's book, (*The Identity of Junius with a Distinguished Living Character Established*,) that, if the matter had been argued before him as a Judge in a trial for libel, he should have directed the Jury to find Sir Philip Francis guilty, — a speech which has been also attributed to the late Lord Ellenborough, and even to the late Lord Erskine, — when the friend of the Author, Mr. Butler, in his *Reminiscences* 1, 93. apparently in allusion to these opinions, declares “ the external evidence produced by Mr. Taylor to be very strong, so strong, perhaps, that, if he had been tried upon it for a libel, and the case had rested upon the facts, from which this evidence is formed, the Judge would have directed the Jury to find him guilty,” — and when the *Edinburgh-Reviewer* of Mr. Taylor's book, (57, 96.) has delivered the following character of it : — “ We are half inclined to think, however, that the real author is at length detected ; and “ we shall proceed to lay before the reader the ground of “ this opinion. The merit of the discovery, if the truth “ is indeed found out, belongs entirely to the author of “ the work before us. Sir Philip had never, as far as “ we know, been suspected. The book is written in a “ way abundantly creditable to the author ; especially if, “ as we suspect, he is not a professed literary man. It “ does not certainly make the most of the evidence ; it “ is somewhat too prolix ; frequently dwells upon trifles ; “ and is not always very distinct in its statements. But “ it contains every thing necessary for determining the “ question, and is written without affectation. That “ it proves Sir Philip to be *Junius*, we will not affirm ; “ but this we can safely assert that it accumulates such

“ a mass of circumstantial evidence, as renders it extremely difficult to believe he is not ; and that, if so many coincidences shall be found to have misled us in this case, our faith in all conclusions drawn from proofs of a similar kind may henceforth be shaken : ” — when the evidence for Sir Philip Francis is thus characterised by three eminent Judges, one eminent Conveyancer, and one eminent Counsellor, it is entitled to a fair and full examination, and such an examination it has received from the Author of this book. He does not pretend, and without hypocrisy could not pretend, to be indifferent to the honour of having disproved claims thus powerfully supported ; — such philosophy is too high for him, he knows that he is mortal, and possesses the common feelings of humanity ; — he has endeavoured to merit the honour, and if the public voice re-echo the general opinion of his intellectual and literary friends, he will enjoy the honour without indecently exulting in the victory, or ungenerously insulting the vanquished.

A friend in a *Letter* dated *Oct. 31, 1827.* compliments the pursuit in these terms : — “ If the riddle were solved, as in the case of any other riddle, the interest would instantly cease. The death of George III. took away much of the importance of this enquiry : — its present state puts me much in mind of a Scotch story. A man, who had sold, and been paid for his horse, was asked to give its *bona-fide* character. ‘ Truly,’ says he, ‘ it has but two faults, 1. very hard to catch, 2. good for nothing, when you catch him. But yet, I doubt not, there is amusement in the pursuit.’ ” One thing, at least, is certain, that much, which has been written on this question,

would have been withheld from the public eye, if the writers had applied to their compositions that strictness of proof, and that closeness of reasoning, which the Author has employed ; and one other thing is certain, that the rules, which the Author has endeavoured to lay down, are calculated to bring the investigation nearer to an end by striking out of the number of claimants, those, whose pretensions cannot be placed within those rules. As the Author is not prepared to match his friend with a story, he will present him with the following extracts : —

“ The question respecting the author of Junius's *Letters* is thought, we believe, by philosophers to be one of more curiosity than importance. We are very far from pretending that the happiness of mankind is materially interested in its determination ; or that it involves any great and scientific truths. But it must be viewed as a point of literary history ; and among discussions of this description, it ranks very high. After all, are there many points of civil or military history really more interesting to persons living in the present times ? Is the guilt of Queen Mary, — the character of Richard III, — or the story of the *Man in the Iron Mask*, very nearly connected with the welfare of the existing generation ? Indeed, we would rather caution, even the most profound of philosophers, against making too nice an inquiry into the practical importance of scientific truths ; for assuredly there are numberless propositions, of which the curiosity is more easily descried than the utility, in all the branches of science, and especially in the severer ones — the professors of which are the most prone to deride an enquiry like that about Junius. That the community

has long taken an extraordinary interest in this question, — that a great and universal curiosity has been felt to know who wrote the *Letters*, seems quite sufficient to justify a good deal of pains in the research, and satisfaction in the discovery. He, who should find out the longitude, would, no doubt, more substantially benefit the world; yet we dare to assert that for one, who really profited by the discovery, a thousand would derive nothing beyond the mere gratification of curiosity; and the inventor's fame would depend chiefly on their voice. Is any man much the better for knowing how the alkalies are composed? In his circumstances, no one — but, in his scientific capacity, every one, who regards the gratification of a learned curiosity. Let us not be too curious in settling the relative importance of literary labour, or even of scientific pursuits. It is a good thing to find out the truth, at all events; and the pleasure of knowing what was before unknown, forms, perhaps in all cases, the greater proportion of the value derived from the inquiry.”\*

*The Edinburgh-Review* (of Mr. Taylor's book on Junius,) 57, 94.

\* “The praise of Delolme's superficial book,” says the Reviewer p. 96., “contained in the *Preface* to Junius, is only a new example of the rashness, with which men, engaged in controversy, will bestow commendations upon a work containing doctrines, of which they wish to avail themselves. Burke's praises of Vattel may be given as another instance; and they have greatly added to the undue reputation enjoyed by that popular work.” In the same way the Author may remark, that Reviewers are too apt to take for granted the truth of assertions and statements made by respectable writers, whose works they are criticising, when those assertions and statements are, intentionally or unintentionally, contrary to facts. Thus the Reviewer writeth p. 105:—

“ The writer now lays down his pen with something like a persuasion,” says a very excellent friend of the Author, “ that it will be allowed he has proved his two points, — that Sir William Cavendish of Chatsworth

“ The manner, in which Junius always treats Lord Chatham, coincides exactly with the expressions of Sir Philip in his speeches and writings; and is such as might naturally be expected to result from the kindness he had received from that great man, as well as from his known principles. But the high admiration of Lord Chatham, which Junius has shown, seems not easily reconciled with his kindness towards his antagonist, Lord Holland. ‘ I wish Lord Holland may acquit himself with honour,’ says he in a *Letter to Woodfall*, (1, 174.) and when he suspected Mr. Fox of attacking him anonymously in the Newspapers, instead of retaliating as he did in the *Letters* already noticed against Lord Barrington, and at once charging Lord Holland, or his son, with having been the writers of this attack, as did Lord Barry and others in similar cases, he says that ‘ he designedly spares Lord Holland and his family;’ but adds that it is worthy of their consideration, ‘ whether Lord Holland ‘ be invulnerable, or whether Junius should be wantonly ‘ provoked.’ (3, 410.) He shows this manifest forbearance towards the Fox-family, not under his usual signature of *Junius*, but under another, assumed for the obvious purpose of concealing it, and yet of keeping them from forcing him into a contest with them. The history of Sir Philip at once explains all this. His father was Lord Holland’s domestic chaplain, lived on intimate terms with him, and dedicated his *Translation of Demosthenes* to him, as the patron, to whom he owed his church-preferment. Sir Philip himself received from Lord Holland his first place in the Foreign-Office. These circumstances must have overcome the natural inducement, which Junius had to join in the attacks upon Lord Holland, for a conduct, which, whether justly or not, was made the constant topic of invective by all, who took the side of Lord Chatham.”

Now in the following pages the Author has abundantly proved that Lord Chatham was, in the earlier part of Junius’s *reign*, the constant object of attack, and that Junius subsequently, but very guardedly, panegyricised him; and that, as political aversion was the cause of the attack, so political attachment was the cause of the panegyric. The argument,

could not have been the author of the *Life of Wolsey*, and that we owe the work to his brother, George Cavendish of Glemsford. It results also as a corollary, that the foundation of the present grandeur of the house of

then, in favour of Sir Philip Francis, adopted from Mr. Taylor's book by the Reviewer, instead of strengthening the claims of Sir Philip, is converted by the Author into a powerful argument against the claims. For Sir Philip has NOWHERE attacked Lord Chatham, but has EVERYWHERE spoken of him in the highest terms; in ONLY ONE place has he censured him, and the censure is of such a nature in itself, and is so accompanied with praise, that the latter very greatly predominates. And this, being the plain state of the case, affects the other argument of the Reviewer about Lord Holland, also derived from Mr. Taylor's book; for, if Sir Philip Francis, as Junius, was the man to attack his patron and friend, Lord Chatham, he, as Junius, might have been the man to attack his earlier patron and friend, Lord Holland; and if virtuous principles would have restrained him, as Junius, in the one case, they would have restrained him, as Junius, in the other. In these circumstances, then, it is impossible for the Reviewer, who p. 110. says of Sir Philip, "that he had long, in his proper person, POSSESSED THE ADMIRATION OF ALL, WHO HAVE A DUE REGARD FOR UNBLEMISHED PUBLIC VIRTUE, great talents and accomplishments," henceforth to contend that Sir Philip and Junius could have been one and the same person.

The Reviewer p. 113. follows Mr. Taylor p. 378. (2d. ed.) in saying that "both Junius and Sir Philip Francis place the asterisk, or star of reference, to a foot-note, at the *beginning*, and not at the *end*, of the passage, to which it belongs—contrary to what may be termed the invariable usage of other writers." The insecurity of such an argument is this, that a single instance of a similar practice observed by any other writer destroys its whole force. Now in Debrett's *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts, written by Persons of Eminence*, published in 4 vols. 8vo. 1788. the reader may find many examples: 1, 119. 142. 176. 194. 199. 235. 321. 322. 323. 331. 335. 337.

In conclusion, it should be remembered by the reader, that this celebrated Review does not contain any new facts, or the development of any new principles of reasoning, for the elucidation of this subject, and that it does not display

Cavendish was not laid, as is commonly understood, in an attendance upon Cardinal Wolsey, and in certain favourable circumstances connected with that service. The inquiry, then, even in all its bearings, like many other literary enquiries, cannot be considered as of very high importance. The writer will not, however, affect to insinuate that he considers it as of no consequence. In works so universally consulted as the *Biographia Britannica* and the *Peerages*, it is desirable that no errors of any magnitude should remain undetected and unexposed. Error begets error, and truth begets truth: nor can any one say how much larger in both cases may be the offspring than the sire. I do not indeed scruple to acknowledge that, though not without a relish for inquiries, which embrace objects of far greater magnitude, and a disposition justly to appreciate their value, I should be thankful to the man, who should remove my uncertainty, as to whose countenance was concealed by the *Masque de Fer*, or would tell me whether Richard was the hunch-backed tyrant, and Harry 'the nimble-footed mad-cap' exhibited by our great dramatist; whether Charles wrote the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, and Lady Packington *The Whole Duty of Man*? Not that I would place this humble disquisition on a level with the inquiries, which have been instituted, and so learnedly conducted into these several questions. In one material

any particular acquaintance with the subject, but that its sole merit consists in a clear and succinct, an able and lawyer-like statement of the evidence, which is contained in Mr. Taylor's book, and that this book, with Woodfall's *Junius*, is apparently the only book on the question, which the Reviewer had studied.



point, however, even this disquisition may challenge an equality with them. There is a much nearer approach made to *certainty* than in the discussions of any of the above-mentioned so much greater questions.

“ There are amongst readers of books some persons, whose minds being every moment occupied in the contemplation of the objects of the highest importance, look down with contempt upon the naturalist at his *leucophræ*, the critic at his *μὲν* and *δὲ* work, the astronomer at his *nebulae*, and the toiling antiquary at every thing. One word to these gentlemen before we part. To them may be recommended the words of a writer of our own day, a man of the most enlarged and highly-cultivated mind : — ‘ He, who determines with certainty a single species ‘ of the minutest moss, or meanest insect, adds so far ‘ to the general stock of human knowledge, which is ‘ more than can be said of many a celebrated name. No ‘ one can tell of what importance that simple fact may be ‘ to future ages ; and when we consider how many millions of our fellow-creatures pass through life without ‘ furnishing a single atom to augment that stock, we shall ‘ learn to think with more respect of those who do.’ ”

(The Rev. Joseph Hunter’s Tract entitled) *Who wrote ‘ Cavendish’s Life of Wolsey ? ’* Lond. 1814. 4to. p. 54.

The reader may, if he pleases, compare what I have said in p. 65.

*The Edinburgh-Reviewer* p. 106. informs us :—  
“ There is reason also to believe that Junius was known to Garrick. He expresses himself much alarmed by the inquiries of the latter, and was afraid lest Woodfall

might have told him the place, where the *Letters* were sent, which he desires him to change. He writes a *Note*, to be sent to Garrick, with the view of intimidating him, and thus preventing his meddling, and endeavouring to trace the secret; and he desires Woodfall to copy it in his own hand. Sir Francis has told us, in the *Preface* to the play of *Eugenia*, that he enjoyed the 'friendship and esteem' of Garrick." It is, I believe, Dr. Francis, who has so told us, and Mr. Taylor p. 126., whom the Reviewer follows, intimates as much. But for other reasons I must quote this part of Mr. T.'s book:—

"The *Note*, which Junius desired Woodfall to get transcribed, before he sent it to Garrick, was written to check the impertinent inquiries of the latter, whose assiduity to trace our author gave him excessive alarm. By implication, this precautionary measure, as in the case of Woodfall, leads us to conclude that Garrick, or some one, to whom the original might be shewn, was acquainted with the natural hand-writing of Junius, and might be able to detect it in spite of the disguise. This supposition, that the writer was a person known to Garrick, is further countenanced by the particular information Junius seems to have had of every proceeding on the part of his 'impertinent' spy. The opportunity, which it seems he possessed of knowing to what secret practices Garrick had recourse, affords evidence of peculiar means of inspection, and renders it probable that equal means of obtaining intelligence, *mutatis mutandis*, were in the power of the latter. But there is little doubt that Junius was *personally* known to Garrick, and that *for this reason* he was so exceedingly disturbed. He knew that, if he was once

seen by Garrick, detection was unavoidable. Let us observe the facts: — He knew that Garrick had learnt from Woodfall that Junius would write no more, but he did not know in what manner this information was obtained. He imagined that Garrick had drawn it from Woodfall by his own ingenuity; and he accordingly warns the latter in the following words: — ‘ (*Secret.*) Beware of David Garrick; he was sent to pump you, and went directly to Richmond to tell the King I should write no more.’ Under the impression also that Garrick had gained this intelligence by insinuating himself into the confidence of Woodfall, he wrote the *Note*, which has been already mentioned, threatening vengeance if he persisted in his ‘*impertinent enquiries* ;’ and, justly apprehensive lest Woodfall should have told Garrick the name of the Coffee-house, where his *Letters* were left, he writes to the former: — ‘ I must be more cautious than ever. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days; or, if I did, they would attain me by bill. *Change to the Somerset Coffee-House, and let no MORTAL know the alteration.* I am persuaded you are too honest a man to contribute in any way to my *destruction*. Act honourably by me, and at a proper time you shall know me.’ (1,\* 231., *private Letter to Woodfall.*) On the outside of this *Letter* was written *private and particular*, (1,\*233. *Note by the Editor.*) Woodfall explained that Garrick had been apprized of the intended discontinuance of the *Letters*, by his having named it confidentially in a *Letter* he was writing to Garrick; and therefore dissuades Junius from sending the *Note*. With this he at first seems satisfied: ‘ I have no doubt of what you say about David

‘Garrick; so drop the Note.’ But so necessary was it that Garrick should not endeavour to trace him, that he adds: — ‘As it is important to deter him from meddling, I desire you will tell him that I am aware of his practices, and will certainly be revenged, if he does not desist. An appeal to the public from Junius would destroy him.’ Not satisfied even with this security, he says at the end of the same *Letter* (1,\* 236. *private Letter to Woodfall.*) ‘Upon reflection, I think it absolutely necessary to send that Note to D. G., only say practices, instead of *impertinent inquiries.*’ Nor did the subject end here: though the rest is not printed, more was undoubtedly said to Woodfall concerning the facility of his disposition; for the next *Letter* begins: — ‘I did never question your understanding — far otherwise. The Latin word *simplex* conveys to me an amiable character, and never denotes folly. Though we may not be deficient in point of capacity, it is very possible that neither of us may be cunning enough for Mr. Garrick.’ Three weeks after, he again adverts to the same topic: — ‘Make your mind easy about me; I believe you are an honest man, and I never am angry.’ The inferences altogether drawn from the above statement are these, that Junius had a particular knowledge of Garrick, and that the latter was *certainly* acquainted with the person, and *probably* with the hand-writing of him, who carried on the ‘conveyancing’ and corresponding department of Junius; from which *personal knowledge* it became of the utmost possible consequence, that *Garrick, above all men*, should be deterred from joining in the pursuit, which was made after the author. To meet these conclusions, it must be

stated on the part of Sir Philip Francis, that Garrick enjoyed ‘*the friendship and esteem*’ of Dr. Francis, as we are told by the latter in the *Preface* to his play of *Eugenia*. The son of Dr. Francis was, of course, *personally* known to Mr. Garrick; who, if he was not also familiar with the hand-writing of Sir Philip, might have shewn it to some one, by whom it would be recognized even in a disguised state. It was prudent, therefore, in Sir Philip to desire that his *Note* to Garrick might be copied ‘to avoid having this hand too commonly seen’ — this *feigned* hand. And, if Sir Philip was also the *receiver* of the *Letters* from the Coffee-house, it was *highly necessary that the place should be changed*, and that no mortal should know the alteration. With this instance of remarkable agreement between the writer of the *Letters* and Sir Philip Francis, we shall close the account of their *connections*. The supposition that Sir Philip was himself ‘the *conveyancer*’ of the packets, either directly, or through the medium of a chairman, and consequently *certain of detection, if Garrick caught a glimpse of his person*, will receive further illustration, as we proceed.”

1. From this extract the reader will conceive it to be highly probable that two copies of the *Note* of Junius to Garrick were prepared, and that *both* those, which I have cited in p. 188. of this book, are genuine and authentic, though only *one* of them has been admitted into Woodfall’s edition of Junius’s *Letters*.

2. Mr. Taylor and the *Edinburgh-Reviewer* do not *prove* by any one fact that there was any personal acquaintance between Junius and Garrick — they do not, and cannot *prove* that Garrick was certainly acquainted

with the hand-writing of Junius, whether real or feigned — both the *Letters to Garrick* afford no internal evidence to prove that there was any personal knowledge between them — the *fair* inference from the *Letters* is that there was none — Well, Mr. Taylor and the Reviewer quietly take for granted that the writing was known to Garrick, because Woodfall was desired to conceal it from him. But this is, I think, *inferring* too much ; no particular inference is safe reasoning, when any other inference can be drawn from the same fact ; that inference is alone valuable argument, which is the only inference deducible from the same fact. In the present instance, the general, particular, circumstantial, minute caution always employed by Junius on all occasions is employed in respect to Garrick : this vigilant circumspection would be exercised by Junius, whether it related to his personal appearance, his epistolary habits, his choice of Coffee-houses, chairmen, porters, or messengers, and his hand-writing, whether the writing were feigned or real ; it was one uniform, continual, perpetual, æternal, sempiternal system of caution, on which he acted ; he was the hundred-eyed Argus, the watchful Cerberus, the fiend-like monster, who guarded his own treasure ; his existence depended on his vigilance, and therefore his vigilance never relaxed for a moment. He knew the curiosity, activity, and perhaps the sources of information, which were open to Garrick, and he knew the use, which Garrick would make of any information, which he could collect. Whether Garrick did or did not know the hand-writing of Junius, — whether the hand-writing were real or feigned, made no difference in the mind of Junius, — he did

not wish Garrick to have any clue of any kind. For exactly the same reason we may safely take for granted that he did not employ his natural hand-writing in his private communications to Woodfall. Let us hear what Mr. Taylor says p. 121. :—

“ It is not indeed very likely that a *total* stranger to Woodfall would have taken the trouble to *disguise his hand-writing*. As he trusted him with more important matters, he might have confided to Woodfall the destruction of his *Letters*, and so have written them in the hand most easy to him, which at any rate would have been a considerable alleviation of the labour, by which he confesses he was almost overcome. Or he might have desired Woodfall to copy them, as was the case with the *Note* to Garrick, in order that no person might ever see the originals, and then he could have incurred no risk. But from the necessity there seems to have been that his natural hand-writing should not be seen *even by Woodfall*, and from his *undeviating* use of a feigned character in his most private and confidential *Notes* to him, the only inference, that can be drawn, in my opinion, is the possible knowledge by Woodfall of the natural hand-writing, from some previous or probable intercourse between the parties.”

1. Here we have a striking proof of the great pains, which Mr. Taylor has taken, first to deceive himself, and then to deceive his readers. 2. He first *fairly makes out by facts* that Sir Philip Francis and Woodfall were school-fellows and friends, and then he *unfairly infers* “ that Junius might have been the early friend and school-fellow of Woodfall,” because he wrote to the lat-

ter in a disguised hand, and because "it is not very likely that a *total* stranger to Woodfall would have taken the trouble to disguise his *hand-writing*." Now the *fair* inference is DIRECTLY the reverse; for 1. general prudence required that he should observe the same caution in respect to Woodfall, which he exercised on all occasions, where his personal safety was concerned, 2. it is absurd to suppose that he would so far relax from those general habits of caution, as unnecessarily to furnish Woodfall, whether his early friend and school-fellow or not, with his natural hand-writing. The necessity of an amanuensis, or the necessity of a feigned hand, was imposed on him by the necessity of concealing his natural hand-writing from every person, whether Woodfall, Garrick, or others.

In pages 176. 215 — 218. of this book, the Author has referred to the burning of the Jesuitical works in Paris, at which Junius represents himself to have been present; and in addition to what is there stated, the Author now presents the reader with the following remarks:—

"I have now the *Gentleman's Magazine for October* (1827.) before me—it states that the Jesuitical books, 24 in number, were burnt by the common hangman in Paris on Aug. 7, 1761. The question is whether this conflagration is the one alluded to by Junius—or whether it was one of an earlier date? That it cannot be the one alluded to by Junius, is, I think, evident from the circumstance, that we were at open hostility with France at the æra in question; so that it would have been next to an impossibility that Junius should have been in Paris at the said conflagration, unless he were a prisoner of



“ Mr. Butler mentions in the same page that *Junius's Letter to the King* is in a different hand from his other *Letters* : in whose possession was, or is this *Letter* ? If in Mr. Woodfall's, as one would suppose, it is a wonder he does not give a *fac-simile* of it, as he has done of other *Letters*.

“ The cause assigned (p. 104.) for Lord George Sackville's enmity to the King and Lord Mansfield is evidently erroneous ; \* for his Lordship's trial and disgrace on account of the Battle of Minden took place in the reign of George II. His Lordship's animosity, indeed, towards the Marquis of Granby might well be accounted for by what happened at Minden. But neither his late Majesty, nor Lord Mansfield, it is believed, had any concern in the prosecution : besides, why should Lord George have stifled his resentment for 9 or 10 years ? Numerous occasions had offered, long before *Junius's Letters* were written, for attacking the Sovereign and the Chief-Justice. It appears, however, by *Junius's* early *Letters* under various signatures, that his opposition to Government arose from the dismissal of the Grenville-Administration and the repeal of the American Stamp-Act. What evidence have we that Lord George Sackville was attached to the Grenvilles ? Another objection to the claims of Lord George arises from his early life and habits, which were military, whereas *Junius* professed profound constitutional knowledge.” (Signed) “ P.”

The Author does not profess to discuss the claims of

\* [On this point the reader can refer to what Mr. Butler has said in the last edition of the *Reminiscences*. E. H. B.]

Lord George Sackville, which his friend Mr. Coventry, to whose book he refers the reader, has set forth at great length.

In a pamphlet entitled *A Collection of all the Remarkable and Personal Passages in the BRITON, NORTH-BRITON, and AUDITOR*, Lond. 1766. 8vo. p. 5. there is the following character of Lord Barrington from the *Auditor* Jan. 8. : — “ Lord Viscount Barrington, a little squirrel of state, who has been all his life busy in the cage, without turning it round to any human purpose ; who had been perplexed and puzzled in the eye of the whole nation with the insurmountable difficulty of writing *three intelligible Letters*, and who every mortal was convinced would be equally embarrassed with the management of *three fingers*.”\*

We need not wonder that men should differ so much in their notions of the value of *moral* evidence, when we find that even Judges differ materially on questions of *legal* evidence : —

“ In a recent appeal before the House of Lords, the Earl of Eldon, in moving their Lordships to make an order in the case, mentioned some extraordinary instances of

\* In p. 55. the following facetious character of Warburton is given from the *Briton*, Febr. 5. : — “ If I was not afraid of shocking the known modesty and self-denial of this venerable Prelate, I should not scruple to declare that his promotion in the Church was one of the most meritorious efforts of Mr. Pitt’s Administration. What ineffable blessings has he conferred on the hierarchy for procuring the mitre for a Prelate of his speculative virtue ! For a pious ecclesiastic, who hath so happily imitated the meekness, humility, and Moderation of his divine Master ; so eminently possessed of genius without arrogance, of learning without ostentation ; whose charity is so liberal, as to embrace all mankind ; who can argue with decency, refute with tender-

discrepancy between the Judges upon questions of law. 'The late Lord Thurlow,' said Lord Eldon, 'sent a question at one time for the opinion of the Court of King's Bench, when Lord Kenyon was Chief Justice of that Court. Lord Kenyon returned an answer to that question, but it was so little satisfactory to Lord Thurlow, that he sent it back to Lord Kenyon, with a request that it might be reconsidered. Lord Kenyon was somewhat surprised at such a proceeding; but he did reconsider the subject, and the result was that he gave a second opinion directly opposite to the first.' 'I myself,' added the Noble Earl, 'at one time requested the Court of King's Bench to certify to me their opinion as to the estate, which a person took in some lands. The Court of King's Bench were unanimously of opinion that he took an estate in fee. I was not satisfied with this opinion, and I therefore sent the question to the Court of Common Pleas, who were unanimously of opinion that he took no estate at all in the lands in question. Now I was impertinent enough to think that they were all wrong, and I made an order directly opposite to the opinions of both Courts; and, what is very extraordinary,

ness, and retract with candour; who never advanced a dogma, which he himself did not implicitly believe; nor started a paradox for the gratification of polemical pride; nor endeavoured to puzzle with subtlety, rather than to convince with reason; nor sought to hide the nakedness of error with the multiplied folds of sophistry and supposition! Such an ecclesiastic is, no doubt, an ornament to the Protestant Church, and a shining light among the nations; and we can never enough applaud the judgment and equity of Mr. Pitt, who, without being actuated or influenced by motives of private connection or worldly interest, added this great luminary to the episcopal sphere!"

my decision satisfied all the parties concerned.'” *The Times*, July 25, 1827.


“ APPEAL — *House of Lords*, May 9. — “ *The Leigh Peerage*.

“ The House sat again to-day in a Committee for Privileges on the claim of Mr. George Leigh in this case.

“ After another witness had been examined as to the existence of the monument in Stonely-Church,

“ The LORD CHANCELLOR addressed the Committee. Their Lordships were aware that the case of the present claimant depended solely on his proving to their satisfaction the once existence of the monument in Stonely-Church. It was admitted that, if he failed in that, there was at once an end of the case. Now a great many witnesses had been examined for the purpose of establishing that fact. Since the case was last before their Lordships, he, (the Lord Chancellor,) had attentively read the evidence of those witnesses, and extracted from it certain facts, to which he now begged to call the attention of their Lordships, and the learned Counsel for the claimant; because he was satisfied that, unless they had some reasonable hope of success in this case, notwithstanding the striking contradictions of their own witnesses, to which he was now about to refer, they would not think it proper to consume more of their Lordships' time in this investigation. The first witness described the monument as being black; the second spoke of it as a kind of dove-colour; the third said it was black and white; the fourth said it was originally white, but dirty, when he saw it; the fifth differing from the others, said it was blue; the next witness described it as a light marble, but said it had

a dark appearance as if it had been bronzed, and the last witness spoke of it as being of a light gray colour. Then, as to the form of the monument, the first witness said it was oblong ; the next said it was square at the top, and came down narrower to the bottom, and there rested on a single truss ; the third witness described it as being square at the bottom, resting upon two trusses, and went up narrower and narrower to a point at the top ; the fourth witness said it was angular at the top ; the next said it was square at the bottom, was brought to a point in the middle, and was then curved into a sort of festoon ; the sixth witness stated that it was square at the top and bottom, and had a curve ; and the last said it was square at the top and bottom. With respect to the inscription, all the witnesses differed most essentially ; and the evidence of John White, if that were to be taken as correct, was decisive of the case against the claimant. As to the language of the inscriptions, the first witness stated that the names of *Thomas* and *Christopher Leigh* were in English ; the next said the inscription was not in English ; the third said there was a great deal in English ; the fourth witness said the whole, (with the exception of the name *Christopher Lee*,) was in a language, which he did not understand ; the next witness stated that the inscription was all in English, except the words *Anno Domini* ; and the last witness said it was not in English. Here, then, were the most striking discrepancies in the evidence of the claimant's own witnesses, not only with respect to the colour and form of the monument, but to its inscription and language also. His Lordship would make no comments on these facts ; he merely stated them in the



presence of the claimant's Counsel, in order that they might consider whether it was possible for them to repair the damage done by their own witnesses. Unless they were satisfied that they could do so, his Lordship was sure that in candour and common fairness they would not persevere in an enquiry, which was likely to have no other result than that of wasting their Lordships' time, of the value of which, as being due to the public, the learned Counsel were fully aware."

*The Times, May 10, 1828.*

One of the disadvantages resulting from *legal* habits is a disposition in certain cases to entertain doubts, where an *unprofessional* man would see none, to create difficulties on minor points, when the main fact is indisputable, and in avoiding error to overlook and overstep the truth. In this instance the important question is, whether the monument did, or did not exist? The Lord Chancellor intimates that the discrepancies in the evidence of those witnesses, who deposed to the fact of its existence, about its size, shape, and colour, about the inscription and the language of the inscription, negative the fact in dispute. The Author, on the contrary, thinks that they prove directly the reverse. If a large number of witnesses in such a case minutely agree in the facts and circumstances, it affords matter for reasonable suspicion, that those facts and circumstances have been made to suit the case, and that the witnesses have been regularly disciplined, while the very discrepancies between many witnesses constitute a very fair ground for the belief, that they have deposed to the truth according to their best, however imperfect, recollection, without any professional help. If fifty per-

sons, who were spectators during a fight between two persons in the street, are called into a court of justice to give an account of the fight, however much they may differ from each other in their detail of the facts and circumstances, (whether the discrepancies arose from careless inattention, interrupted inspection, or imperfect recollection,) those discrepancies would not disprove the *fact* itself of the fight, but confirm it beyond all doubt; for who would have the hardihood to deny the reality of the fight, when fifty persons, accidentally present, and all independent of each other, had deposed to the truth of such a fact? And yet, if there be any force in the reasoning of the Lord Chancellor, about the Leigh Peerage, he would, from the discrepancies between the witnesses, most unreasonably disbelieve the fact of the fight. The main point, which was to be established, was whether the monument did, or did not exist in Stoneleigh-Church? This fact is attested by fifty witnesses, more or less, and therefore it is proved, beyond all possibility of reasonable doubt, to the satisfaction of every *moral* reasoner. However much the witnesses differ about the size, shape, and colour, about the inscription and the language of the inscription, they are ALL agreed as to the really important point, that the monument *was* in the Church. It is by no means impossible sufficiently to reconcile the very discrepancies, of which the Lord Chancellor complained. For monuments, viewed by day or by night, on a bright or a dull day, by the sun or the moon, in fair or foul weather, by strong or weak eyes, by young or old eyes, leisurely or interruptedly, in front or aside, with or without interposing obstacles, soon or long after erection,

by careless or exact eyes, will present very different aspects, quite sufficient to account for the variations of testimony in respect to size, shape, and colour, etc., when the witnesses, after the lapse of many years, some with good, and some with confused recollection, speak of these monuments. But the Author doubts whether any *legal* gentleman would contemplate the question in such an *unlawyerlike*, however morally just, view—the maxims of law, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, change not—they are transmitted from one lawyer to another in uninterrupted succession—and *legal* minds are too much filled with the notion of the *sanctity* of the principles to examine, with sacrilegious curiosity, into the *grounds*, on which they rest. If the principle be erroneous, there is little chance of the error being detected by themselves till the day, when all prejudice shall be removed, and all truth shall be revealed.

The Author will mention one other instance to show how universally legal men are in all cases governed by their own principle of evidence. The Author was concerned in the trial of an Issue at York, arising out of an important Chancery-Suit, (*Barker v. Ray and others*,) and the credibility of one of his witnesses was objected to, because the witness, who deposed to conversations, at which he was present, 30 or 40 years ago, was unable to state from recollection the day of his own marriage! Now certain facts and circumstances, whether personal or adventitious, are fixed in the memory by a chain of associations, which can never be broken, while other facts and circumstances, however personal, soon escape from the recollection, because there is no such bond of union.



Why can a soldier recount with great minuteness, the several battles with all their attendant circumstances, in which he has been engaged, and yet have but a very faint recollection of his early life under the paternal roof, or of a thousand little domestic events, which interested him, in his own humble dwelling, at the moments of their occurrence?

On the same occasion the testimony of another witness of the Author was objected to, because of its circumstantiality. Now circumstantiality, in cases of distant recollection, depends on the strength of the mental associations, and on the kind of memory possessed by the witness, which may remember either the main facts without any particular circumstances, or the whole circumstances along with the main facts. Circumstantiality, then, as a criterion of evidence, is fallacious, because it is just as likely to arise from a faithful memory as from a fabricated narrative; — a blush may crimson the cheek of suspected innocence, as well as of conscious guilt; — the ghastly sight of a murdered man may fill the guiltless accused with horror, while the callous murderer may touch the corpse without the smallest hesitation, or the least appearance of crime.

On the same occasion, too, the testimony of another witness of the Author was objected to, because it was considered to be improbable that he could, after the lapse of so many years, and at his advanced time of life, recollect the circumstances in question. Now we all in common life, *out of the precincts of the court*, know that old men by a sort of *rejuvenescence* recover the recollection of past events, which they can detail with great exactness,


while circumstances of a comparatively recent date have wholly escaped their recollection.

On the same occasion, too, testimony produced by the Author was objected to, because the witness deposed to certain particulars attending an event without the recollection of other particulars connected with it. Now this very circumstance stamped a value on the evidence by shewing that it did not proceed from a *prompted* memory ; and in general we may lay down this as a safe rule, *in direct opposition to the received maxim of law*, that discrepancies, in the testimony of witnesses deposing to the same main fact, prove the *honesty* of the evidence. It belongs not to Judges to fathom the depths of human memory, and they should not seek to reduce human minds, amidst all their eccentricities and extravagancies and imperfections and excellencies, to one common standard of intellect, or to try them by the regularity and order, which may pervade their own mental system.

Classical philologists are often called to decide on questions of authorship, involving many points similar to those, which are involved in the case of Junius. Of the many instances, to which the Author might refer, he will content himself with one remarkable coincidence, in the words of his learned friend, Professor Anthon of Columbia College, New-York : —

“ There has come down to us a *Dialogue* entitled *de Claris Oratoribus, sive de Causis corruptæ Eloquentiæ*. The MSS. and old editions name Tacitus as the author of this production ; a great number of commentators, however, ascribe it to Quintilian, and some to Pliny the younger. They, who argue from the language of MSS.,

allege in their favour Pomponius Sabinus, a grammarian who states that Tacitus had given to the works of Mæcenas the epithet of *calamistri*. Now the passage, to which the grammarian alludes, is actually found in the 26th chapter of the *Dialogue* under consideration. The author of the *Dialogue*, moreover, informs us in the first chapter that he was a very young man, (*juvenis admodum*,) when he wrote it, or, at least, at the period when he supposes it to have been held in his presence. This point of time is clearly determined in the 17th chapter; it was the 6th year of the reign of Vespasian, A. D. 75. Tacitus at this period would be about 16 years of age. From what has been said, then, it will be perceived that, as far as chronology is concerned, nothing prevents our regarding Tacitus as the author of the *Dialogue* in question. It is true we find a marked difference between the style of the writer of this *Dialogue*, and that of the historian; but would not the intervening period of 40 years sufficiently account for this discrepancy, and the language of the *man* be different from the tone of *early youth*? Might not too the same writer have varied his style in order to adapt it to different subjects? Ought he not to assimilate his style to the various characters, who bear a part in the *Dialogue*? Induced by these and other reasons, Pithou, Dodwell, Schulze, and many others have given their opinion in favour of our adhering to the titles of the MSS., and have ascribed the *Dialogue* to Tacitus. Rhenanus was the first, who entertained doubts respecting the claim of Tacitus to the authorship of this production, and since his time Dousa, Stephens, Freinshemius, and others no less celebrated, have contended that Quintilian,



not Tacitus, must be regarded as the true writer of the work. They place great reliance on two passages of Quintilian, where that writer says expressly that he had composed a separate treatise on the *Causes of the Corruption of Eloquence*, (*Inst. Or.* 6, 8, 6.) as well as on many other passages, in which this same work is cited, without the author's indicating the title. How can we suppose, it is asked, that either Tacitus or Pliny would be inclined to treat of a subject, which had already been discussed by Quintilian? These same critics observe, moreover, that there appears to be a great analogy, not only between the matter treated of in this *Dialogue*, and those, which form the subject of Quintilian's writings, but also between his style and that of the work in question. But it may be replied, in the first place, that at the time, when the *Dialogue* was written, Quintilian was already 33 years of age, a period of life to which the expression *juvenis admodum* can with no propriety whatever be made to apply. In the next place, the argument deduced from analogy of style is not the most conclusive, since those critics, who assign the work to Pliny or Tacitus, adduce a similar argument in support of their claims. On the other hand, the argument, which has been drawn from identity of title, would be a very strong one, if it were not a fact that the second title, which is found in modern editions, *de Causis corruptæ Eloquentiæ*, owes its existence entirely to Lipsius, who thought fit to add this second title, which he had found in Quintilian. All the MSS. and the early editions merely have the title *de claris Oratoribus*, or else this one, *Dialogus an sui Sæculi Oratores et quare concedant*. Another circumstance very

much against the idea of Quintilian's being the author of the piece, is the fact of his more than once referring the reader to his other work for matters, of which the *Dialogue* we are considering, makes not the slightest mention; such, for example, are *the hyperbole and exaggeration*, of which he speaks in the 3rd. bk, ch. 3. and 6. The latest editor of Quintilian, Spalding, has carefully collected all these passages, which, in his opinion, show that Quintilian was not the author of the *Dialogue*."

*Professor Anthon's Edition of Lempriere's Classical Dictionary* p. 800. edn. Barker.

1. The reader will observe that those critics, who assign the work to Pfiny or Tacitus, adduce, in support of their claims, the same course of argument, from analogy of style, which other critics employ for adjudicating the composition to Quintilian;—i. e. Mr. Taylor contends for the claims of Sir Philip Francis by the same line of argument as that, which is pursued by Mr. Roche in support of the claims of Burke? 2. The words, *admodum juvenis*, which Professor Anthon thinks cannot be with propriety applied to Quintilian, who was then 33 years of age, certainly may, with strict propriety, note that period of life. According to the most correct Roman writers, human life was divided into 4 stages of 15 years each: thus *pueritia* was within 15; *adolescencia* within 30; *juventus* within 45; and *senectus* comprised the remaining period of life. Of this division the Author has given some curious examples in the *Classical Journal* T. 1. p. 473

To this division Tacitus alludes, *Agr.* 3. "*Quid, si, per quindecim annos, grande mortalis ævi spatium, multi*

*fortuitis casibus, promptissimus quisque sævitia principis interciderunt? Pauci, et, ut ita dixerim, non modo aliorum, sed etiam nostri superstites sumus, exemptis e media vita tot annis, quibus juvenes ad senectutem, senes prope ad ipsos exactæ ætatis terminos per silentium venimus: non tamen pigebit, vel incondita ac rudi voce, memoriam prioris servitutis, ac testimonium præsentium bonorum composuisse.”* Censorinus *de Die Natali* 14. p. 74. Lindenbr.: — “*Igitur, expositis iis, quæ ante diem natalem sunt, nunc ut climacterici anni noscantur, quid de gradibus ætatis humanæ sensum sit, dicam. Varro quinque gradus ætatis æquabiliter putat esse divisos; unumquemque scilicet, præter extremum, in annos XV. Itaque primo gradu usque ad annum XV. PUEROS dictos, quod sint PURI, id est impubes. Secundo ad XXX. annum ADOLESCENTES, ab ADOLESCENDO sic nominatos. In tertio gradu qui erant, usque XLV. annos JUVENES appellatos, eo quod rempublicam in re militari possunt JUVARE. In quarto autem ad usque LX. annum SENIORES esse vocitatos, quod tunc primum SENESCERE corpus incipiat. Inde usque finem vitæ uniuscujusque, quintum gradum factum, in quo qui essent, SENES appellatos, quod ea ætate corpus SENIO jam laboraret.”*

As the celebrated scholar, David Ruhnken, was, in the *Aldine Rhetoricians*, reading Apsines, he observed a diversity of style, and on investigation he recognized the style of Longinus, and found that he was perusing part of the treatise of Longinus *on Rhetoric*. The discovery is thus mentioned in Wytttenbach's *Life of Ruhnken* p. 127. ed. Leyd.: —

“RHETORUM omnium, certe plurimorum, necdum scor-

*sum editorum, adhuc una est editio Aldina, eaque perrara, ut paucis in publicis, paucissimis privatis, exstet bibliothecis, et Hemsterhusius ejus exemplum, quovis pretio emere cupiens ac dedita opera quærens, per sexaginta annos nullo in bibliopolio, nullo cujusquam in auctionis catalogo deprehenderit. Ruhnkenius duo, quibus hæc editio continetur, volumina, rara felicitate, diverso utrumque et loco et tempore, sibi comparaverat, et librum, ut suum, eo majore cum otio ac diligentia tractabat. Legens Apinem, qui unus est ex illis RHETORIBUS, animadvertit subito se in aliam orationem incidere, similem eam Longini multo sibi usu cognitæ: hujus, ut progreditur, ita deinceps nova vestigia deprehendit, locum etiam sub Longini nomine memoratum ab inedito COMMENTATORE ARISTIDIS JOANNE SICELIOTA: nihil porro dubii relinquebatur, quin hæc esset pars DE INVENTIONE, e deperdito Longini opere DE ARTE RHETORICA. Ut vidit, ita ad Hemsterhusium suum volavit non tam ejus judicium exploraturus, quam rem exploratam nunciaturus. Hic item, ut audiit et locum inspexit, ita rationes Ruhnkenii probavit, eumque monuit ut hujus inventionis laudem sibi vindicaret, mentione ac notitia ejus in DIARIO ERUDITORUM GALLICO prodenda. Fecit Ruhnkenius. Libellum porro cum scriptis codicibus contulit, emendavit, et ad editionem fere paratum reliquit moriens. Et, ne hoc fugiat harum litterarum studiosos, hic est ille RHETOR et LONGINUS, quem simpliciter his nominibus significavit aliis deinde in scriptis, maxime in altera Timæi editione."*

Professor Porson, the Rev. Thomas Kidd, and other scholars, had in vain tried to find the passage thus vaguely referred to. The Author applied to his distin-



guished friend, Professor Boissonade of Paris, whom he has seldom consulted without receiving the fullest information, and he soon discovered the place. The Author sent an account of the discovery to the late F. A. Wolf, the celebrated Editor of Homer, and he published a statement in his *Analecta Litteraria, maxime eruditæ Antiquitatis Litteris et Artibus illustrandis collecta*, 4, 515, with the following title: *de Dav. Ruhnkenii Cælebri quodam Reperto Litterario*, which was afterwards reprinted in the *Classical Journal*.

One other extract from Professor Anthon's additions to *Dr. Lempriere's Classical Dictionary* will not be unacceptable to the reader:—"It has been said above that the *Lives* of Nepos were published in his own name by Æmilius Probus. In the *Dedication* of this latter writer, which is in bad Latin verse, no mention whatever is made of Nepos, and Probus claims the work as the joint production of himself, his father, and grandfather. One is astonished at the want of intelligence on the part of his readers, in their not perceiving the discrepancy between the thoughts and sentiments, which prevailed in the age of Nepos, and those which characterised the reign of Theodosius; nor in being struck with the difference between the barbarous style of the writers, who flourished in the latter period, and the elegance of the golden age, which marks the diction of the historian. It must be confessed, however, that the style of the *Life of Atticus*, which the MSS. unanimously ascribe to Nepos, while they all agree in naming Æmilius Probus as the author of the *Lives of Illustrious Commanders*, differs essentially from that of the last-mentioned work, in which



may be observed various unusual expressions, singular constructions, and some solecisms, which may well excite surprise, if regarded as coming from a contemporary of Cicero. It seems most reasonable to adopt the conjecture of Barth, that Probus treated the work of Nepos, as Justin did that of Trogus Pompeius, in making changes, additions, and retrenchments throughout. This hypothesis acquires additional weight from what Nepos himself observes, towards the conclusion of his *Preface* respecting the *large size* of the volume, which he was giving to the world."

As further evidences of the caution necessary in deciding on questions on authorship, and of the certainty, with which we may occasionally reason about such matters, the Author cites the following passages.

"Every reform, however necessary, will by weak minds be carried to an excess, that itself will need reforming. The reader will excuse me for noticing that I myself was the first to expose *risu honesto* the three sins of poetry, one or the other of which is the most likely to beset a young writer. So long ago as the publication of the second No. of the *Monthly Magazine*, under the name of *Nehemiah Higgenbottam*, I contributed three *Sonnets*, the first of which had for its object to excite a good-natured laugh at the spirit of *doleful egotism*, and at the recurrence of favorite phrases, with the double defect of being at once trite and licentious. The second on low, creeping language and thoughts, under the pretence of *simplicity*. And the third, the phrases of which were borrowed entirely from my own Poems, on the indiscriminate use of elaborate and swelling language and imagery. The reader will find them in the note below,

and will, I trust regard them as reprinted for biographical purposes, and not for their poetic merits. So general at that time, and so decided was the opinion concerning the characteristic vices of my style, that a celebrated physician, (now alas ! no more,) speaking of me in other respects with his usual kindness to a gentleman, who was about to meet me at a dinner-party, could not, however, resist giving him a hint not to mention ‘ the *House that Jack built* in my presence, for that I was as *sore as a boil* about that Sonnet ;’ he not knowing that I was myself the author of it.

And this reft house is that, the which he built,  
 Lamented Jack ! and here his malt he pil'd,  
 Cautious in vain ! these rats, that squeak so wild,  
 Squeak not unconscious of their father's guilt.  
 Did he not see her gleaming thro' the glade ?  
 Belike 'twas she, the maiden all forlorn.  
 What tho' she milk no cow with crumpled horn,  
 Yet *aye* she haunts the dale, where *erst* she strayed :  
 And *aye* beside her stalks her amorous knight !  
 Still on his thighs their wonted brogues are worn,  
 And thro' those brogues, still tatter'd and betorn,  
 His hindward charms gleam an unearthly white.  
 Ah ! thus thro' broken clouds at night's high noon,  
 Peeps in fair fragments forth the full-orb'd, harvest-moon !

“ The following anecdote will not be wholly out of place here, and may perhaps amuse the reader. An *amateur* performer in verse expressed to a common friend, a strong desire to be introduced to me, but hesitated in accepting my friend's immediate offer, on the score ‘ that he was, he must acknowledge, the author of a confounded severe Epigram on my *Ancient Mariner*, which had

‘ given me great pain.’ I assured my friend that, if the Epigram was a good one, it would only increase my desire to become acquainted with the author, and begged to hear it recited, when, to my no less surprise than amusement, it proved to be one, which I had myself some time before written and inserted in the *Morning Post* :

‘ To the Author of the *Ancient Mariner* ;

Your poem must eternal be,  
Dear Sir, it cannot fail ;  
For ’tis incomprehensible,  
And without head or tail.’”

*Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of my (HIS) Literary Life and Opinions. By S. T. Coleridge Esq. Lond. 1817. V. 1. p. 26.*

“ The censures that are made from stile and language alone, are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices. Some very sagacious and learned men have been deceived in those conjectures, even to ridicule. The great Scaliger published a few *Iambicks*, as a choice fragment of an old Tragedian, given him by Muretus ; who soon after confessed the jest, that they were made by himself. Boxhornius writ a *Commentary* upon a small poem *de Lite*, supposed by him to be some ancient Author’s ; but it was soon discovered to be Michael Hospitalius’s, a late Chancellor of France. So that, if I had no other argument but the stile, to detect the spuriousness of *Phalaris’s Epistles*, I myself indeed should be satisfied with that alone, but I durst not hope to convince every body else. I shall begin, therefore, with another sort of proofs, that will affect the most slow judgment,

and assure the most timid or incredulous." Bentley's *Dissertation on Phalaris* p. 19.\*

"Dr. Burney admits that the ancient-melody of the 100th Psalm, as a congregational hymn, is sublime, and the composition excellent. On this singular and unequalled, but *nameless* strain, I shall take the opportunity of making some remarks. It has been attributed to Martin Luther; but, whatever authority there may be for the composition, which we have heard so divinely sung by Caradori etc. to the words of

'Oh! God, what do I see and hear?' etc.

I do not fear to say there is no authority whatever for attributing the old English 100th Psalm-tune to Luther. It is found as the melody of a French *chanson* in four parts, by Claude le Jeune, and published in Burney's *History of Music*. Burney admits that it has been attributed to Dr. Dowland. I have in my possession an old collection of Psalm-tunes, in which the melody appears, with the name of Dr. Dowland; but before we venture to fix on Dowland as the author, let us see whether we can prove it to be English, and not foreign; for it is claimed both by French and Germans. I contend it is strictly *English*, and I shall be gratified if, as I think, I shall be the first person to have proved so much. It is remarkable that Playford, in his collection printed

\* Surely the question about *Junius* is in itself far more important than the question about the *Epistles* of Phalaris, and who ever blamed Bentley for wasting over it oil and ink, labour and time?

Dr. Jortin wrote some "exquisite lines on a wife snatched by death from her husband, to deceive antiquaries in the character of an old classical inscription." See my amiable friend, the Rev. W. L. Bowles's *Parochial History of Bremhill in the County of Wilts* p. 233-9.

in 1677, says: — ‘ I have observed and made trial both  
‘ of French and German tunes, and I do not find but  
‘ our English tunes, both for air and gravity, well suit-  
‘ ing the words, rather to excel than be inferior to them.’  
He adds: ‘ I find printed in the French Psalm-book those  
‘ tunes, which we also use—the 100th, 112th, and  
‘ 113th, but not able to determine to whom they origi-  
‘ nally belong.’ Dr. Burney says the same thing; I  
shall, therefore, first endeavour to prove that this fine  
air is ‘*originally*’ English, and neither French nor Ger-  
man. Now I do not fear to assert, that the peculiar  
accent of the words proves that this tune must have been  
originally made to these very English words, and to no  
other; for this tune will not *fit*, (if I may so say,) any  
other words of the whole 150 Psalms, and in this, and  
in no other Psalm, the musical accents fall on exactly the  
proper and peculiar words, where the *stress* is required.  
I take the air as it is found in all the most ancient copies,  
and now let us appeal to this test. The accent is first on  
*all*, ‘*All people*’; the next is on the emphatic word *sing*,  
‘*Sing to the,*’ etc.; the third is on *him*, ‘*Him serve with*’  
etc: and last on the very word, which requires the strong-  
est stress, *come*, ‘*Come ye before him*’ etc. Now let us  
try the same tune to the words of the first Psalm. The  
accent will be on the insignificant word *the*, ‘*Thē mǎn*  
*is blest*’ etc. And this will be found to be the case with  
every Psalm, except the identical one, to which the tune  
is given; that is, there is not in the whole 150, one  
Psalm, in which it will *fit* the *four* first verses, as it so  
remarkably does the old English translation of the 100th;  
I contend this coincidence is not only extraordinary, but

indeed almost impossible to conceive, unless the tune was made to the words *originally*. It is singular that neither Burney, nor any other composer, who has paid attention to the subject, seems to have been aware of this strong test of internal evidence, proving, in my opinion, incontrovertibly, that the 100th Psalm-tune was English. I contend again that it bears not the least likeness to any of the tunes in the German book of Psalmody. There is not one, whose melody is so flowing, and there are no words in German or French, to which it is so completely adapted as the English; nor has it the *complexion*, if I may say so, of the French or German school, any more than an Englishman has of a foreigner. I therefore consider the 100th Psalm-tune, from internal evidence, to be originally and intrinsically English."

"I think, then, I have proved the fact, that this Psalm-tune was, I might almost say, *must* have been composed originally to these words, and *to no other*. But it may be observed, that, though on the first word of every line, where particular stress and accent is required, this accent is found, yet it is only so found in the *first* verse! I answer, the same melody could not possibly *bend* itself, if I may say so, to *all* the verses, in which the *stress* is laid *differently*; and this impossibility of *adaptation* being found even in the Psalm itself, convinces me further, that the first verse only of this Psalm was that, which immediately directed the composer in his ideas of accent. The only words in this first verse, which appear not so justly accented, are the words, "*That on earth do dwell*;" and also, "*and rejoice!*" but these words were, at the time, probably, read as the tune accents

them ; nor was it possible to preserve; in *every word*, the strict propriety of accent, which accompanies the general euphony of the musical phrases of the tune. Of the most perfect adaptation of words to a given melody by a person of genius and skill, we have examples ; but none is so felicitous as More's exquisite words to Millico's song of

‘ Ho sparso tante lacrime.’

‘ Fall'n is thy throne, oh Isræel !’

Throughout the song the dactyl, *lacrymæ*, is beautifully and appropriately preserved in the English words of the song —

‘ Jerūsälēm’ — ‘ Sölímă.’

But no words, unless written expressly for a given air, by a writer of the most consummate skill in this most delicate and difficult task, would exactly, and for four lines together, *fit* a tune, which was made originally to other words, and those foreign ! I think this impossible, taking into consideration also how little the art of adaptation was known or practised at the period ; and that in no other metrical Psalm in the whole book can a Psalm be found, where the *stress* might, with such strict propriety, be placed upon the *four first words* of the *four first lines*.”

“ Playford says that he has found the 100th, 112th, and 113th Psalms in French and German books, and cannot tell to whom they originally belong. If my rule will determine the first, it will the others ; and I should pronounce by the same arguments, which persuade me that the 100th Psalm is English, that the 112th is *not*,

but foreign ; for all the accents are *false*, and, according to the tune, must be sung with these *unfortunate stresses* —

“ THE mān is blest that God does fear,  
 AND that his law doth love indeed ;  
 His seed on earth God will uprear,  
 AND bless such as from him proceed !”

No composer could think of accenting the first word of every line so entirely false, if the tune was made to the words, careless as a composer might be of his accents. The 113th, a popular tune in England, and very commonly used as a chime, fails when it is brought to the same test ; and I have no doubt it is German or French, of which it has the cast of character and features, being totally unlike an English tune. The 100th only will bear, in every line and nearly *every word* of the first verse, this plain, unerring test, of its being originally English. I think the testimony of Ravenscroft, that it was composed by the musician celebrated by Shakspeare, together with all the circumstances, decides it to be English by Peacham's poor ‘ old friend ;’ and I shall be happy, after many years of musical dispute, to have placed the chaplet unmoveably on the brows of its author. This is only a part of literary justice, and it is grateful to find the finest congregational melody, which stands as such, unrivalled in the world, to be, after all the discussion, the composition of an Englishman, the author of some of the sweetest and most impassioned madrigals, and celebrated by Shakspeare, (Dr. Dowland.)”

*The Parochial History of Bremhill in the County of Wilts*, by the Rev. W. L. Bowles, Lond. 1828, pp. 206-9. 211-2. 214-5.



“ Of the merit of Hampton’s *Translation of Polybius*, it cannot now be necessary to say anything. Its reputation has been long established, and many succeeding editions prove the extensiveness of its circulation. One thing relating to it, however, may not have been a circumstance of general remark, and this is that the style of the *Dedication* to Lord Henly, who was at that time Lord Chancellor, as well as that of the *Work* itself, has not precisely the same character, which distinguishes the *Preface*. This idea is by no means my own, nor is it altogether novel. A learned friend some years since suggested to me that the outlines of the *Preface* were drawn up by Hampton himself, and that the composition had received its finishing polish from the pen of Dr. Johnson. Nothing can be more certain than that the characters of two minds are easily discernible ; and perhaps, in one or two recollections, that want of uniformity may be distinguished, which really exists in the *Bampton-Lectures* of Dr. White, but which at the time of their publication wholly escaped the penetration and sagacity of certain learned critics, who were pleased to infer the authenticity” (*genuineness*) “ of the *Sermons* from the regularity of the style. One thing is incontrovertible. No man living could have written the *Preface* to the *Translation of Polybius*, whose mind had not an extensive and steady view of the subject, which Polybius has discussed ; and this praise surely belongs to Hampton. Neither could any man have written it, whose taste had not been early formed by the best models of antiquity, in composition, and in criticism ; and here also the claims of Hampton are indisputable. At the same time


there is a profoundness of thinking, an energy of expression, a regularity of cadence, very dissimilar from the structure of the sentences in the *Translation*, and very similar to the best peculiarities of Johnson's phraseology. With respect to the *Translation* itself, whoever will be at the pains to compare it with the original, will doubtless, as must be unavoidable in such undertakings, be able to detect some mistakes; but none, it may be asserted, of very material consequence. The body of the style is firm and compact, full of sinews and muscles, and with such evident marks of talent, as must impress the reader with the most exalted ideas of Hampton's erudition, as well as judgment."

Beloe's *Anecdotes of Literature and Scarce Books* 5, 286.

This 'learned friend' in all probability was Dr. Parr; for in August 1825, when the Author was visiting an enlightened and excellent friend in Warwickshire, he was informed by him in conversation that Dr. Parr considered the *Preface* in question to be the composition of Johnson, and as decidedly proving the original tendency of Johnson's mind to Whig-principles. And Dr. Parr himself thus wrote on the fly-leaf of his copy of the work, (*Bibliotheca Parriana* p. 226,) "The gift of my illustrious friend, James Mackintosh, Nov. 26, 1794. I was very little acquainted with the merits of this work, till they were pointed out by Jebb, The *Preface* was certainly revised and improved by Dr. Johnson. S. P." In p. 328. he "reckons, among the best Translations in the English language, Twining's Translation of *Aristotle's Poetics*, Sydenham's *Dialogues of Plato*, and Hampton's *Translation of Polybius*."

Of this *Translation* Gibbon said " that the English Translator has preserved the admirable sense, and improved the coarse style of his Arcadian original. A grammarian, like Dionysius, might despise Polybius for not understanding the structure of words, and Lord Monbodo might wish for a version into Attic Greek."

" His (Burke's) first avowed Work, *the Vindication of Natural Society*, which came out in the spring of 1756, may in fact be termed a piece of philosophical criticism couched under the guise of serious irony. It was an octavo pamphlet of 106 pages, published by Cooper at the price of 1s. 6d., and originated in an opinion generally expressed in literary society, of the style of Lord Bolingbroke being not only the best of that time, but in itself wholly inimitable; and in the approbation expressed by some persons of what were called his philosophical opinions, which had been published in March, 1754. The design of Mr. Burke was to produce a covert mimicry both of his style and principles; and particularly, by pushing the latter to their ultimate results, to force conviction on the mind of the reader of their unsoundness, by showing that the arguments, employed by the Peer against religion, applied as strongly against every other institution of civilized men. His Lordship's philosophy, such as it was, was the newest pattern of the day, and of course excited considerable notice, as coming from a man, who had made so conspicuous a figure in politics; and whose career, after a youth spent in the stews, and a manhood in turbulence and disaffection to the Government of his country, seemed appropriately terminated by an old-age of infidelity. Accustomed to disregard honest and wise opi-



nions on other matters, he wanted courage to show his contempt of them on this ; but at his death left to Mallet, a brother infidel, the office of ushering his benevolent legacy of deism into light ; which drew from Dr. Johnson, when asked his opinion of it, the exclamation — ‘ A scoundrel ! who spent his life in charging a popgun against Christianity ; and a coward ! who, afraid of the report of his own gun, left half a crown to a hungry Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death.’ The novelty of the plan of attack upon the dialectics of the noble philosopher, caused some stir in the literary circles, though it has been untruly stated by a virulent *enemy*, in the guise of a *biographer*, to have fallen still-born from the press. Lord Chesterfield and Bishop Warburton for a short time believed it genuine ; Mallet, it has been said, went to Dodsley’s shop, when filled with the *literati*, purposely to disavow it ; and the periodical critics, though alive to the deception, when their strictures appeared in print, gave it a full examination, and much praise for the ingenuity shown in the execution. The imitation, indeed, was so perfect, as to constitute identity rather than resemblance. It was not merely the language, style, and general eloquence of the original, which has been caught ; but the whole mind of the Peer, his train of thought, the power to enter into his conceptions, seemed to be transfused into the pen of his imitator with a fidelity and ‘ grace beyond the reach of art.’ Several able critics of the present day have expressed their admiration of it in strong terms ; one of them, in a celebrated periodical Work, alluding to this power of copying an author in *all* his peculiarities, says : — ‘ In Burke’s imitation of Boling-

‘ broke, (the most perfect specimen perhaps, that ever will  
 ‘ exist of the art in question,) we have all the qualities,  
 ‘ which distinguish the style, or we may indeed say the  
 ‘ genius of that noble Writer, concentrated and brought  
 ‘ before us ; so that an ordinary reader, who, in perusing  
 ‘ his genuine Works merely felt himself dazled and dis-  
 ‘ appointed—delighted and wearied he could not tell why,  
 ‘ is now enabled to form a definite and precise conception  
 ‘ of the causes of those opposite sensations — and to trace  
 ‘ to the nobleness of the diction, and the inaccuracy of the  
 ‘ reasoning — the boldness of the propositions, and the  
 ‘ rashness of the inductions — the magnificence of the  
 ‘ pretensions, and the feebleness of the performance, those  
 ‘ contradictory judgments, with the confused result of  
 ‘ which he had been perplexed in his study of the original.’”

Mr. Prior's *Memoir of the Life and Character of  
 Burke* V. 1. p. 53.

If, then, Mr. Burke could so successfully imitate the style of Lord Bolingbroke, as to deceive Lord Chesterfield and Bishop Warburton, themselves most distinguished writers, and therefore excellent judges of composition, we may learn to be wary in deciding for or against the particular claims of any individuals to the authorship of Junius's *Letters*. But candour requires the Author to add, that, as the first avowed production of Burke was a successful, or somewhat successful, attempt to imitate the style of Lord Bolingbroke, all argument against the claims of Burke to the composition of Junius's *Letters*, founded on the dissimilarity of style between these two celebrated writers should be received with great caution ; for he, who can successfully imitate a style,

may be equally happy in the art of disguising his own, if circumstances require him to practise the deception.

“ Bolingbroke’s manner of reasoning and philosophising has been so happily caught in a piece entitled *A Vindication of Natural Society*, that many, even acute readers, mistook it for a genuine discourse of the author, whom it was intended to expose ; it is indeed a masterpiece of irony. No writings, that raised so mighty an expectation in the public as those of Bolingbroke, ever perished so soon and sunk into oblivion.”

Dr. Jos. Warton’s *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope*, 2, 179.

“ Sept. 30, 1798. Read Burke’s *Vindication of Natural Society*. Except in parts, (as in the opening and ending,) I cannot think that this piece has much of Bolingbroke’s style and manner : there is throughout an air of constraint, most abhorrent in its nature, to the bold and rapid flow of Bolingbroke’s declamation. Burke certainly began and ended his labours in the same cause.”

*Extracts from the Diary of a Lover of Literature*,  
(by Mr. Green, of Ipswich,) p. 102.

“ Now that the pen is in my hand, I will take permission to point out another slight inaccuracy committed by an author of the highest merit. In Dugald Stewart’s *Philosophical Essays* p. 502. ed. 8vo. it is written : ‘ Warburton has remarked, and in my opinion with some truth, that Burke himself never wrote so well as when he imitated Bolingbroke.’ No reference is made by Mr. S. to any authority whatsoever in support of this remark ; nor do I believe it to have been made by Warburton in any way whatsoever, either written or conversational.

The name of Burke does not occur in that Prelate's *View of Lord B.'s Philosophy*, or in any one of his other learned and argumentative works. Nor will it be found where some notice of so eminent a contemporary might reasonably have been expected, in the volume of his *Correspondence with Bishop Hurd*. The truth is, that, though both of these wonderful men were akin to each other by the possession of transcendent genius, yet the pursuits and intellectual habits of them were so wide asunder, that the one cared little or nothing for the doings of the other, and accordingly there never was any interchange of sentiment, any reciprocation of civility between them; nor even a critical comment on the intellectual operations of each other. In reality, Warburton's pride was so desperately intractable, that he seldom spared a crumb of praise to any author, excepting the muzzled slaves of his own school, Hurd, Browne, Towne, and Balguy. A stain of disgrace must for ever rest upon his name for the contemptuous mention he has thought fit to make of Dr. Johnson. See his *Letters to Hurd*, p. 368. A most elaborate vehemence is also passed on this great man's edition of Shakspeare. This most offensive passage, I regret to say, was thrust in quite out of its place by the very learned compiler of that publication, from the base impulse of envy towards a very superior intellect. For, exalted and sincere as is my admiration for Bishop Hurd, I do not hesitate to say that he might have been cut out from a corner of Johnson's mind, without his missing it."

JOHN JACOBS, in the *Gent's Mag. for Jan. 1828*.  
p. 500.

Severe as was the satire of Junius, it produced no such

effects as the bitter iambics, which Archilochus, stimulated by revenge, wrote against Lycambes and his daughter Neobule, who had accepted the hand of a wealthier lover ; — they did homage to the genius of Archilochus by hanging themselves !

Junius is supposed by some, (at least was supposed by the late antiquarian, T. Park,) to have taken his name from the celebrated work of Hubert Languet, who died in 1581. “ *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos, sive de Principis in Populum, Populique in Principem Legitima Potestate*, 1579, 12mo. This bears the name of STEPHANUS JUNIUS BRUTUS, and the place *Edinburgh*, but the place was *Basil*, and it never was doubted that Languet was the author of this spirited attack on tyranny. It was often reprinted and translated into French.” Chalmers’s *Biographical Dictionary*. A French translation is now lying before the Author, entitled, *De la Puissance Legitime du Prince sur le Peuple, et du Peuple sur le Prince : Traité tres-utile et digne de Lecture en ce Temps, escrit en Latin par ESTIENNE JUNIUS BRUTUS, et nouvellement traduit en François*, 1581, 12mo. pp. 409. “ During his illness he was visited by Madam Du Plessis, who, though sick herself, attended him in his last moments. His dying words were, ‘ that the only thing, which ‘ grieved him was, that he had not been able to see Mons. ‘ Du Plessis again before he died, to whom he would ‘ have left his very heart, had it been in his power, — ‘ that he had wished to live to see the world reformed, ‘ but, since it became daily worse, he had no longer any ‘ business in it, — that the princes of these times were ‘ strange men, — that virtue had much to suffer, and



‘ little to get, — that he pitied M. Du Plessis very much, to whose share a great part of the misfortunes of the time would fall, and who would see many unhappy days ; but that he must take courage, for God would assist him. For the rest, he begged one thing of him in his last farewell, namely, that he would mention something of their friendship in the first book he should publish.’ This request was performed by Du Plessis soon after, in a short *Preface* to his treatise *Of the Truth of the Christian Religion*, where he makes the following eulogy of this friend in a few comprehensive words : *Is fuit qualis multi videri volunt, is vixit qualiter optimi mori cupiunt.*”

*The Vices, a Poem, in three Cantos, by the Author of the Letters of Junius*, 1828. 12mo. pp. 45. The editor writes thus in the prefatory *Advertisement* : — “ The *Poem* which is here presented to the world, was found some years since among the papers of the late John Almon, long a very distinguished publisher in Piccadilly, and himself the author and editor of some political and biographical works well known to the public. It is believed to be in the hand-writing of the unknown author of the *Letters of Junius*, from comparing the MS. not merely with the *fac-similes* published by Mr. Woodfall, but with the originals in his possession. It was evidently 12 or 13 years after the *Letters of Junius*, and hence some trivial variations ; but the general character and aspect of the hands are the very same ; and the style of penmanship in the original *Letters* and in this *Poem* is so singularly clear, easy, and neat, that scarcely ten men of the same age would have written in a similar manner,

and perhaps no two men of genius. It is presumed also that the subject-matter of the *Poem* its tone of biting satire, its political principles, and the individuality of its personal sarcasms, will concur with the similarity of hand in producing a conviction of the identity of authorship. It would be marvellous indeed, if two different men in the same epoch wrote in a peculiar character, so much alike as scarcely to be distinguished, and should also maintain the same principles, entertain the same personal antipathies, and display signs of genius more than ordinary. The probability is very low that they should be two persons; and very high that they were one and the same person."

"*The Vices, a Poem. By Junius. Philips, Charing-Cross.* Mr. E. H. Barker, of Thetford, in his *Letter to Charles Butler*, the amiable friend of civil and religious liberty, on the subject of Junius, justly says that the similarity of hand-writings is a very fallacious argument in attempting to assign the patriotic effusions of Junius to any particular individual. The *Poem* now before us was found among the papers of the great political publisher, Almon, who was not aware of the author. A comparison with the published specimens of Junius's hand-writing, has induced the possessors of it to throw it before the public for their opinion. We are surprised that ever the editor or publisher should have been so deceived; the style of writing, the formation of the letters, being so entirely different from the specimen they have unfortunately selected to maintain their opinion. As a *Poem*, it possesses great merit; the ideas are strong, nervously expressed; the satire piquant, and the con-

struction of the piece not bad." *The Gentleman's Mag.*, March, 1828. p. 249.

In p. 312. the Author has inserted some matter taken from the *Inspector*, relative to the recent discoveries at Stowe; a friend has desired him to correct the statement:—

“ *London, March 22, 1828.* Allow me to make the following assertions, that your readers may not be misled by a document, which has evidently been fabricated to gain the *Magazine* some notoriety. 1. I can assure you from the best authority, and I have every reason to believe it, that Lord Nugent and the Duke of Buckingham never lit upon a parcel concealed in an unknown recess. 2. That they found no Letter to George Grenville from Junius, asking for legal advice as to the risk of publishing the *Letter to the King*, with the real name. 3. That there was no Letter enclosing Junius's Letter to Lord Mansfield, with the author's initials. 4. That the Duke of Buckingham never went to Dropmore with any such parcel. 5. That Lord Grenville never declared his intention of providing for the publicity of such documents after his decease. 6. That the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Nugent never pledged themselves to silence until Lord Grenville's decease. 7. That Lord Grenville at his advanced age is totally uninterested in the subject, and never makes it the theme of conversation, or of research. 8. That Lord Nugent never considered himself justified in conversing with his uncle on the subject, knowing that it was one, which afforded him no interest. 10. That the claims of Charles Lloyd, (independently of his going abroad after the decease of

George Grenville,) are too vague to justify even a suspicion that he was in any manner concerned in the publication of the *Letters*. 11. That most men entertain opinions of their own upon this mysterious subject, and it is highly probable that Lord Nugent may suspect some individual, whose name has hitherto been withheld from the public ; but of such suspicion he has no positive evidence.

“ I have now given a full reply to the paragraph in the *Inspector*, and I pledge my word that I have advanced nothing, but what I have it in my power fully to substantiate. You are at liberty, therefore, to prefix it to your forthcoming publication. The images, illustrations, and similes, so industriously collected and contained in your *Appendix*, show that the author was a man of the world, well read upon every subject, — that he was a classic scholar, a play-reader, and an historian, an enemy to the priesthood, and one who had an inveterate detestation of the chicanery of the law.”

There is a reference to Lord Nugent in the *Preface* p. x. to *The Vices, a Poem in three Cantos, by the Author of the Letters of Junius* :— “ Who this writer was, is still a mystery. We are told that Lord Nugent has recently made discoveries, which are not, however, to be publicly developed till after the decease of a living statesman ; but the same expectation has been so often raised in vain, that, until the proofs are adduced, or we have the high authority of the noble Lord in an authentic form, the story must be regarded as legendary.”

Of the Stowe-discovery, the Author will give two extracts from *Letters* addressed to him by friends, who take much interest in the question of Junius.

“ *London, Jan. 25, 1828.* This very day a friend, who is very intimate with the Duke of Buckingham, informed me that a short time before the Duke went abroad, he wrote to him thus — ‘ What will you give me, ‘ if I tell you who was the author of *Junius*? *I know ‘ it ; but the secret must be kept some time longer.*’ I understand the Duke found some *family-papers*, by which he is, no doubt, in full possession of the secret.”

“ *Jan. 16, 1828.* I have, however, some information for you relative to the Grenvilles, to which family Junius and Lloyd seem to have leaned in their political attachments and writings. I was informed some time ago that the Duke of Buckingham had, from certain documents, found in his archives, discovered who really was the author of the *Letters of Junius*. Not having the honour of his Grace’s acquaintance, I wrote to a friend, who had been in the habit of spending a considerable portion of his time at Stowe, to let me know whether he had heard anything upon the subject during his stay there, and whether the Duke was inclined to make public the documents. In answer he informed me that he had heard his Grace express himself to the effect of knowing who Junius was, and that his name was not among those, *who had ever been suspected.* My friend was not inclined to trespass further upon his Grace’s communicativeness : he was privileged to eat his mutton, drink his claret, and ride his horses, but, although a man of respectable rank, not authorised to question his noble host upon such matters. What his Grace’s documents or suppositions are, I therefore know not, whether worth anything, or nothing.”

From these authentic statements it is evident that, though the Stowe-discovery is not so important as the writer in the *Inspector* represents, it is of so much importance that the Duke of Buckingham considers himself to have detected the name of the writer ; and the reader will remark that in the statement, which comments on the article extracted from the *Inspector*, there is no attempt to deny the fact of the discovery, or even its real importance, but the denial goes no farther than to contradict the reported extent of the discovery.

“ I wrote the other sheet a few days since, which I intended to complete and forward, but waited to see Mr. Woodfall, if possible, in which I have succeeded. I breakfasted with him yesterday-morning at Westminster. He presents his compliments, and requested me to forward the anecdote about Francis, if of any use. You are doubtless aware that his father and Francis were schoolfellows — educated at St. Paul’s School. In after-years they generally attended the anniversary dinners. On one of those occasions, on Mr. Woodfall’s returning home, he met an intimate friend, who said — ‘ I met you and Junius, going to the Pauline Festival.’ ‘ To whom do you allude ?’ replied Mr. Woodfall. ‘ Francis, to be sure, there is no other Junius.’ ‘ To my certain knowledge,’ replied Mr. Woodfall, ‘ Francis had no more to do with Junius than either you or I.’ The gentleman was quite satisfied with Mr. Woodfall’s positive denial, and wished him good evening. Mr. Woodfall informed me that there were many reasons why Francis had no hand in the *Letters* — his father knew him so well — his capabilities — his confined situation — the

the sphere, which he moved in, as well as the risk that he would run in being thrown upon the world neglected—all concurred, united with his positive denial, to cause Mr. Woodfall to know that the motto, *Stat nominis umbra*, would never be solved in the son of Dr. Francis." *Extract from a Letter of Mr. Coventry, dated June 18, 1828.*

*Lincoln's Inn, June 14, 1828.*

"DEAR SIR,

In answer to your enquiries, I have to mention that, since the publication of the *Reminiscences*, I have heard little on the subject of *Junius*, and that this little is scarcely of any consequence.

"I persist in thinking that neither Mr. Burke, nor Sir Philip Francis was the author of the *Letters*, under the signature of *Junius*. I think the mind of the first so superior, and the mind of the latter so inferior, to that of *Junius*, as to put the supposition that either of them was *Junius*, wholly out of the question.

"Some of your arguments against Sir Philip's claim appear to me very strong; some decisive. That there was some connexion between *Junius* and Sir Philip, appears to me sufficiently proved by Mr. Taylor's publication. *Junius's Letters* do not contain one effusion of that high moral or political wisdom, with which Burke's writings abound: Sir Philip Francis's productions discover nothing of the *vivida vis*, which characterises *Junius*; nothing of *Junius's* sly, lofty, and bitter sarcasms. What you say concerning Sir Arthur Pigott's belief of the identity of Burke and *Junius*, is true; and his opinion is valuable, so far as it witnesses the opinion of those, with whom he had lived; but I am pretty sure that it was founded on no information or reasoning of his own.

“ I continue to think that Dr. Parr’s arguments in favour of Lloyd prove nothing.

“ I know from Mr. Woodfall himself, that he thinks the originals of Junius’s *Letters* were destroyed by his father ; but I believe he has no reason for thinking it, except that it was the custom of his father to burn all his Letters at a certain period of the year. As Junius’s *Letters* had so much real, and so much possible importance, I cannot believe the fact. Mr. Woodfall, however, is persuaded of it ; and is convinced that some how or other, I am mistaken, in thinking I saw the original *Letters* in the custody of Mr. Wilkes. As the circumstance, if it took place at all, took place about half a century ago, I should readily admit the mistake, if the fact now came into my memory for the first time. But the circumstance, that I saw the *Letters* in Mr. Wilkes’s custody, that the *Letter to the King* is in a hand-writing different from the others, and the conversations, which took place at the time between Mr. Wilkes and myself, have occurred to my mind more than once in every year since the time I have mentioned, and my recollection of the fact is so distinct, that I have no doubt of it.

“ A gentleman and I went to see the MS. of a Poem attributed to Junius, and compared it with the *fac-similes* published by Mr. Taylor. My friend thought the similitude in the hand-writings greater than I did. The poem is not above mediocrity, and bears no resemblance to the spirit or style of Junius.

“ A *Letter* from a gentleman, upon whose accuracy I can rely, informs me, that the Mr. Swinney, who is mentioned in Junius’s *Letters*, was a clergyman, who had been



attached to the Russian Embassy, and had afterwards been attached to an English Regiment, serving in Germany; and that upon his return to England, he was frequently in the Treasury and its environs; and that he was a carrier of new intelligence to and from different persons.

“ I have heard of the discoveries at Stowe: the subject was started in a conversation I had with one of the family; but no particulars were mentioned.

“ It was once mentioned to me, that the late Lady Ashburton produced a proof-impression of one of Junius's *Letters*, with corrections of the press in Mr. Dunning's hand-writing. This was afterwards explicitly confirmed by a Letter from a person present, when Lady Ashburton produced the *Letter*. Being well acquainted with the last Lord Ashburton, I informed his Lordship of the tale, and requested his sentiments upon it. He disclaimed with indignation his father's authorship of the *Letters*,—said no such proof-impression had been found among his papers, and that he had never heard his mother mention any thing of the kind. He stated other circumstances, which led him to think that the story deserved no attention.

“ I am sorry I cannot communicate to you any information of importance on the subject, in which you take so great an interest. I have only to add, that it appears to me to be involved in as great obscurity as ever.

With great respect, I am, dear Sir,  
Your most obedient Servant,

CHARLES BUTLER.”

“ To E. H. Barker Esq.”

My friend, Mr. Coventry, in a *Letter* dated *Bull-head Passage*, Jan. 5, 1828, writes thus:—

“ In reply to your queries, I believe I can now strictly answer them. 1. Mr. Woodfall declares that every year it was his father’s custom to destroy all the papers of the preceding year ; but with respect to Junius’s correspondence, 2. there is every reason to believe that, after such *Letters* were printed, it was the invariable custom to return them to Junius through the medium of the Coffee-houses. Without any private opinion, we have sufficient evidence from the correspondence between him and Mr. Woodfall, that such packets were regularly sealed and delivered. What else could they contain? 3. We have also evidence that the private *Letters* to Mr. Wilkes were forwarded through Mr. Woodfall. You may recollect he says in one of his *Notes* — ‘ Shew the *Dedication* and *Preface* to Mr. Wilkes.’ Nevertheless some of his minor *Notes* to Wilkes appear to have been sent by private hand ; for at the back of one the *Notes* Mr. Wilkes wrote — ‘ Received from a chairman, who said he received it from a gentleman in Lancaster-Court in the Strand.’ Now it is not likely that Woodfall would send to a chairman in the Strand to deliver a *Letter* to Mr. Wilkes.”

There is, as the Author thinks, some reason to doubt whether any of the *Letters*, addressed by Junius to Mr. Wilkes, were in the hand-writing, which we consider to be the hand-writing of Wilkes. It is pretty evident that Junius corresponded with Wilkes through Mr. Woodfall, and there is fair ground for supposing, from the habitual and the unavoidable caution of Junius, that he would require copies to be taken in Mr. Woodfall’s office, and forwarded to Mr. Wilkes by a porter, by a private hand, or by the Penny-post. It is certain that Mr.

Wilkes was in the habit of endorsing the Letters, and stating when he received each, and, (where he knew the fact,) from whom. Thus one communication was received from "a chairman," (1, 263.) another "by the Penny-post," (1, 296.) Mr. Butler states the *Letter to the King*, which he saw in Mr. Wilkes's possession, to have been in a different hand from the others, and this is a strong confirmation of the opinion, which the Author has given, that Mr. Wilkes had not any originals, but only copies. The Author adds that there is a lady now living, who, when she was a girl, used to be locked up by old Woodfall till she had executed her allotted tasks of transcription; he kept possession of the *Letters*, and dictated the matter to her from them. Moreover, the *Letter*, sent to Garrick by Woodfall in the name of Junius, was, not an original, but a copy.

"It was Mr. Woodfall's lawyer, who resided in *Paternoster-Row*, that copied Garrick's *Letter* in Mr. Upcott's possession. The copy of the other *Letter* you were kind enough to hand me, is wholly new to me — if genuine, (and it certainly is in Junius's style,) it is not a little singular that the original is not in Garrick's papers. The odds are very great that he should have parted with it, as Garrick made a practise of keeping all his *Letters*. Mr. Woodfall knows nothing of it — it was not forwarded to Garrick through his father. How Junius, (unless he lived at Richmond, and was intimate with some of the King's household, which Sackville was,) should forward such a *Note* to Garrick so quickly, quite puzzles me. It is more surprising than the case of Swinney, although Woodfall knew that the following day."

*Extract from Mr. Coventry's Letter dated Wandsworth Common,  
July 26, 1827.*

The only specimens of Junius's writing, whether in a real or a feigned hand,— whether in his own hand, or in the hand of an amanuensis,— on which reliance can be placed, are the private *Letters* of Junius to Mr. H. S. Woodfall in the possession of the present Mr. Woodfall. The latter states that it was the practice of his father to destroy all correspondence at the end of the year ; — we will admit that it was his *general* practice, but, if such had been his *universal and invariable* practice, even the private *Letters* of Junius addressed to himself would have been sacrificed in the holocaust. The preservation of the private *Letters* proves, beyond all doubt, that Woodfall would have preserved every *original* communication of Junius, if each and all had been in his power. The supposition of Mr. Coventry is well warranted — that Junius's *Letters*, at least the public *Letters*, were returned to himself through the Coffee-houses mentioned in the private *Letters* to Woodfall.

The Author subjoins a Letter, for which he was indebted to the friendly courtesy of Mr. Serjeant Rough :

“ *Serjeant's Inn, Chancery-Lane, April 12, 1827.*

“ Dear Sir,

I hasten to acknowledge your Letter, with the printed papers accompanying it, delivered at my chambers by Mr. Maxon. I am sorry, however, that I can render you so very little service in respect of the subjects, on which you write.

“ The *Letters* of Junius to Mr. Wilkes passed through my hands to Mr. Woodfall, and are those, which appear in his edition of 1812. They belonged to Mr. P. Elmsley, the late Principal of St. Alban's, who, as I believe,

possessed them as executor to his father. His knowledge of me as a brother-Westminster with me and the circumstance of my having married an acknowledged daughter of Mr. Wilkes induced him to decline letting Mr. Woodfall have them without my assent. They came to me from my friend, Mr. Hallam, to whom they were afterwards returned for Mr. Elmsley.

“ Mr. Wilkes used, I have been told, to say that *he* knew who the author of Junius was — that it was *not* Rosenhagen ; but he never said it was *not* Sir P. Francis. The latter used to dine at Kensington frequently, and once cut off a lock of Mrs. Rough’s hair, (she was then quite a girl.) She had an obscure imagination that her father once said, she had met Junius. All this is too slight I admit, to build any conclusion upon.

“ In the *Letters*, I fear, I have to answer for the striking out of a line or two, in which the late King was spoken of, upon alleged personal knowledge, with an expression of much bitterness. It was an idle precaution on my part, inasmuch as Junius’s opinions could have done little harm to any one, and were sufficiently avowed in other *Letters*. I have never seen the *Letters*, about which you enquire, *since* they were given back by me to Mr. Hallam, for Elmsley.

“ I may mention here that some *Letters* of Mr. Wilkes forming a part of his correspondence with his daughter, (Mary,) and published by Longman and Rees, 1804, also passed through my hands. They were purchased of Sir Robert Baker, Bart., then of Richmond, for £300, by Mr. Hatchard, jointly with Longman and Rees. I was induced to superintend the publication with a view

of serving Mr. Hatchard, and of guarding against anything appearing in the *Letters* unpleasant to the feelings of my wife. She was a natural daughter of Wilkes. With *him* I never was in company: he was dead before I knew his daughter. Of that daughter our dear Dr. Parr thought with veneration. For myself, life has never been, what it once was, since I lost her.

“ There is nothing secret in what I have thus communicated.

I am yours truly,

W. ROUGH.”

“ To E. H. Barker, Esq.”

Mr. Butler, in the *Letter* addressed to the Author, refers to the story about Lady Ashburton having had in her possession some proof-sheets of Junius’s public *Letters*. Information of this sort, (and we have had abundance of it in the matter of *Junius*, we may expect more, and therefore the Author adds these remarks and invites public attention to them,) is often too vague for argument, and the fact is generally too improbable for evidence. Dunning might have written papers on similar subjects, and under similar signatures, and yet might not have written the *Letters* of Junius in question. Neither Lady Ashburton, nor the person present, might be sufficiently qualified to give any correct opinion on the subject; they might perhaps be easily deceived. The story, *if true*, is destitute of the circumstantiality, without which it cannot be used in evidence. The Author is not inclined to view such stories as sheer inventions; they have a foundation of truth, but may have more *superficies* of error, than *solidity* of fact, the *superstructure* may overhang the *base*; the error originates rather in unin-

tentional misconception, than in studied deception, or a great disregard to veracity ; and it gathers strength, as it proceeds, because the defects of memory are, in conversational narration, promptly and imperceptibly supplied by the lively and inventive power of imagination in the narrator. In the course of time truth and fiction are so blended in his mind, that he cannot distinguish one from the other.

Surely it is *dangerous* to undertake to deny the truth of all such stories, and it is *improbable* that they should be pure inventions. The point, then, is, not to credit the whole story with innocent gullibility, but to separate the small portion of truth from the surrounding fiction, and to account for the fiction itself. In this way we do not offer any violence to strong, however mistaken, opinion ; and we may hope that that opinion will yield to the force of our arguments, because those arguments do not strike at the *person*, but at the *subject*. There is no wounded self-love roused to defend itself, and in its fervour not only confounding the supposed personality of the language used by an opponent, with the real attack made on the question at issue, but so hoodwinking its discernment, that truth ceases to be at all perceptible. Thus argumentation often idly continues — thus logomachy grievously rages — thus the ball rolls on in its fiery course, against whatever solid bodies it may impinge, rebounding again and again till all its vitality, activity, and energy are destroyed by the gradual annihilation of its substance.

In pp. 227. 256. mention is made of a passage in the Rev. Sir Herbert Croft's *Love and Madness* : there are two others, also referring to Charles Lloyd : —

“ Does any one admire Junius for saying that his secret should die with him, and for keeping his word? But this was only saying he would not enlarge the circle of those, to whom his secret was already known. For that he was, as he says, ‘ the sole depository of his own secret,’ I cannot think. The original Letters are written in a female hand. But *Junius* is now known. Let any man, at any time of life, make an experiment of not communicating to a single individual, during twelve months, a single scheme, a single prospect, a single circumstance respecting himself. Let him try how (hard) it is to lock up every thing, trifling or serious, sad or merry, within his own solitary breast. There are easier tasks. This boy, (Chatterton,) did it during his whole life.” P. 140.

“ Mr. L. never took off his mask, but rather chose that Fame should dress up an ideal writer, and worship him as the author of *Junius*, than to claim the eternal crown in his own name and person. Good men are satisfied with the applause of their own consciences, and scatter charity with the invisible hand of bounty. May not great men be formed in the same mold? May not obscurity appear to enlarge an ideal, as well as a real object? God would, perhaps, be something less of God, were he visible. But, as I said, I neither know nor care what was Chatterton’s motive.” P. 209.

In pp. 260. 262. 263. I have mentioned Dr. Parr’s high opinion of Dr. Nathaniel Forster, who with Dr. Farmer first turned the attention of Dr. Parr to Charles Lloyd as the writer of *Junius’s Letters*. I should have added the following testimony contained in the *Bibliotheca Parriana* p. 373:—



“(Lind’s) celebrated *Letters on the present State of Poland*, 1773. 8vo. ‘ This book was written by the sagacious and benevolent Mr. Lind, the friend of the profoundly philosophical Dr. Nathaniel Forster of Colchester, and the celebrated Jeremy Bentham, and Tutor to the worthy and enlightened King of Poland. S. P.’ ”

E. H. BARKER.

*Thetford, June 30, 1828.*

ERRATUM.—p. 240, insert *not before the Author.*

THE CLAIMS  
OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS  
TO THE  
AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS DISPROVED,

*In a Letter addressed to CHARLES BUTLER, Esq.*

---

1. I readily avail myself of a public opportunity of testifying my respect for your great talents, considerable attainments, moral worth, and high character; and of expressing my sincere hope that your life, so useful and so honourable, will be spared by a merciful Providence, while you are capable of sharing in the enjoyments of life; that literature will continue to solace the growing infirmities of age; and that you will yet live to witness the triumph of that Cause, which you have so well sustained by your knowledge and learning, candour and good manners — the triumph of Parliamentary wisdom over Ecclesiastical fears; of moral justice over legalised wrong; of religious principle over political prejudice; and of Christian charity over Protestant intolerance.

2. In considering the question about the authorship of JUNIUS, it is to be remarked that, while Mr. Taylor selects certain passages from the Letters of Junius to establish certain points, Mr. Coventry

selects other passages to prove points of an opposite tendency : the same may be said of other writers on the question. Nay, the very same passages of Junius sometimes serve to supply the writers with inferences of a very opposite tendency. How does this difference of judgment arise? Because they, in pursuit of their different objects, are not impartially discussing the general question, but only searching for arguments to support their own theory. He who is impartially considering the subject, is able to reconcile these contradictions either by producing other passages of Junius, or by adducing various circumstances and facts extraneous to the passages, or by qualifying the opinions of the contending writers from internal evidence, which is supplied by the passages themselves. Controversies of this complicated sort can only be decided by men, who investigate the claims advanced for each supposed author of the Letters of Junius, with the apparent partiality of an advocate, and at the same time with the apparent zeal of an opponent, allowing to each argument, in proof or in disproof, the full force which belongs to it, and admitting neither more nor less. Argumentation so pursued is demonstration, and necessarily carries conviction to the mind of the reader ; but argumentation so pursued has not yet been employed to settle the question, which I have undertaken to discuss.

3. Mr. Taylor has adduced a multitude of facts, incidents, circumstances, and arguments, to identify Sir Philip Francis with Junius : he supposes himself to have succeeded in his object. Mr. Coventry is equally confident of having successfully identified Lord George Sackville with Junius, and he has produced a work of equal magnitude. Well, then, if so many apparently striking proofs support the claims made for the knight, as well as for the

nobleman, we may learn the great caution which is necessary to be observed in pursuing the subject, if we hope to arrive at any right conclusion. And I draw a most important inference from the fact of these conflicting proofs of authorship, viz. that the claims in a great degree neutralise each other; for he who on strong grounds contends for Sir Philip Francis's authorship, is on strong grounds opposed by him who pleads for the authorship of Lord George Sackville: then it proves that such grounds of argument in favour of the one may be entitled to no great weight, because similar grounds are taken in favour of the other, and our confidence in either body of arguments is weakened or destroyed. For instance; if Sir Philip Francis, in penmanship, writes like Junius, so does Lord George Sackville. But Junius was not a *duality*, like the German Deity *Alcis* mentioned by Tacitus: if he was Sir Philip, he was not Lord George. Then similarity of hand-writing is a fallacious criterion for tracing the authorship of Junius. Then in discussing the question between the knight and the nobleman, we must strike out of the account all the arguments common to each, and judge by the number and the weight of those peculiar to each. On this plan we shall bring the controversy to a narrower point, and proceed on safer principles. But no man has yet made the attempt to act on this plan; and can we then wonder that the controversy still continues?

4. Mr. Taylor. p. 379, says: — “ ‘*To skulk,*’ ‘*to skreen,*’ are examples of a system of orthography uniformly acted on by both writers, (Junius and Sir Philip Francis,) however rarely practised by others.” But Mr. T. is mistaken; for I have by accident met with the following instance in a Letter of Sir Wm. Draper to the Editor of the *Public Advertiser* April 24, 1769. (Woodfall's Junius 1, 448.): — “A wri-

ter, who when repeatedly called upon to avow himself, and personally maintain his accusation, still *skulks* in the dark, or in the mean subterfuge of a mask." And it would be easy to produce other examples from contemporary writers.

5. Mr. Taylor lays great stress on the identity of *Veteran* with *Junius*, and as he shews *Veteran* to have been Sir Philip Francis, he contends that the latter is *Junius*. But whether we suppose *Veteran* and *Junius* to be really one and the same writer, (and *Junius* certainly does identify himself with *Veteran*,) or the latter to have assumed the identity for his own purposes, there is great difficulty in concluding Sir Philip to have been *Junius*. That *Junius* displays a "minute and commissarial knowledge of petty military matters" is true; and this seems to prove a close connection with the War-Office or the Horse-Guards. Now *Veteran* confines himself wholly to the subject of the transactions in the War-Office; and supposing Sir Philip to have been *Veteran*, we need not wonder at the fact, as Sir Philip was himself in the War-Office, and closely connected with the transactions. Had the earliest publication of *Junius* been simultaneous with the appearance of the Letters of *Veteran*, there would have been much force in the arguments of Mr. Taylor for identifying the two writers with Sir Philip, as we can easily conceive that a man wishing to plead his own cause may contrive to identify it with public questions — that public spirit may arise out of private motives — that public good may be the professed aim, while individual interest is the secret spring — and that patriotism may be apparently the ruling principle, while party-purposes are the latent and real objects. Events of this kind are, even in our own times, sufficiently obvious to attest the truth of this remark. Sir Philip Francis might, as a Clerk in the War-

Office, with the consciousness of slighted services, or as a man with the vengeance of outraged feelings, have had good reason for exposing the transactions of that Office to public animadversion, for denouncing certain individuals, for appealing to public sympathy, and for identifying his cause with the public good. All this is perfectly natural and quite intelligible — it MIGHT have given birth to a Junius, but unluckily for the hypothesis *Junius had sprung up two or three years before*, at first under other names, and then under that Roman appellation — *Junius* — had taken his station, and that elevated station related not to the proceedings of the War-Office alone or chiefly, avowedly or secretly, which we should have expected from Sir Philip Francis as a Clerk in that Office, but to the proceedings of the Ministry and of the Parliament, and to the general transactions of the Empire, and to the advancement of the public interests. Influenced then by this consideration, I cannot admit the claims made for Sir Philip Francis to the authorship of Junius, and I would urge on the mind of the reader this novel objection, with all the force with which it can be employed. It is quite contrary to all sound principles of reasoning — to all just views of human nature — to all the repeated lessons of experience — and to all the fair limits of rational belief — to suppose and to declare that Sir Philip Francis, either avowedly or anonymously, when he was 27 years of age, (i. e. ‘when the first of the Miscellaneous Letters, being the earliest of the known productions of Junius, made its appearance,’) should, though a mere Clerk in the War-Office, have ventured to enter into public political discussion at all — that he should have either overlooked or despised the danger of the attempt — that he should have thrown so serious an obstacle in the way of his advancement, should he be detected, —

that he, instead of promoting the wishes of his employers, instead of aiding the views of the Government, of which he formed a part however subordinate, instead of sympathising with all around him as bound by the common tie of interest, should have laboured with the most vigilant energy to effect such purposes as were inconsistent with his situation, opposed to his progress in life, and calculated to subvert alike the influence of his patrons and the power of the Ministry, — that he, a mere Clerk in the War-Office, should have commenced his literary career by a series of papers perfect in their style of composition, and his political career by professing those high public principles, which belong only to the tongues or the pens of men, who have been for a series of years running their course of usefulness and of fame, — that he should have denounced the conduct of the Ministry in the severest terms with the apparent skill of an experienced rhetorician, the exact knowledge of an able statesman, the lofty tone of an independent spirit, the persevering zeal of a disinterested patriot, and a Demosthenic vehemence of diction unparalleled in the history of human eloquence. If Sir Philip Francis did in such circumstances write the Letters of Junius, then the history of the world itself has exhibited no similar or second instance of this sort, the phenomenon cannot be explained by all the philosophy of the human mind, and nothing is too little or too great for human credulity.

6. The earliest composition of Junius before he assumed the name of *Junius*, is a Letter signed *Poplicola*, and dated April 28th, 1767. (2, 451.) In that Letter he thus characterises Lord Chatham: “Without any uncommon depravity of mind, a man so trusted might lose all ideas of public principle or gratitude, and not unreasonably exert himself to perpetuate a power, which he saw his fellow-citi-

zens weak and abject enough to surrender to him. But if, instead of a man of a common mixed character, whose vices might be redeemed by some appearance of virtue and generosity, it should have unfortunately happened that a nation had placed all their confidence in a man purely and perfectly bad; if a great and good prince, by some fatal delusion, had made choice of such a man for his first Minister, and had delegated all his authority to him, what security would that nation have for its freedom, or that prince for his crown? The history of every nation that once had a claim to liberty, will tell us what would be the progress of such a traitor, and what the probable event of his crimes." [the Earl of Chatham.] "Let us suppose him arrived at that moment, at which he might see himself within reach of the great object, to which all the artifices, the intrigues, the hypocrisy, and the impudence of his past life were directed. On the point of having the whole power of the crown committed to him, what would be his conduct? An affectation of prostrate humility in the closet, but a lordly dictation of terms to the people, by whose interest he had been supported, by whose fortunes he had subsisted. Has he a brother? That brother must be sacrificed," [Lord Temple, brother-in-law of Lord Chatham.] "Has he a rancorous enemy? That enemy must be promoted," [the Duke of Bedford.] "Have years of his life been spent in declaiming against the pernicious influence of a favourite? That favourite must be taken to his bosom, and made the only partner of his power," [Lord Bute.] "But it is in the natural course of things that a despotic power, which of itself violates every principle of a free constitution, should be acquired by means, which equally violate every principle of honour and morality. The office of a grand Vizir is



inconsistent with a limited monarchy, and can never subsist long but by its destruction. The same measures, by which an abandoned profligate is advanced to power, must be observed to maintain him in it. The principal nobility, who might disdain to submit to the upstart insolence of a dictator, must be removed from every post of honour and authority; all public employments must be filled with a despicable set of creatures, who having neither experience nor capacity, nor any weight or respect in their own persons, will necessarily derive all their little busy importance from him." etc. etc. The Editor of Woodfall's Junius here makes the following remarks: — "This severe invective is aimed against the late Lord Chatham, formerly the Rt. Hon. Wm. Pitt. The reader, by a perusal of the preceding Letter, is already acquainted with the utter aversion which Junius felt for this nobleman on various political accounts, and especially on the subject of the American dispute. His aversion, however, softened as their political views approximated, and was at length converted into approbation and eulogy. See for a further explanation the *Note to Misc. Letter No. 12. V. 3. p. 4.*" The passage in Junius's *Miscellaneous Letter* here cited is this: — "Why the Earl of Chatham should continue to hold an employment of this importance, while he is unable to perform the duties of it, is at least a curious question. But it is infinitely more material to enquire why the interregnum is not committed to people of a higher rank and character." The following Note is subjoined: — "We have here another proof of the hostility of Junius at one period to this nobleman, a previous proof having already occurred in the *Misc. Letter No. 1. V. 2. p. 451.* to the *Note* appended to which we refer the reader. In the *Private Letter No. 23.* dated Oct. 19, 1770. (1,213.) he still insinu-

ates his dislike; for in requesting the printer of the *Public Advertiser* to contradict his being the author of the Letters subscribed *A Whig and an Englishman*, he adds, 'I neither admire the writer nor his *idol*.' Who the Writer of these Letters was, we know not; but the *idol* was certainly Lord Chatham. In reality it was not till about the date of Letter LIV. (August 31, 1771.) under his favourite signature of *Junius*, that he began to think commendably of this Nobleman, 2, §10. :— 'It seems I am ' a partisan of the great leader of the Opposition. If ' the charge had been a reproach, it should have been ' better supported. I did not intend to make a ' public declaration of the respect I bear Lord Chatham. I well knew what unworthy conclusions ' would be drawn from it. But I am called upon to ' deliver my opinion, and *surely it is not in the little ' censure of Mr. Horne to deter me from doing signal ' justice to a man, who, I confess, has grown upon ' my esteem*. As for the common, sordid views of ' avarice, or any purpose of vulgar ambition, I question whether the applause of Junius would be of ' service to Lord Chatham. *My vote will hardly ' recommend him to an increase of his pension, or to ' a seat in the cabinet. But, if his ambition be ' upon a level with his understanding; if he judges ' of what is truly honourable for himself, with the ' same superior genius which animates and directs ' him to eloquence in debate, to wisdom in decision, ' even the pen of Junius shall contribute to reward ' him. Recorded honours shall gather round his ' monument, and thicken over him. It is a solid ' fabric, and will support the laurels that adorn it. ' I am not conversant in the language of panegyric : ' these praises are extorted from me, but they will ' wear well; for they have been dearly earned.'*"

Among the earlier papers of Junius are several

passages, which animadvert bitterly on Lord Chatham. The second Letter of *Poplicola*, dated May 28, 1767. (2. 458.) runs thus:—“Your correspondent C. D. (W. D.) professes to undeceive the public with respect to some reflections thrown out upon the Earl of Chatham in Mr. Wilkes’s Letter to the Duke of Grafton. Without undertaking the defence of that gentleman’s conduct or character, permit me to observe that he was the instrument, and a useful one to the party, therefore should not have been sacrificed by it. He served them perhaps with too much zeal; but such is the reward which the tools of faction usually receive, and in some measure deserve, when they are imprudent enough to hazard every thing in support of other men’s ambition. I cannot admit that, because Mr. Pitt was respected and honoured a few years ago, the Earl of Chatham therefore deserves to be so now; or that a description, which might have suited him at one part of his life, must of necessity be the only one applicable to him at another. It is barely possible that a very honest commoner may become a very corrupt and worthless peer; and I am inclined to suspect that Mr. C. D. (W. D.) will find but few people credulous enough to believe that either Mr. Pitt or Mr. Pulteney, when they accepted of a title, did not, by that action, betray their friends, their country, and, in every honourable sense, themselves. Mr. C. D. (W. D.) wilfully misrepresents the cause of that censure, which was very justly thrown upon Lord Chatham, when the exportation of corn was prohibited by proclamation. The measure itself was necessary, and the more necessary from the scandalous delay of the Ministry in calling the Parliament together; but to maintain that the proclamation was legal, and that there was a suspending power lodged in the Crown, was such

an outrage to the common sense of mankind, and such a daring attack upon the Constitution, as a free people ought never to forgive. The man, who maintained those doctrines, ought to have had the Tarpeian rock or a gibbet for his reward. Another gentleman, upon that occasion, had spirit and patriotism enough to declare, even in a respectable assembly, that, when he advised the proclamation, he did it with the strongest conviction of its being illegal; but he rested his defence upon the unavoidable necessity of the case, and submitted himself to the judgment of his country. This noble conduct deserved the applause and gratitude of the nation, while that of the Earl of Chatham, and his miserable understrappers, deserved nothing but detestation and contempt."

In another Letter signed *Anti-Sejanus Jun.* and dated June 24, 1767. (2, 465.) Junius says:—"It is worth while to consider, though perhaps not safe to point out, by what arts it hath been possible for him, (the Earl of Bute,) to maintain himself so long in power, and to skreen himself from national justice. Some of them have been obvious enough; the rest may without difficulty be guessed at. But whatever they are, it is not above a twelvemonth ago, since they might have all been defeated, and the venomous spider itself caught and trampled on in its own webs. It was then his good fortune to corrupt one man, from whom we least of all expected so base an apostasy, (the Earl of Chatham.) Who indeed could have suspected that it should ever consist with the spirit or understanding of that person, to accept of a share of power under a pernicious court-minion, whom he himself had affected to detest or despise, as much as he knew he was detested and despised by the whole nation? I will not censure him for the avarice of a pension, nor

the melancholy ambition of a title. These were objects, which he perhaps looked up to, though the rest of the world thought them far beneath his acceptance. But, to become the stalking-horse of a stallion, to shake hands with a Scotchman at the hazard of catching all his infamy, to fight under his auspices against the Constitution, and to receive the word from him, prerogative and a thistle, (by the once respected name of Pitt!) it is even below contempt. But it seems that this unhappy country had long enough been distracted by their divisions, and in the last instance was to be oppressed by their union. May that union, honourable as it is, subsist for ever! May they continue to smell at one thistle, and not be separated even in death!"

In another Letter, signed *Correggio*, and dated Sept. 16, 1767. (2, 473.) Junius says:—" You may give us a Commander-in-chief, (the Marquis of Granby,) and a Secretary at War, (Lord Barrington,) seeming to pull at two ends of a rope, while a slip-knot in the middle may really strangle three-fourths of the army; or a lunatic brandishing a crutch, (Lord Chatham,) or bawling through a grate, or writing with desperate charcoal a Letter to North America."

In another Letter without a signature and dated Dec. 19, 1767. (2, 512.) Junius writes thus:—" I will not suppose that the bulk of the British people is sunk into so criminal a state of stupidity; that there does exist a particular set of men, base and treacherous enough to have enlisted under the banners of a lunatic, (Lord Chatham,) to whom they sacrificed their honour, their conscience, and their country, in order to carry a point of party, and to gratify a personal rancour, is a truth too melancholy and too certain for Great Britain. These were the wretched Ministers, who served at the altar, whilst

the high priest himself, with more than frantic fury, offered up his bleeding country a victim to America.”

In another Letter of Junius, signed *Downright*, and dated Dec. 22, 1767. (2, 517.) we read:—“Your correspondent of yesterday, Mr. Macaroni, in his account of the new ministerial arrangements, has thrust in a laboured bombast panegyric on the Earl of Chatham, in which he tells us ‘that this country owes more to him than it can ever repay.’ Now, Mr. Woodfall, I entirely agree with Mr. Macaroni, that this country *does* owe more to Lord Chatham than it can ever repay; for to *him* we OWE the greatest part of our national debt; and THAT I am sure we never can repay. I mean no offence to Mr. Macaroni, nor any of your *gentlemen* authors, who are so kind as to give *us* citizens an *early* peep behind the political curtain, but I cannot bear to see so *much* incense offered to an idol, who so *little* deserves it.” The editor here presents us with the following note:—“See the conclusion of *Misc. Letter* No. 4. V. 2. p. 469. (dated St. James’s Coffee-house, Aug. 25, 1767. ‘And is it by such a prop that ‘Grafton thinks to stand, after throwing down his ‘idol Pitt, at whose false altar he had before sacrificed his friends?’) and *Private Letter* No. 23. V. 1. p. 213. (already cited,) in which the same term is applied to Lord Chatham.”

In another Letter of Junius dated Aug. 29, 1768. and signed *Lucius*, (3, 105.) we have these words;—“I think I have now named all the Cabinet, but the Earl of Chatham. His infirmities have forced him into a retirement, where I presume he is ready to suffer, with a sullen submission, every insult and disgrace, that can be heaped upon a miserable, decrepid, worn out old man. But it is impossible he should be so far active in his own dishonour, as to advise the taking away an employment, given as a

reward for the first military success, that distinguished his entrance into Administration. He is indeed a compound of contradictions; but his Letter to Sir Jeffery Amherst stands upon record, and is not to be explained away. You know, my Lord, that Mr. Pitt therein assured Sir Jeffery Amherst, that the Government of Virginia was given him merely as a reward, and solemnly pledged the royal faith that his residence should never be required. Lost as he is, he would not dare to contradict this Letter. If he did, it would be something more than madness. The disorder must have quitted his head, and fixed itself in his heart."

In another Letter of Junius dated Oct. 19, 1768. and signed *Atticus*, (3, 173.) we have these words: — "The life of this young man, (the Earl of Shelburne,) is a satire on mankind. The treachery, which deserts a friend, might be a virtue compared to the fawning baseness, which attaches itself to a declared enemy. Lord Chatham became his idol, introduced him into the most difficult department of the State, and left him there to shift for himself. It was a masterpiece of revenge." "The Earl of Chatham — I had much to say, but it were inhuman to persecute, when Providence has marked out the example to mankind!" Here the editor observes: — "Lord Chatham was at this time so severely tortured and worn away by the gout, that it was supposed he never would be able to resume an active part in politics. His Lordship had resigned his post of Lord Privy Seal three days previous to the date of this Letter, and was succeeded in that office on Nov. 2, following by the Earl of Bristol."

In another Letter dated Oct. 16, 1771. signed *Junius*, and addressed to Mr. Wilkes, (1,320) we read: — "Nothing can be more true than what you say about *great men*. They are indeed a worthless,

pitiful race. Chatham has gallantly thrown away the scabbard, and never flinched. From that moment I began to like him."

In another Letter of Junius dated Sept. 7, 1771. signed *Junius*, and addressed to Mr. Wilkes, (1, 287.) we have these words:—" Lord Chatham's project, for instance, of increasing the number of Knights of Shires, appears to me admirable, and the moment we have obtained a triennial Parliament, it ought to be tried." (1, 290.) " Besides that I approve highly of Lord Chatham's idea of infusing ' a portion of new health into the Constitution, to ' enable it to bear its infirmities,' (a brilliant expression, and full of intrinsic wisdom,) other reasons concur in persuading me to adopt it. I have no objection to paying him such compliments as carry a condition with them, and either bind him firmly to the cause, or become the bitterest reproach to him, if he deserts it. Of this last I have not the most distant suspicion. There is another man indeed, with whose conduct I am not so completely satisfied. Yet even *he*, I think, has not resolution enough to do anything flagrantly impudent in the face of his country. At the same time that I think it good policy to pay those compliments to Lord Chatham, which, in truth, he has nobly deserved, I should be glad to mortify those contemptible creatures who call themselves noblemen."

These appear to be all or the principal passages in the Letters of Junius, which censure or applaud the conduct and the character of Lord Chatham. Some of them are quoted by Mr. Coventry, and accompanied by the following remarks:—" I have stated in the Preface that it was not my intention to enter into the claims of others. They have all been ably refuted, excepting the last candidate, Sir Philip Francis, whose claims have only been noticed by



the *Edinburgh Reviewers*," [and in Mr. Charles Butler's *Reminiscences*.] "Those learned Critics have not gone systematically into the question, but have been guided by the ingenuity of the volume laid before them. As they have not come to any satisfactory conclusion, I shall merely state a few facts here, which will at once shew that it is idle for a moment to suppose that Sir Philip had any claim whatever to the authorship of the Letters, more than Mr. D'Oyley, or any other person whom Junius may have casually mentioned. Sir Philip Francis was patronised and encouraged by the Earl of Chatham, and it was through his patronage that Sir Philip became Secretary to General Bligh. By the same recommendation he was afterwards appointed Secretary to the Earl of Kinnoul, Ambassador to Lisbon. Let us hear the opinion which Junius entertained of the Earl of Chatham." [Mr. C. then cites passages from V. 1, p. 213. 2, 452. 510. 515. 3, 108. 174. and proceeds.] "These extracts are sufficient to shew that Sir Philip Francis and Junius were two distinct persons. Could Sir Philip Francis have made use of such language against the very man, who had brought him forward in the world? It is contrary to reason and common sense. The writer in the *Edinburgh Review* for Nov. 1817, has blended Sir Philip Francis with the speeches of the Earl of Chatham, which have nothing whatever to do with the question, any further than that Junius may have borrowed some of his ideas from Lord Chatham's eloquence, as he evidently did from other distinguished characters. The line of politics pursued by Junius and the Earl of Chatham, was totally different on American Taxation, which of itself shews there was no connexion between them. Sir Philip Francis, on the contrary, was an enthusiastic admirer of the Earl of

Chatham. On the decease of that nobleman he passed a high eulogium on his character, and observed that he had left no one behind him that bore any resemblance to him. Sir Philip had just cause for this opinion, having been raised to the station he then held in society through that nobleman's interest. Junius had cause for his invective against the Earl of Chatham. The prominent part, which he (when Mr. Pitt,) took against Lord George Sackville, after the unfortunate affair at Minden, would naturally sour him against that distinguished Statesman, however highly he might admire his *abilities*. Junius admired the *abilities* of Lord Mansfield, but he detested the *man*." As great importance is attached to this part of the question by Mr. Taylor and the Edinburgh Reviewer, it is proper to enter into a minute and careful examination of it. Where the investigation of truth is concerned, prolixity is often unavoidable, and as often commendable.

While I fully agree with Mr. Coventry in his inference that "it is contrary to reason and common sense" to suppose "that Sir Philip could have made use of such language against the very man, who had brought him forward in the world," I must censure him for his unfairness in stating only a part of the case. 1. He omits the mention of the high panegyric passed by Junius on the same Lord Chatham, and of course does not reconcile the apparent contradiction; for the censure would seem to be balanced by the commendation, more particularly as the latter flowed from the pen of Junius at a later period of his authorship. 2. He omits all mention of the Notes in Woodfall's edition of Junius, which I have cited above, where the apparent contradiction is most satisfactorily and unanswerably explained. 3. He unwarrantably assigns to Junius a private motive for the invectives against Lord Chatham,

when the note referred to clearly proves that the dislike, which Junius in the early part of his authorship had to Lord Chatham, originated in the difference of political feelings and objects, as the subsequent attachment to him is to be traced to an approximation in their political opinions. 4. The inference then, which Mr. C. draws from the supposed private animosity of Junius to Lord Chatham in favour of Lord George Sackville, falls to the ground; in the words of Cowper,

“ Such reasoning falls like an inverted cone,  
“ Wanting its proper base to stand upon.”

5. He represents Sir Philip Francis to have been “ an enthusiastic admirer” of Lord Chatham without admitting the fact that Sir Philip in his own words “ admired him as a great, illustrious, *faulty* human being.”

Having then discussed what Mr. Coventry has said on this subject, let us now advert to Mr. Taylor, and we shall find equal reason to be dissatisfied with his treatment of the question, however we may be disposed to praise the ingenuity of his work. Mr. T. p. 94. writes thus:—“ On Jan. 29, 1770. the resignation of the Duke of Grafton took place, and Lord North was made prime Minister; but this was not the turn, which Junius expected. He again persecutes the Administration with as much vigour as before, though in consequence of the changes that had occurred, it appears that he had greater fears than ever for his own safety. Yet once more his spirits revive, and he conceives it possible that his wishes may be accomplished. On March 17th, after desiring Woodfall to do whatever he thinks best, to give publicity to the Letter he should send on the following day, he adds, ‘ *Now is the crisis,*’ (1,\* 207.) The Letter he alludes to was written

in vindication of the Remonstrance of the City of London, and was designed to encourage the intended Remonstrance of the City of Westminster. When this Letter was sent to Woodfall, the writer's hopes were at the highest point of elevation. He had heard that Lord Chatham meant to support the Remonstrance, and under that impression having at once laid aside his wonted caution, and all the prejudices he had entertained against that nobleman, he directly avows himself to be of his party. His Note to Woodfall is as follows:— ‘ Sunday, ‘ March 18, 1770. This Letter is written wide, ‘ and I suppose will not fill two columns. *For God's sake let it appear to-morrow.* I hope you received ‘ my Note of yesterday. *Lord Chatham is determined to go to the Hall to support the Westminster Remonstrance. I have no doubt that we shall conquer them at last.*’ (1, 210.) But he was again disappointed. The Ministry kept their places in consequence of the King's determination in their favour. From this time he appears to have given up all serious thoughts of being able to displace them; and with the motive he dropped the *name* of Junius.” [The final Letter signed *Junius*, is addressed to Lord Camden through *the Public Advertiser* without date, but following the one addressed to Lord Mansfield, Jan. 21, 1772. This statement, then, is very erroneous.] “ His opinion of Lord Chatham seems to have often fluctuated. In his next Note to Woodfall he says, ‘ I neither admire the writer (of the *Whig*,) nor his idol,’ (Lord Chatham, (1,\* 210.) The fact, however, is easily explained: Lord Chatham, in this Paper, the *Whig*, was ‘ panegyricized in very warm terms’ for his conduct with regard to the taxation of America. This, it is well known, was a subject on which Junius always differed from him. As an admirer

of Mr. George Grenville in the part he took on that occasion, it was impossible that Junius could approve of Lord Chatham's conduct: yet this was the only subject, whereon he latterly dissented from him; for about 10 months after this time he says to Mr. Horne, 'I did not intend——dearly earned,' 2, 310." [The entire passage has been cited above.] "Still he declares 'he listens without the smallest degree of conviction or assent, when Lord Chatham affirms that the authority of the British Legislature is not supreme over the Colonies, in the same sense in which it is supreme over Great Britain,' (2, 350.)

"Let us turn now to Sir Philip Francis, and see what was his opinion of Lord Chatham. We need not look far, nor trouble ourselves with a long inference. It is recorded on more than one occasion, and in terms so express as to leave no doubt of its exact agreement with that of Junius. 'In the early part of my life,' says Sir Philip, 'I had the good fortune to hold a place very inconsiderable in itself, but immediately under the late Earl of Chatham. He descended from his station to take notice of mine; and he honoured me with repeated marks of his favour and protection. How warmly, in return, I was attached to his person, and how I have been grateful to his memory, they, who know me, know. *I admired him as a great, illustrious, FAULTY human being, whose character, like all the noblest works of human composition, should be determined by its EXCELLENCIES, not by its defects.* I should not have mentioned these circumstances, though I confess I am proud of them, if they did not lead me naturally to the subject immediately in question. In the year 1760. Mr. Secretary Pitt recommended it to the late King to send the present Earl of Kinnoul, Am-

‘bassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the  
 ‘Court of Lisbon. The same recommendation en-  
 ‘gaged the Noble Lord to appoint me his Secre-  
 ‘tary.’ (Mr. Francis’s Speech, Febr. 12, 1787.)  
 In a subsequent Speech Sir Philip again mentions  
 Lord Chatham as ‘*a person, whose name he should*  
 ‘*never recollect without admiration and reverence.*’  
 (May 24, 1791.) When the late Mr. Pitt, by his  
 India-Bill, proposed to take the Trial by Jury out  
 of the Indian system of judicature, Mr. Francis  
 spoke as follows: — ‘If a British House of Com-  
 ‘mons can on any terms consent, in any instance,  
 ‘to abolish a Trial by Jury, and if the people at  
 ‘large are insensible of the danger of such a prece-  
 ‘dent, individuals, who have done their duty, must  
 ‘submit to their share in the mischief, which they  
 ‘could not prevent. I fear the temper and the cha-  
 ‘racter of the nation are changed. Though I am  
 ‘not an old man, I can remember the time, when  
 ‘an attempt of this nature would have thrown the  
 ‘whole kingdom into a flame. Had it been made,  
 ‘when a great man, (the late Earl of Chatham,)  
 ‘who is now no more, had a seat in this House, he  
 ‘would have started from the bed of sickness, he  
 ‘would have solicited some friendly hand to deposit  
 ‘him on this floor, and from this station with a mo-  
 ‘narch’s voice would have called the kingdom to  
 ‘arms to oppose it. But he is dead, and has left  
 ‘nothing in this world that resembles him. He is  
 ‘dead; and the sense, and honour, and character,  
 ‘and understanding of the nation are dead with him.’  
 (Mr. Francis’s Speech, Parliamentary Debates 16,  
 228.) This brilliant eulogium on one of the noblest  
 of men, is in a style worthy of the subject, — ‘the  
 highest style of Junius,’ — and it is as like him in  
 sentiment as in style. Whether the qualified terms,  
 in which each bestowed his commendation, were

occasioned by both entertaining precisely the same views of his Lordship's character, though it is a matter of inferior consequence, may perhaps be ascertained by the following considerations. To have approved at the same time of Mr. George Grenville and Lord Chatham was impossible. The conduct of the latter, during the period he was last in office, was calculated to wound the feelings of all Mr. Grenville's friends. Not content with Lord Temple's consent to give up his brother, for the purpose of forming a new and comprehensive Administration, Lord Chatham is said to have required so many other sacrifices from that nobleman and his party, that he lost the most favourable opportunity of really benefitting his country. What added to this misconduct, as it was generally deemed, was the countenance he gave, by retaining place, to the Ministry of the Duke of Grafton. To this part of Lord Chatham's life Sir Philip probably adverts, when he affirms that his Lordship's character was in some respects *faulty*; and Junius, by the severity of his attack on his Lordship at this particular period, evinced that it excited his displeasure, (2, 467.) This cause, however, did not continue long. In the autumn of 1768. Lord Chatham resigned the office of Lord Privy Seal, having for many months been unable to execute its duties. The first act of his freedom from ministerial connexions was the effecting of a perfect reconciliation with Earl Temple, and Mr. George Grenville. It was not till the Sessions, which commenced in Jan. 1770. that he was able to attend Parliament. The speeches he then made, and the line of conduct he pursued, gave general satisfaction. When this alteration in his practice had been marked with the characters of a determined plan, and 'he had gallantly thrown away the scabbard,' (1,\* 321,) both Junius and Sir

Philip Francis, as one man, testify the almost unbounded respect they entertained for him. To condemn Lord Chatham's behaviour to Mr. George Grenville, was in effect to support the latter. But Junius took a decided part; and by the manner, in which he advocated Mr. Grenville's cause, he gave rise to a suspicion that he was biassed by interested motives." In p. 104. Mr. Taylor says:—"In 1765. the prospect was altered by the dismissal of Mr. Grenville from office, and by his refusing to take any place again. Under the new arrangement Sir Philip had no friend: his hopes would, therefore, be directed to another change: and whatever was calculated to give stability to the existing power, would be viewed by him with apprehension. This accounts for the attacks of Junius on Lord Chatham and Lord Camden. By lending their great influence to an Administration so confessedly weak, that it was impossible it could hold together by any inherent principle of its own, they were open to every censure, which attached to the Duke of Grafton's measures."

In p. 140. Mr. Taylor has these words:—"Sir Philip declares that he was in the House of Lords on the night (Jan. 9, 1770.) this speech was made, and that he heard Lord Chatham make use of the very words, which it contains. In this instance the identity is brought home. 'I HEARD IT from Lord 'Chatham,' says Sir Philip, that power without 'right is the most odious and detestable object that 'can be offered to the human imagination. It is at 'once *res detestabilis et caduca.*'" (*Essay on the Regency*, p. 223. in Mr. T.'s book.) "In the 'printed speech this passage is as follows:—'Power without right is the most odious and detestable 'object that can be offered to the imagination; it is 'not only pernicious to those who are subject to it,



‘ but tends to its own destruction. It is what my  
‘ noble friend Lord Lyttleton has truly described  
‘ it, *Res detestabilis et caduca*. The motto in the  
same Essay presents us with another quotation from  
Lord Chatham’s Speech: — ‘ There is one ambition  
‘ at least, which I will not renounce but with my  
‘ life. It is the ambition of delivering to my poste-  
‘ rity those rights of freedom, which I have received  
‘ from my ancestors.’ *Earl of Chatham, Jan. 9,*  
1770. In this quotation the words, *which I ever*  
*will acknowledge*, should have been inserted after  
*least*. By the alteration, as in the former example,  
Sir Philip again proves his uncontrollable property  
in the printed Speech. But what does he say be-  
sides? ‘ After the noble speaker of these words,  
no man has so good a right to make use of them as  
I have.’ Perhaps it was not intended, but according  
to our present argument, there is a truth in this as-  
sertion beyond what strikes the eye; for, if his Lord-  
ship uttered the words, Sir Philip, who had given  
them to the public, had *a better title* to them than  
any other man *except his Lordship*. He further  
observes:—‘ They express a principle, on which I  
have acted, and I resort to them as my own.’ He  
has always been a firm friend to liberty; but why  
he should resort to these expressions as *his own*, and  
with a *right*, which no *other man* but the *speaker* is  
warranted to assume, is under any other supposition  
than the above, incomprehensible. Another quo-  
tation from the same Speech occurs at the beginning  
of Sir Philip’s Pamphlet on Paper Currency:—  
‘ It was said by Wm. Earl of Chatham 40 years ago,  
‘ or somebody has recorded it for him, that it was  
‘ a maxim he had observed through life, when he had  
‘ lost his way, to stop short, lest, by proceeding  
‘ without knowledge, and advancing from one false  
‘ step to another, he should wind himself into an

‘ inextricable labyrinth, and never be able to recover the right road.’ ”

In p. 145. Mr. Taylor writes thus : — “ Sir Philip avows his title to this latter speech (of Lord Chatham, Jan. 22, 1770.) He *not only quotes it, but was present at its delivery.* In his pamphlet on Paper Currency are these remarkable words : ‘ Let the war take its course, or, as *I heard* Lord Chatham declare in the House of Lords, with a monarch’s voice, LET DISCORD PREVAIL FOR EVER.’ The speech says : ‘ If the breach in the Constitution be effectually repaired, the people will of themselves return to a state of tranquillity ; if not, MAY DISCORD PREVAIL FOR EVER.’ (Almon’s *Anecdotes of Lord Chatham*, 2, 119.) The sentence is in both cases printed in small capitals, as an acknowledgment of its peculiar emphasis. It should also be observed that, frequent as are these quotations from the speeches in question, I know of no other instances, wherein Sir Philip has alluded to or transcribed any expressions made use of by Lord Chatham in other printed speeches.”

In p. 205. Mr. Taylor cites from a speech of Sir Philip Francis, April 11, 1796. these words : — “ With all these transactions in my view, I declare now, on the principles and in the language of Lord Chatham, that I rejoice that America resisted.”

Again, in p. 208. Mr. Taylor says : — “ An admirer of Lord Chatham, and in principle a thorough anti-Gallican, Junius would acknowledge every opinion contained in the following extract from one of Sir Philip’s speeches, (Febr. 12, 1787.) : — ‘ It has been the deliberate policy, not the passion, of England, in all times but those of the House of Stuart, to prefer the friendship of any distant nation to that of France. But now, it seems, we are arrived at a new enlightened era of affection for our

‘ neighbours, and of liberality to our enemies,  
 ‘ of which our uninstructed ancestors had no con-  
 ‘ ception. The pomp of modern eloquence is em-  
 ‘ ployed to blast even the triumphs of Lord Chat-  
 ‘ ham’s Administration. The polemic laurels of the  
 ‘ father must yield to the pacific myrtles, which  
 ‘ shadow the forehead of the son. Sir, the first and  
 ‘ most prominent feature, in the political character  
 ‘ of Lord Chatham, was anti-Gallican. His glory is  
 ‘ founded on the resistance he made to the united  
 ‘ power of the House of Bourbon. The present  
 ‘ Minister has taken the opposite road to fame; and  
 ‘ France, the object of every hostile principle in the  
 ‘ policy of Lord Chatham, is the *gens amicissima* of  
 ‘ his son.’”

Again, p. 356. : — “ Though neither Junius nor Sir Philip Francis were at that time members of Parliament, yet they attended the debates in both Houses; both were in the House of Lords at the same time, on two particular occasions; both were accustomed to take notes and report speeches, especially those of Lord Chatham; and two of the latter by Sir Philip, and one of Burke’s by Junius, were sent in a perfect state to Almon for publication. Junius makes reference in his *Private Letters* to portions of Lord Chatham’s speeches then unpublished, though afterwards reported by Sir Philip Francis; and the latter to this day sometimes quotes from other speeches of the same nobleman, of which there exists at present no printed record. See the *Letter Missive to Lord Holland*, where the following passage occurs: — ‘ In the sonorous language of  
 ‘ Lord Chatham,

‘ Whose voice divine still vibrates on my ear,  
 ‘ to chain Britain, like Prometheus, to a rock, while a  
 ‘ vulture, by settlement without wings, gnawed her to  
 ‘ the heart, and devoured her vitals.’”

(1.) The reader must pardon the prolixity of quotation, because by the juxta-position alone of all the passages cited from Junius and from Sir Philip Francis about Lord Chatham, can we arrive at a right conclusion. (2.) Mr. Taylor by quoting only the passage from Junius, where he slightly censures Lord Chatham, by omitting those numerous passages, where he attacks him in the most severe language, and by citing a long passage, which contains an elaborate and warm panegyric of the same nobleman, seduces his unwary readers, (and among them the Edinburgh Reviewer,) into the adoption of his opinions, which they could not adopt, if the case were fairly represented to them. (3.) Mr. T. infers the identity of Sir Philip with Junius, because Sir Philip had reported speeches of Lord Chatham, which were used by Junius, although they were not in print at the time, and because Sir Philip, to the day of his death, continued to quote from unprinted speeches of Lord Chatham. But surely, looking to the situation which Sir Philip held under Lord Chatham, — looking to the patronage and friendship which he experienced from him, — looking to the high admiration of his talents, and the deep veneration of his character, and the great fondness for the energetic language of Lord Chatham, which Sir Philip has avowed in his writings, we need not wonder that Sir Philip should have taken notes of his Lordship's speeches for his own use, or have reported them for the benefit of the public. Had he taken notes and reported the whole of them, there would have been nothing so extraordinary in the fact; there is no evidence to prove that Sir Philip did not take notes of many other speeches of Lord Chatham; Mr. Taylor himself, p. 357. seems inclined to believe that he did: — “If Sir Philip is in possession of any reports of Lord Chatham's


speeches not yet in print, it is to be hoped that he will not withhold them much longer from the world. Perhaps he may be able to supply the debates on the 5th and 13th of Febr. 1771, respecting Falkland's Island, which Junius was so desirous (p. 128.) to hear, and of which Almon says, it is not known that any notes were taken." In these circumstances Mr. Taylor, p. 146. pushes his argument too far: — "At present we have to attend to the *circumstantial* details connected with this stage of our enquiry; and these, let us remember, consist of the important facts, that in conformity with the practice of Junius, Sir Philip Francis took notes of two of Lord Chatham's speeches, which he subsequently reported; that the speeches so reported by Sir Philip, were made at the opening of that particular Session, in which Junius anticipated the discomfiture of the Ministerial party; that they were delivered at the very time, when he expected things would *take the turn*, from which Woodfall should *know him by his works*; that then the *crisis* was approaching, at which with *the assistance of Lord Chatham*, he had no doubt he should *conquer them at last*: all which expressions plainly shew that he felt the utmost interest in the success of those debates, and lead us to expect that, if any speeches were deemed worthy of being preserved by Junius, it would be those, for which we are indebted to Sir Philip Francis." If the probability or the certainty is that Sir Philip reported other speeches of Lord Chatham besides the two here referred to, then the argument of Mr. Taylor, drawn from the report of these two in particular as connected with Junius, loses half its force. What evidence can Mr. T. produce against the notion, or what improbability is there in the supposition, that Sir Philip Francis was hired by Junius to report

these two speeches? Nothing can be more likely than for Junius to have employed Sir Philip for the purpose, if he were his amanuensis, and Mr. T.'s own statement is not inconsistent with the idea of Sir Philip having been the amanuensis of Junius.

4. Mr. Taylor himself has proved that Junius reported a speech of Burke, and frequently attended the debates and occasionally availed himself of the ideas and the language of the principal speakers for his own purposes. But Junius, intent more on the matter than on the expressions of Lord Chatham, does not betray the same partiality for his diction, which Sir Philip Francis manifests on all occasions; though it is true that Junius on one occasion does mention 'a brilliant expression' of Lord Chatham, but adding immediately, 'and full of intrinsic wisdom,' (1, 290). I deem this a fair argument, though not entitled to much weight, against the claims of Sir Philip to the authorship of Junius.

(5.) If the reader will leisurely examine the quotations about Lord Chatham, made by Mr. Taylor from the speeches and the writings of Sir Philip and transcribed above, he will see in them alone a sufficient reason for rejecting those claims. The evidence is internal, and therefore most unsuspecting; the evidence supplied by one quotation, is confirmed by the other quotations, while each quotation is sufficient for our purpose; not dependent links in a chain, but pillars standing on their own base. The passages, one and all, mark the affection, esteem, respect, and veneration uniformly entertained by Sir Philip for the person of Lord Chatham, while they attest his particular fondness for the nervous language of this second Demosthenes. And how are these passages at all consistent with the violent and libellous language used by Junius in 1767 and 1768, about Lord Chatham betraying

personal hatred founded on political aversions, and subsequently exchanged for the loftiest language of panegyric, evincing personal liking founded on political sympathies? In order to identify Sir Philip with Junius from the sentiments avowed by each about Lord Chatham, Mr. Taylor is required to prove that Sir Philip *ever at any period of his whole life* sympathised with Junius in personal hatred and political hostility, or even in the smallest degree of personal and political aversion, to Lord Chatham; if he cannot produce such a proof, then I maintain that he ought to abandon his opinion as quite untenable from this consideration alone. Had Junius felt and avowed on every occasion throughout his political career, an ardent attachment to the person and the highest respect for the talents and the character of Lord Chatham, and a particular delight in adopting his sentiments and applying his language, as we know to have been the case in regard to Sir Philip Francis, then I hesitate not to declare that there would have been such a proof of identity between these two patriots, as would have been most satisfactory and perhaps conclusive on the question. Junius's early aversion to Lord Chatham was political, and his late attachment to him was political only, whereas Sir Philip never had ANY political aversion to him and ALWAYS felt, professed, and manifested a steady personal attachment to him. Mr. Taylor pleasantly endeavours to identify the early political aversion of Junius to Lord Chatham with 'the faultiness' of his character as set forth by Sir Philip Francis 20 years afterwards, (Speech Febr. 12, 1787). But is it quite certain that Sir Philip referred to the erroneous policy of Lord Chatham's Administration in any respects, and not to moral qualities only? Is there no difference between Junius denouncing in the bitterest terms the



political conduct and arraigning in the most unqualified manner the private character of Lord Chatham, and Sir Philip intimating in the most temperate and respectful, but energetic and feeling language his dissatisfaction at some part of Lord Chatham's private or political character? Junius represents Lord Chatham to have been a public criminal and a political apostate, and Sir Philip merely describes him as "a great, illustrious, faulty human being;" and therefore Junius and Sir Philip were unquestionably two distinct persons. (6.) Sir Philip is, in his public character, allowed by all impartial men to have been a man of the most unblemished moral integrity and of the purest political principles. Now to suppose him to have been the author of Junius, is in fact to proclaim him a villain of no vulgar cast; for he must be henceforth regarded by us as a base ingrate to his great benefactor, patron, and friend, the Earl of Chatham, without any assigned or assignable cause — It is to proclaim Sir Philip a hypocrite of the blackest dye, professing in his Parliamentary speeches and avowed productions to have ever felt the strongest attachment to the person and the highest veneration for the character of Lord Chatham, when he had in truth commenced his literary and political career by a series of virulent and anonymous libels on him — It is to proclaim Sir Philip to have been an idiot of the grossest stupidity; for it would make him, though a mere Clerk in the War-Office, risk his official situation and even personal existence by calumniating the Ministry, whose servant he was, and without any apparent motive of private pique; for he was not expelled from the War-Office till 1772, and Junius began to write in 1767. long before Lord Barrington had given any provocation to him — It is to proclaim Sir Philip to have acted on principles



contrary to the ordinary principles of human nature; for men do not desert and libel their benefactor, patron, and friend, nor do they act in direct opposition to their own private interests, without some powerful motive, which has not been shewn in the case of Sir Philip Francis, at the date of the *earliest* known production of Junius, viz. April 28, 1767.

Other arguments on this branch of the question will occupy a second Letter.

*Thetford, Oct. 17, 1826.*

THE CLAIMS  
OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS

TO THE  
AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS DISPROVED,  
*In a Letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Martin Davy,  
M. D. Master of Caius College, Cambridge.*

---

*Dear Sir,*

I. The interest which you take in the question about Junius, and the respect which I feel for your knowledge and learning, judgment and taste, political principles, public conduct, academical usefulness, and moral integrity, are sufficient motives to induce me to address myself to you on the present occasion.

II. Sir Philip Francis was 27 years of age, when he first entered the War-Office. Like General Lee, he had been a good deal on the Continent, and on the supposition that either of them was concerned in *Junius*, one might expect to find very correct and frequent allusions to foreign countries. Does Junius abound with such allusions?

Sir Philip, it should seem, had written nothing before he entered the War-Office — not one of his avowed publications bears a date prior to the first acknowledged composition of Junius. The evidence, then, in favour of Sir Philip, apparently strong in other points, totally fails here. But, had Sir Philip

published any paper in the style of Junius, and prior to the appearance of Junius, it would have been a powerful argument for Sir Philip's claim, in connection with the other testimony.

If he was employed as the amanuensis of Junius, or as the transcriber of his papers, the employment, continued for so long a period, would, by the mere force of imitation, give to him severe habits of thinking, close powers of reasoning, a great turn for sarcasm and invective, a facility of expression, a readiness at composition, a pointed and impassioned and polished style — his mind would gradually rise above the little world of official knowledge — borne on a bolder wing, he would take a loftier flight — he could not fail in his ascent to imbibe a portion of the æther, by which he was surrounded, and in approximating the sun to reflect some of the glory, by which he was irradiated — the expressions, the thoughts, and the sentiments of Junius would be familiarised to his mind — the mannerism of that original writer would be his object of imitation — he could propose to his aspiring ambition no nobler model of excellence — he could find within the recesses of his bosom no graver authority to direct and support his opinions — by that high altar he would vow eternal patriotism — to that great demi-god he would pay his secret adoration — inspired by his presence and protected by his arm, he would fearlessly pursue his career of usefulness and of fame, exulting in his strength, and rejoicing to be deemed by the sagacious an emanation of that divine intelligence, and careless of being mistaken by the vulgar for the intelligence itself.

On this principle, then, we can fairly account for the vigorous style and the powerful mind of Sir Philip without supposing him to be Junius. Many of Dr. Parr's pupils acquired a very flowing and

elegant style from the habit of assisting him as amanuenses, and no doubt their minds would be enlarged by the intellectual employment.

There can be no question that Sir Philip would derive great intellectual and literary advantages from being employed to report, or from voluntarily reporting Lord Chatham's speeches.

But it is not necessary to have recourse to the supposition that Sir Philip was the amanuensis of Junius; for he might by the frequent perusal of Junius's *Letters* as a model of composition, have gradually obtained all that energy of expression, that cogency of reasoning, and that power of sarcasm, for which Sir Philip was, long subsequently to the retirement of Junius, remarkable.

III. A writer in the habit of publishing pamphlets or books either with his name, or without it, though accompanied by intimations, which made the addition of the name unnecessary, either is not likely to have been the author of Junius, or would long ago have been discovered as the author, because every pamphlet or book would furnish an additional clue to a discovery in one way or other, and the author would feel conscious that the dangerous discovery might be made. Hence the great probability is that the real Junius was not an author by profession, was not in the habit of publishing any articles but what are now known to have emanated from his pen, and what were adapted to the purposes of Newspapers and Magazines, where he could continue to preserve his mysterious character. This argument militates against the claims of Burke, of Francis, and of others.

IV. "Junius," says Mr. Taylor p. 74. "was not so accustomed to give praise as to render an interference and a panegyric, like the present, a matter of no importance. The editor of Woodfall's edition

distinguishes the *Letter* to Lord Camden as possessing 'the peculiarity of being the *only* encomiastic *Letter*, that ever fell from his pen under the signature of *Junius*.' (l. p. 49. *Preliminary Essay*.)" But, though this is true, yet it should not be forgotten that the praise is bestowed in contrast with the censure of Lord Mansfield, and that the apparent object of the praise is to induce the former to make another 'noble stand' against the latter, and therefore the praise itself is a little liable to suspicion. Moreover, amid the praise Junius glances at Lord Camden's connection with the Duke of Grafton. Mr. Taylor has not shewn, nor attempted to shew, that Sir Philip Francis, if he were Junius, had any private reason for panegyrising Lord Camden. But it may be worth while to consider whether any of the other persons, marked out as the authors of Junius, had any particular connection with Lord Camden?

V. No man can have read Junius carefully without observing the high-mindedness and pride, which belong to his character. Such a writer would not be willing to impress his readers with a notion that he derived any considerable assistance from the pen of any living writer, or from the conversation of any living statesman. And in any speech delivered by the real Junius long after he ceased to write in that name, we should not expect to find him descend from this loftiness of spirit; and I therefore regard the following passage in Sir Philip Francis's speech, April 11, 1796. not as characteristic of the real Junius (with Mr. Taylor p. 202.) but as indicative of a *less* dignified mind: — "This part of the question is *not new to me*. What I know of it is derived not only from study and reflection, as deep as I am capable of giving to any subject, but from the wisdom of great men, whom I have known, and from experi-

ence of events, which have happened within my own time. Though too young to take part, *I was old enough to observe, and I had access to some of the greatest sources of instruction.* How far I may have been able to avail myself of these advantages, must be determined by others." Of the same character is the following passage in Sir Philip Francis's paper on the Regency-Question, dated Dec. 24, 1810. and quoted by Mr. Taylor p. 216:— "For myself I might perhaps claim something more from age, from experience, and long unblemished public service; but still more from the school I was bred in, and from the society of many eminent men, whom I have had the honour to live with, and the misfortune to survive."

VI. "In his 5th *Private Letter* to Woodfall July 21, 1769. (1, 174.) Junius says:— 'Whenever you have any thing to communicate to me, let the hint be thus, *C at the usual place*; and so direct to Mr. John Fretley, at the same Coffee-House, where it is absolutely impossible I should be known:' that is *himself personally*: for Fretley was a feigned name, which no one could know. It was *absolutely impossible* that Junius should be known at the New Exchange Coffee-House in the Strand, or at any other Coffee-House 'west of Temple-Bar.' (*Vide Private Letter*, No. 54.) How unfriendly this circumstance is to the supposition that any *public character* was the author, is too obvious to escape the consideration of the reader." Mr. Taylor p. 368.

I. I agree with Mr. Taylor that the great difficulty experienced by Junius in the conveyance and the return of his packets to and from Woodfall's Office, does militate strongly against the notion that the author of Junius was a *public character*, and therefore it strikes at the claims made for Burke,

Lord George Sackville, Horace Walpole, and others.

2. But, should it not have occurred to Mr. Taylor that Sir Philip Francis as a clerk in the War-Office was a demi-official personage, a *quasi-public character*, who could not be quite unknown to the military gentlemen, who would more or less frequent the Coffee-Houses named and resorted to by Junius, and that therefore Sir Philip is so far not likely to have been the author of Junius?

3. Lloyd was, however, a sufficiently obscure person to preserve his *incognito* in such circumstances.

VII. Serious objections have been raised against the claims made for many public characters as the authors of Junius. What, then, should we reasonably infer from the fact? Why, that the real author was *not* a public character.

A public character stands particularly exposed to general observation, and his public merits and private virtues are well understood by the enlightened community. Even the private transactions of his family are known, and he could not, during his leisure from the public service, be engaged for three or four years in correspondence with Woodfall without having furnished his friends or his dependents with many opportunities for detecting the fact and the object. What, then, is the fair inference? Why, that the *Letters* were not written by a public character.

Now of all the persons named as the authors of Junius, Lloyd is the least known, and thence arises some presumption in his favour.

But it may be said, What proof can you bring that Lloyd possessed a mind equal to the composition of the *Letters*? I reply that, though I may not be able to give this proof, yet I have not to cou-

tend against a contrary proof. There is no production of Lloyd tending to shew his inferiority to Junius, whereas we in the case of Ld. G. Sackville have evidence that he was too small-minded to be equal to the composition, and the same may be said of Boyd and Dyer.

VIII. "With peculiar happiness of adaptation, the present case applies even to circumstances, which with a strong degree of probability originally in their favour, have been raised into consequence by the frequent mention, which is made of them, and the general impression of their reality. First, Sir P. Francis is the only person *now living*, to whom the *Letters* of Junius have been attributed, and yet it is currently believed that whoever was the author, he is not yet dead. No papers have hitherto been produced, from the port-folio of any deceased author or politician, which could throw light on the subject. The original copies of the *Letters*, which appear to have been returned to the author as soon as they were done with, and which caused so many packets to be left for him at the different Coffee-Houses, are still probably in his own possession; for they have never again been heard of. No similar hand-writing has been laid before the public: nor have the two books, bound in vellum, fallen into other hands, as far as we know, than those of their first possessor; though the motive for having them so distinguished by the binding was, doubtless, that by their means, at some distant period, and probably after his death, the honour of having written the work should be reclaimed for the real author, in opposition to pretensions made on the part of others." Mr. Taylor p. 396.

1. The current belief was most probably, not so much that Junius was still alive, as that he was dead and had been long dead, though Mr. Taylor thinks otherwise.



2. As to the fact that 'no papers have hitherto been produced, from the port-folio of any deceased author or politician, which could throw light on the subject,' that does not prove that Junius is either living or dead. The disclosure of his real name would have involved him in instant ruin; and is not that a sufficient reason for believing that he would bear about him no marks of identity, and that the contents of his desk could tell no secrets?

3. Sir Philip Francis is dead, and if there be any truth in the logic of Mr. Taylor, Sir Philip's papers ought to have been produced, and would have been produced, by his heirs or executors to vindicate and prove his claim to the authorship of Junius. The non-production of the papers in itself neither proves nor disproves Sir Philip's claim; no fair argument for either supposition can be founded on the non-production of them. But, as Mr. Taylor believes himself to have identified Sir Philip with Junius, the non-production of the documents on Sir Philip's decease, according to Mr. Taylor's own principles, tends to prove that Sir Philip was not the author of Junius.

4. Most probably the original copies of the *Letters*, would, as they were returned to Junius by Woodfall, be committed to the flames. It is irrational to suppose that, when Junius could have access to his papers in the *Public Advertiser*, he would hazard his security by preserving the original MSS.

5. Mr. Taylor cannot, in the absence of proof, be permitted to define Junius's motive for ordering the two books to be bound in vellum. Suppose that we could ascertain the fact that Sir P. Francis's Library contained no such books at the time of his decease? Is Mr. Taylor in that case willing to take the fair inference from his own reasoning, viz. that Sir Philip was not the author of Junius?

But can we not more reasonably imagine that the real motive of Junius for ordering the books was to present them to his patron, to the person by whose desire and under whose countenance he was induced to publish the *Letters*? And who can say that the books are not now in the possession of Lord Grenville?

IX. "A very sensible, dispassionate *Letter* respecting Junius, inserted in the *Anti-Jacobin Review* for 1799. contains the substance of a conversation, which passed between the writer and Wilkes, after examining the *Letters*, which the latter had received from Junius. Among other remarks it is observed 'that the *Letters* generally, if not always, were sent in an envelope, (which was then by no means so general as it now is,) and in the folding up and the direction of the *Letter*, we thought we could see *marks of the writer's habit of folding and directing official Letters.*' They also determined 'that he had lived with military men, *from the propriety of his language on military subjects.*' This last opinion agrees with that of Malone, who argues that Hamilton could not be the author, as 'he had none of that *minute and commissarial knowledge of petty military matters*, which is displayed in some of the earlier papers of Junius." Mr. Taylor p. 358.

1. The *Letter* referred to is the composition of Mr. Charles Butler: see his *Reminiscences*, first published in 1822. The second edition of Mr. Taylor's book was in 1818; the first in 1813.

2. 'The habit of folding and directing official *Letters*' might be as applicable to Lloyd as to Sir Philip Francis.

3. Does the military language of Junius merely betray such 'minute and commissarial knowledge' as might be expected from one connected with the

Horse-Guards or the War-Office? Or does it exhibit a practical or theoretical knowledge of the military art itself? In the former case it is equally applicable to Lord George Sackville and Sir Philip Francis, and in the latter case it so far favours the pretensions of General Lee.

X. "All the *Letters*, under the name of Junius, were written when Sir Philip was passing from his 29th to his 32nd year: — a time of life, in which it has often been remarked, men generally undertake the greatest designs, of which they are capable. And surely he, who is at any time able to compose such *Letters* as these, is even more likely to produce them during such a period than at any other; since the ardour of youth, which alone could stimulate and carry him through such great exertions, is yet in full action, while the judgment has received such lessons from experience, as naturally fortify opinion. To this ardour of Junius in the cause he had espoused, the author of the *Essay*, prefixed to the last edition, bears the following testimony: — ‘No man but he, who with a thorough knowledge of our author’s style, undertakes to examine all the *Nos.* of the *Public Advertiser* for the three years in question, can have any idea of the immense fatigue and trouble he submitted to. Instead of wondering that he should have disappeared at the distance of about five years, we ought much rather to be surprised that he should have *persevered* through half this period, with a spirit at once so indefatigable and invincible.’ (*Preliminary Essay*, 1, 47.)”  
Mr. Taylor p. 33.

This passage is one of great importance in the discussion.

It is admitted by the author of the *Essay* prefixed to Woodfall’s Junius, and by Mr. Taylor that with ‘singular enthusiasm’ there was exhibited by

Junius ‘an indefatigable and invincible spirit,’ and that he underwent ‘immense fatigue and trouble.’ Now these characteristics of Junius will enable us to decide in the most positive manner against the claims of several persons to the authorship of the *Letters*, but I shall advert only to three.

1. General Lee had the requisite ardour of mind and the leisure, but wanted the spirit of industry admitted to have been indispensably necessary for Junius.

2. Burke could not have written the *Letters*, because he wanted the requisite leisure.

3. It is surprising that Mr. Taylor’s acuteness did not discover that this passage completely refutes the arguments in favour of Sir Philip Francis; for though he had the enthusiasm and the diligence, yet he had not the leisure, and Mr. Taylor himself shall be my high authority. In p. 360. he says:—“From the commencement to the termination of the *Letters* of Junius, Sir Philip Francis held a situation in the War-office, requiring almost constant attendance.” But hear what Mr. T. says in p. 52.: “The extreme scope of time occupied by the *Letters* of Junius, with the exception of the last to Woodfall, is from April 28, 1767. to May 10, 1772.” The earliest *Letter* of Junius is dated January 21, 1769. but the earliest of the *Miscellaneous Letters* of Junius published before he assumed that name, appeared in 1767. “During the whole of this period of five years, he kept up with his printer a correspondence so ‘frequent and full,’ as to prove the greatest stumbling-block to every conjecture that has hitherto been formed of the author. The table given in the *Preliminary Essay*, prefixed to the last edition, shews that in the course of 1769. ‘the author maintained not less than fifty-four communications with Mr. Woodfall; that not a single

‘ month passed without one or more acts of inter-  
‘ course ; that some of them had not less than seven  
‘ and many of them not less than six, — at times di-  
‘ rected to events that had occurred only a few days  
‘ antecedently ; that the two most distant commu-  
‘ nications were not more than three weeks apart ;  
‘ that several of them were daily, and the greater  
‘ number of them not more than a week from each  
‘ other.’ Yet however difficult or impossible it is,  
to reconcile all this with the claims that have been  
made on the part of others, it exhibits nothing more  
than might have been accomplished by any person  
possessing the talents, industry, and *opportunities*,  
of Sir Philip Francis. From the year 1763. he  
tells us himself that he held ‘ a station of great trust  
in the War-Office.’ It was a place requiring con-  
stant attendance, and therefore peculiarly favourable  
to that continual correspondence with the printer, in  
which Junius was engaged. He filled this post,  
as it appears by Junius, until March, 1772. which  
comprises the entire period occupied by the *Letters*,  
with the exception of the three, which were pub-  
lished in the May following, and the private *Note*  
addressed to Woodfall in January, 1773.” Again  
in p. 57, Mr. Taylor says : — “ On the whole, we  
may consider it established, that the latest period  
to which Junius carried on that regular correspond-  
ence with his printer, which marks his constant re-  
sidence in Town, was March 23, 1772.” But these  
quotations will require some further comment. Ad-  
mitting that Sir Philip was constantly resident in  
Town during this period, (and his private corres-  
pondence with his friends, as well as the transactions  
in the War-Office, would confirm or refute the fact  
of constant attendance ;) admitting that he was the  
amanuensis of Junius ; admitting that, notwithstand-  
ing that his situation at the War-Office required

constant attendance, he had leisure to correspond with Woodfall so frequently and fully in the name of Junius, I must in the most positive manner deny the possibility of his having leisure to write the public *Letters* of Junius, which presuppose the most ample leisure and the most undivided attention. I will admit that Sir Philip had the 'industry', — I will admit that he had the 'opportunities'; but I will not admit with Mr. Taylor that he had the 'talents.' Mr. T. has produced no proof whatever that Sir Philip was *at the time in question* possessed of 'the talents.' It does not necessarily follow that, because a man at the age of forty exhibits great powers of reasoning and much skill in composition, he must have had the same or similar powers and skill, when he was twenty-seven, (the period when the earliest of the *Miscellaneous Letters*, without the name of *Junius*, appeared,) or twenty-nine, (when the earliest public *Letter* of Junius appeared with that signature.) There is often a very late, as well as a very early development of abilities; circumstances as often retard the one as they promote the other. Sir Philip did not till several years after Junius ceased to write, publish any pamphlet at all, and therefore there is NO documentary proof to shew that Sir Philip had, when he was twenty-seven or even twenty-nine, 'the talents' of Junius; and Mr. Taylor ought not to assume the point, which should be proved by undeniable and irresistible evidence.

Admitting that the facts above stated from the *Preliminary Essay* prefixed to Woodfall's *Junius* prove that the author of Junius was and must have been constantly resident in Town during that 'frequent and full' correspondence with Woodfall, it is worth while to enquire, if we have before us sufficient particulars of the private life of Burke, whe-

ther Burke was at this period constantly resident in Town, and whether his situation, if absent for any portion of the time, will in respect to dates tally with the dates of Junius's public and private *Letters*? If there be any material discrepancy, we shall arrive at a most unsuspecting argument for disproving the claims made for Burke to the authorship of Junius.

XI. Sir Philip Francis published, or there appeared from his pen, without his name, a small pamphlet entitled *Historical Questions exhibited in the Morning Chronicle in Jan. 1818. enlarged, corrected, and improved*, and admitted to be his composition. Now suppose that we were desirous to trace the author as if unknown: does the pamphlet afford to us any clue to a name? Yes, assuredly it does. 1. In p. 17. the writer says:—“ I mention it now for the purpose of doing justice to the German nation, knowing them, as I do, to be a generous, honourable, brave, and hardened people. I am sure that whenever they are mentioned by Sir Philip Francis (in his *Letter to Lord Holland*, and elsewhere,) or any other man of common sense or common honesty, in doubtful terms, such terms can only relate to their military governments, and not at all to themselves.” Here instead of referring to any other writer he cites himself; thus proving how safely we may reason in such cases, and in any case of contested authorship. 2. But the writer has betrayed himself as plainly in the following words, as if he had subscribed his name to them. In the anonymous pamphlet p. 5. Sir Philip writes:—“ Who was the father of Lewis XIV? Besides that it is well known, in France at least, that Lewis XIII.'s partiality to a very few young women at court, (not more than two or three at the utmost,) was purely *metaphysical*, and that, though he vented

his griefs to them, he took no liberties;—he did not cohabit with his wife, *Anne of Austria*, for many, some say 20 years. No man, at all informed on this subject, does or can doubt that the *Masque de Fer* was her son. To account for her subsequent pregnancy, which produced Lewis XIV, the King and Queen were brought together by a stratagem, by which the innocent King was imposed on. After him, she had his brother, the Duke of Anjou, and might safely have had as many more as she thought proper.” Again in p. 14. “On the whole, I am inclined to believe, because I wish it to be true, for the sound and manly reason stated by Dalrymple, that the old Pretender was the son of James II, viz. ‘because I would not have the revolution stand upon a mean or false foundation.’ If legitimacy admitted of gradations, I would therefore give it him in the superlative degree.” Now in the *Letter Missive to Lord Holland* p. 34. we read:—“In naming the House of Bourbon and omitting the family, there is more purpose than you think of. The same house may have had many tenants, of very different extraction. The chastity of Anne of Austria, and the produce thereof; the *Iron Masque*, and his brethren; the frolics or vagaries of the Duchess of Burgundy; the orgies of the Regent and his daughter; and, in our time the Germanic levities, for they are all cousins german, of another Lady, lost, though not forgotten, in the savage barbarity, which pursued her to the scaffold. Such a series of equivocal generation, of spurious claims to inheritance by divine right, is quite enough to make filiation an ænigma, and pedigree ridiculous. He is said to be a wise son, who knows who his father was. On that question, some of the ladies alluded to might have been puzzled to make their sons any wiser than themselves. If, in a case of this extreme



delicacy, you may feel an inclination to be better informed, you may safely consult Lord Chesterfield, who, I presume, had no thoughts of deceiving his son. He knew what he was saying, and has left his discoveries on record, (3, 309. 4, 324.) without ambiguity or reserve, *ita me Dii ament!* Whether the old Pretender, whom Lewis XIV. acknowledged as King of Great Britian, in order to defeat the Act of Settlement and the positive succession to the Crown, granted by Parliament to the family of Hanover, was or was not the son of that miserable bigot, James II, I care no more than he does now. The hereditary relation of their minds is indisputable. In that line of succession, one fool begets another, and they are all legitimate."

I would have the reader consider whether the little, however pardonable, vanity of referring to himself by name, as Sir Philip Francis does in the anonymous pamphlet, is not more characteristic of himself than of the high-minded and proud Junius?

XII. JUNIUS:—"I am well assured that Junius will never descend to a dispute with such a writer as *Modestus*, especially as the dispute must be chiefly about *words*." (2, 28.) "But I shall not descend to a dispute about *words*, I speak to *things*." (3, 137.)

SIR PHILIP FRANCIS:—"If this were a contest about *words*, and if *things* of the greatest moment were not at stake," (*Minute*, 1774. *App.* 45, 5th *Rep.*) "*A dispute about the construction of words might be endless*; I will therefore not enter into it, but content myself with stating what I think the true sense and meaning of the Company's present orders." (*Minute* 13th March, 1778. *App.* 38, 6th *Rep.*) "Much might be said in defence of those opinions, which the Governor General has been pleased to canvass so minutely; *but, as the argument*

would turn chiefly on the construction of words, on nice distinctions in forming such constructions, and probable inferences deduced from thence, I shall not enter into it." (*Minute*, February 2nd, 1778. *App.* 29, 6th Rep.)

Mr. Taylor p. 246. cites these passages as proofs of identity; but the *strongest* proof is wanting, viz. the introduction of the word *descend*, marking the characteristic pride of Junius.

JUNIUS:—"The power of King, Lords, and Commons, is not an arbitrary power. They are the *trustees*, not the owners of the estate. The fee simple is in us. They cannot waste." (1, 5.)

SIR PHILIP FRANCIS:—"The last appeal I shall make is to the prudence of the House. We are *trustees* for the nation, and accountable for the trust reposed in us." (*Parliamentary Debates*, XLV. 171.) "As *trustees* to the Company, we have no discretionary power to give away their property." (7th May 1778. *Evidence* to 6, 7, and 14th Articles.)

Mr. Taylor has in p. 244. cited these passages as indicating the identity between Francis and Junius; I differ wholly from him. The *true* mark of identity is wanting, the *strongest* feature of resemblance is not found in the words of Francis, viz. '*the fee simple is in us*;' they constitute a legal mistake of Junius, from which that most eminent conveyancer, Mr. Charles Butler, has in his *Reminiscences* inferred that Junius was not a lawyer by profession.

Mr. Taylor p. 175-9. has shown on satisfactory evidence that Junius was no lawyer by profession—that he entertained no great respect for the opinions or the principles of lawyers—that he held in small esteem the profession itself—that he solicited professional aid from Wilkes—and that he probably obtained legal information from other quarters. Mr. Charles Butler has, as we have already remarked,

inferred from a legal mistake of Junius that he was not a lawyer by profession; but an intelligent legal friend thinks that in that particular instance, the mistake might have been made by a professional man, because many lawyers are much less acquainted than Mr. Butler is with the conveyancing department of the law. However, the claim made for Dunning to the authorship of the *Letters* is refuted from the facts here stated. This evidence against Dunning must be admitted to be stronger than that combined evidence of facts and circumstances, which supports his claim.

“ If, therefore, the principles I maintain are truly constitutional, I shall not think myself answered, though I should be convicted of a mistake in terms, or of misapplying the language of the law. I speak to the plain understanding of the people, and appeal to their honest, liberal construction of me.” Junius *Pref.* 1, 11. This passage may be taken as a further proof that Junius was not a professional, but a theoretical lawyer, because no practising lawyer would have used such language and proclaimed his own fallibility.

XIII. “ Another remarkable peculiarity,” says Mr. Taylor p. 161., “ wherein the character of Sir Philip Francis bears out the general idea entertained of Junius, is in the circle of his connection with the *sister country*. It has been repeatedly asserted ever since first the appearance of the *Letters* that the author must necessarily have been of Irish descent or Irish education,” (1, 88.) and on that account Mr. Burke was the more generally suspected. While the editor of the last edition of *Junius*\* gives his

\* His words are these:—“ Of those who have critically analysed the style of his compositions, some have pretended to prove that he must necessarily have been of Irish descent or Irish education,

opinion against this supposition, he acknowledges that it was entertained by those 'who have critically analysed the style' of Junius. Whatever may be doubted is unworthy of much notice; but I think that traces of this kind are plainly visible, and it is curious to see how the slightest peculiarities are explained by the life of Sir Philip Francis. The memoirs inform us 'that he was born in Dublin, Oct. 22, 1740, old style' — 'that he received the *first elements of his education* under Thomas Ball, who succeeded Dr. Dunkin, (names well known in Ireland,) and who kept a school in Ship-street. *In the beginning of 1750 he came to England.*' Here then we find that degree of connection with Ireland, which was likely to give a slight characteristic tinge, but no decided nationality, to the expressions of the author. A youth, who acquired no more than the rudiments of learning in his native country, and who quitted it altogether when he was *ten years old*, however he might overcome the habits of his youth, would still find it difficult to forget entirely the phraseology with which he was first familiar. In all his compositions Junius laboured excessively to make his style pure and classical, yet rich in English idiom; and he generally succeeded. But in the *Miscellaneous Letters* are still to be found many oversights; that they were partly owing to the cause now mentioned, is at least a probable conjecture; and it serves in some measure to ex-

from the peculiarity of his idioms; while, to shew how little dependence is to be placed upon any such observations, others have equally pretended to prove, from a similar investigation, that he could not have been a native either of Scotland or Ireland, nor have studied in any University of either of those countries. The fact is, that there are a few phraseologies in his *Letters* peculiar to himself; such as occur in the compositions of all original writers of great force and genius, but which are neither indicative of any particular race, nor referable to any provincial dialect."

plain the reason of that *labor limæ*, which to many persons has appeared so much beyond the necessity of the case. In the use of the word *collegian* he differs so much from the custom of the English Universities, that he could not have received his education there; and on this ground Malone advances one of his arguments against concluding Hamilton to be Junius. — ‘Having been educated at the University of Oxford, he never would have used the term *collegian* for an *academic* or a *gownsmán.*’ (*Parliamentary Logic*, Pref. xxxiii.) The word, however, is proper in Dublin, in which University Dr. Francis received his education, and took his degree. Sir Philip would, therefore, be very likely to adopt the expression: it would be first suggested to him by the example of his father; and the impression thus made not being afterwards effaced, it would most naturally fall in his way, whenever an occasion offered. But the employment of this word, besides giving rise, among other instances, to the suspicion that Junius was a native of Ireland, also corroborates the general opinion that he was not educated at an English University. This, indeed, he almost acknowledges in one of his *Letters* to Sir Wm. Draper. — ‘An *academical education* has given *you* an unlimited command over the most beautiful figures of speech.’ And the same inference may be drawn from one of his *Letters* to Horne: — ‘This *may* be logic at *Cambridge.*’ (2, 315.) Yet his *Letters* abound with classical allusions and quotations, and he seems in no respect defective in scholastic attainments. Of a character perfectly similar, Sir Philip Francis is an acknowledged scholar, without having studied at either University. There is in all his writings a frequent and happy reference to the Greek and Roman authors, but especially to the latter; and in Horace he has

proved himself a very sound and ingenious critic. To the tuition of so profound and elegant a scholar as Dr. Francis, may be ascribed his familiarity with the works of the ancients: and the advantages afforded him in this respect would amply supply, if they did not surpass, those which are usually met with in a college-education."

1. Dr. Parr detected Gallicisms in Junius's style, and from his knowledge, discernment, judgment, and *acumen* who will appeal? (We may apply to him what Peter de Clugny says in his epitaph on Abelard:—

*Gallorum Socrates, Plato maximus Hesperiarum,  
Noster Aristoteles, logicis quicunque fuerunt,  
Aut par aut melior, studiorum cognitus orbi  
Princeps, ingenio varius, subtilis et acer;  
Omnia vi superans rationis et arte loquendi.)*

This circumstance increases the probability that Junius was of Irish descent or of Irish education.

"The conversation now turned upon Mr. David Hume's style. JOHNSON:—'Why, Sir, his style is not English; the structure of his sentences is French. Now the French structure and the English structure may, in the nature of things, be equally good. But, if you allow that the English language is established, he is wrong. My name might originally have been *Nicholson*, as well as *Johnson*; but, were you to call me *Nicholson* now, you would call me very absurdly.'" Boswell 1, 406.

2. The use of the term *collegian* for *academic* or *gownsmen* places the fact of Irish birth or Irish education beyond a doubt; I consider the argument to be most unsuspecting, and I therefore expect the decided assent of the reader to its truth. The use of the term, peculiar to the University of Dublin, is not to be explained away as a "phraseology in

his *Letters* peculiar to Junius himself," because it is not peculiar to himself, but common to all who have been educated in the Irish University. It is not "referable to any provincial dialect" of England, it is true; but it is "referable to the" national "dialect of" Ireland, which is a province of the United Kingdom; and it is "indicative of a particular race" of men, viz. the children of St. Patrick. This is not to be classed among "phraseologies such as occur in the compositions of all original writers of great force and genius:" for it is either properly used by Junius, if an Irishman or educated at the University of Dublin, (and it then ceases to be 'a peculiar phraseology' of Junius,) or else improperly used by Junius, if he was not an Irishman or not educated in Trinity College, Dublin, and so glaring and ridiculous a blunder cannot be assigned to the pen of an English "original writer of great force and genius." "Phraseologies which occur in such compositions" are to be distinguished from blunders and improprieties; they are novel, but not incorrect modes of expression, indicating in their meaning the peculiar feelings, sentiments, thoughts, circumstances, or situation of the writer, and displaying in their structure a striking peculiarity of language formed for the very purpose of either communicating new ideas in new terms, or clothing old notions in new terms, because those new terms please the writer in his love of variety, or more clearly define what he wishes to convey to the mind of the reader.

3. It is true that one advocate may, in his enthusiastic zeal to support the pretensions of *his* Junius, contend that Ireland was the country of his birth, whilst another advocate may, in vindication of other claims, entertain a very different opinion. But this diversity of sentiment, which is a property of hu-

man nature, does not in any particular case prove "how little dependence is to be placed upon any such observations;" for, if the remark were true, we must abandon the Christian religion, which has been a topic of dispute ever since its promulgation, and small would be the merit of our faith, if our religion were unencumbered with doubts and difficulties. But in all cases, where there are very conflicting opinions, men of a certain formation of mind are unable to arrive at any rational conclusion, either because they cannot for want of discernment balance arguments fairly, or will not for want of patience pursue the investigation calmly.

4. While the editor of Woodfall's *Junius* admits that 'those who have critically analyzed the style of Junius,' have pronounced him to be of Irish descent or of Irish education, Mr. Taylor thinks that "traces of this kind are plainly visible," produces two corroborating passages from Junius himself, and deems the peculiarities referable to Sir Philip Francis. I willingly take the admission, but reject the conclusions. If Sir Philip Francis, though the son of an Irishman, remained, as it appears, in Dublin only for nine years from his birth, (for he was only in the *commencement* of his tenth year when he came to England,) he had not remained long enough, at so tender an age, to acquire either a 'decided nationality,' or a characteristic tinge.' Being removed to England, when he was only *beginning* his tenth year, he was not at all 'likely to adopt the expression,' even though he lived in the same house with his father. But, when we consider that he was, immediately on his arrival in London, sent to St. Paul's School, — that he continued there for some years, — that he in England, and at an English school, would associate almost entirely with Englishmen, and could but rarely have the opportunity of



seeing his countrymen, — that amongst Englishmen and at an English school he would imbibe only English notions, and though he was not afterwards a member of either English University, would most assuredly be sufficiently acquainted with the English terms *gownsmen* and *academic*, — we must on this strong ground decide against the claims of Sir Philip to the authorship of Junius.

5. The term *collegian* for *academic* is the proper term in the mouth of one who was educated at the University of Dublin; but it would be equally used, perhaps, by one who had been educated at a Scotch University. The use of it in Junius clearly proves, by a testimony the most unsuspecting, that the writer was either an Irishman or a Scotchman; and the probability is that he was an Irishman. Francis left Dublin when he was ten years of age, being born in 1740, and was placed at St. Paul's School in London in 1753, under Mr. George Thicknesse. He, then, could not have used *collegian* for *academic*. But Burke (and perhaps Lloyd,) and Boyd were Irishmen, and in their mouth the term would be naturally used; so Lord George Sackville might use the term, because he had been educated at the same Irish University.

6. "Junius was so universally suspected to be an *Irishman*, or of Irish descent, that any attempt to prove it from his writings would be unnecessary for our present purpose. A writer, who signs himself *Oxoniensis*, mentions some of Junius's *Hibernicisms*, and endeavours to prove from these expressions that Mr. Burke was the author. We shall quote one paragraph from this letter, chiefly for the sake of the proof it brings, that Junius, whoever he might be, was a member of the University of Dublin: —  
 'Edmund received his education amongst the Irish  
 ' Jesuits at St. Omer's, and finished his studies in

‘ Ireland. If any one will take the trouble of reading over the *Letters* of Junius, he will find that ‘ Edmund, notwithstanding all his *care and pains*, ‘ sometimes falls into *Hibernicisms*. In one place ‘ he says, *make common cause* ; this is not English, ‘ though, to be sure, the phrase is common enough ‘ in Dublin. In Junius’s *Letter* of the 13th of ‘ August; he talks of ‘ the sophistries of a collegian ;’ ‘ this expression is not English, and the word *collegian* ‘ is never used in this sense, except in the ‘ college of Dublin, and (perhaps,) of St. Omer’s.’ ‘ We say, indeed, *fellow-collegian* ; but at the great ‘ schools here, those of the college are called *collegers*, ‘ and at our two Universities the members ‘ of a college are called *gownsmen* ; at Dublin they ‘ are called *collegians*.’ Though *Oxoniensis* was wrong in his suspicion of Mr. Burke, his arguments to prove that Junius was, in his sense of the word, a *collegian*, are worth our notice.” Mr. Taylor’s *Discovery of the Author of the Letters of Junius*, 1813. p. 46.

7. That Sir Philip Francis, though not educated at any University, was a man of scholastic attainments, had a respectable knowledge of Greek literature, and even some extensive and critical knowledge of the Latin, is apparent from his pamphlets, and from the notes in the last edition of his father, Dr. Francis’s Translation of Horace. Now the *Letters* of Junius do not in my opinion, though Mr. Taylor thinks differently, display any such classical knowledge as Sir Philip Francis exhibits, while the subjects, which Junius handled, admitted of frequent quotation from the classical writers either to confirm or to illustrate. I consider this to be a fair and most unsuspecting argument, and I shall hereafter take the pains of investigating the matter closely.

XIV. “ Assistance, if Junius received any,” says

Mr. Taylor p. 368, “ must have been given him in the mechanical part, — in *transcribing* or in *conveying* the *Letters*. The latter of these is an office of so little moment, that singly it is not worth speaking about, though it may be remarked that, if the author did not employ the pen of another, he would most likely undertake it himself. By means of chairmen and ticket-porters, the danger of discovery was eluded, so that to extricate himself from this trifling risk, it is not probable that Junius would encounter the much greater one of confiding his secret to another person. When, therefore, he writes to Woodfall ‘ that the gentleman who transacts the conveyancing department of our correspondence, tells me there was much difficulty last night,’ (*Private Letter*, No. 51.) he most probably uses the phrase with reference to himself in the capacity of messenger ; — or, what amounts to the same thing, he applies the term with an excess of courtesy, and perhaps by way of blind, to the porter or chairman, whom he happened to employ. The truth, however, is told at the commencement of the correspondence. In his 5th *Private Letter* to Woodfall, (July 21, 1769.) he says : — ‘ Whenever you have any thing to communicate to me, let the hint be thus, *C at the usual place* ; and so direct to Mr. John Fretley, at the same Coffee-house, where it is absolutely impossible *I should be known*,’ (1,174.) that is *himself personally* ; for Fretley was a feigned name, which no one could know. At first, according to this, he called for the *Letters* himself, and when the increased danger compelled him to make use of a porter or a chairman, he was even then liable to be seen. ‘ Your Letter was twice refused last night, and the waiter as often attempted to *see* the person who *sent* for it ;’ he was waiting, it appears, for the return of the man, who made the in-


quiry for him, and who was a common servant, for the waiter's curiosity was not satisfied by seeing *him*. The obligation imposed on him to send such people as these to the Coffee-houses, for at that time he dared not appear himself, accounts for a curious observation in one of his *Letters* to Woodfall, 'I think you should give money to the waiters at that place, to make them more attentive.' (1,227.) The advocate for De Lolme considers this hint a proof of the writer's poverty! But the cause is clear: Junius could not be certain that the money, if he were to give it, would reach the hands of the waiters; and if it did, an inconvenient sort of suspicion would be excited in their minds, as well as in that of the carrier. To apply to Woodfall on the subject, was the only rational step that could be taken. We suspected before that Junius was his own messenger: and how closely the description of that messenger, when he was seen, agrees with the personal appearance of Sir Philip Francis, has been stated in p. 167 of this volume."

If Sir Philip Francis were the messenger seen by Mr. Jackson, it would not prove his identity with Junius, because Sir Philip might have been both the amanuensis and the messenger of Junius.

2. I agree with Mr. Taylor in censuring the extravagant opinion entertained by the advocate for De Lolme, and I approve of the explanation given by Mr. Taylor. The reasoning of this advocate may serve to shew the great caution which is necessary to be observed in discussing fairly the question of Junius; we must neither over-state nor under-state facts, neither over-rate nor under-rate arguments, neither increase nor diminish the natural force of circumstances and incidents, but maintain an even, because consistent—a true, because just—a successful, because wary course throughout the investigation of this most curious subject.

3. I have already remarked that, if Mr. Taylor is disposed to give full credit to Junius for veracity in what the latter writes about himself, he must according to his own principles, give full credit to Junius on all occasions; and therefore I cannot without some remarks permit Mr. T. on the present occasion to oppose one declaration of Junius to another; we cannot support the veracity of a writer, while we make him contradict himself. Either he is wholly to be believed, or he is to be dis-believed only in particular circumstances. The right criterion for determining the exact proportion of credit, which we may in any case assign to Junius in any question about himself, is the great difficulty, which Mr. Taylor has nowhere considered, and yet the difficulty is not too great for sober reflection to encounter, or for patient investigation to surmount. In my view of the particular instance of apparent contradiction in Junius, I do not differ from Mr. Taylor; an author, who takes uncommon pains to conceal himself, must expect to be treated with a certain degree of suspicion in respect to what he says of himself—we must give or withhold our belief according to a nice calculation of probabilities, according to attendant and corroborating circumstances—according to internal and external evidence. A want of attention to this important point has caused the advocates for particular claims to rest their cases on detached facts and incidents, which are on a careful examination found by no means to warrant the conclusions, which have been zealously and fearlessly drawn from them. Thus, as the claimants have been multiplied, the subject has been mystified, and the truth is scarcely at all discernible in our day.

XV. Mr. Taylor and the other writers on the subject of Junius refer to Junius's own declarations about himself as unexceptionable authority. Well then, if any of the declarations are to be received in



evidence, they must one and all be received. It is not competent for Mr. Taylor and other writers to choose only such declarations as suit their purposes, rejecting all which interfere with those purposes, because the canon of authority, to which they submit, is opposed by a canon of equal authority. Great caution then is necessary in admitting Junius's own declarations about himself as unexceptionable testimony. His object was profound concealment, and this concealment was so necessary for his personal safety, that he would naturally take various means to mislead his readers in their inquiries after the mysterious writer. We have seen that Junius cannot always be depended on in what he relates about himself, and therefore we must reason not so much from his own positive declarations about himself, as from the internal evidence afforded by the declarations themselves, and their agreement with other facts and circumstances independent of them. Equal caution is necessary in drawing inferences from Junius's words. Mr. Taylor p. 164-6. observes that the tall "stature of Junius may be ascertained from a perusal of his *Letters*," because "it is the custom only of tall men to attach, very commonly, the epithet *little* to those, whom they are inclined to treat with disrespectful freedom; we seldom find one of a middle size guilty of this; it too nearly concerns himself; if he employs the term, it either loses its force, or recoils upon him with an unpleasant effect." I admit the justness of this remark and the fairness of the inference from Junius's use of the epithet *little* applied contemptuously. But this same Mr. Taylor p. 34-7. has remarked that Junius at one time represents himself as a veteran, and at another time as a youth; he is unwilling that the author of the Preliminary Essay should, from passages of the former kind, be allowed to fix the age of Junius at fifty,

“thinking that from the words in question no positive inference can be drawn with respect to the writer’s age, and that, if it be allowed to extract conclusions at this rate, the most contradictory opinions may be supported” — and yet he himself, from passages of an opposite kind, claims the right of inferring the youth of Junius. On this point there is no justness in the argument, no fairness in any such inferences, because in their writings old men display the gaiety of youth, and young men as often assume the gravity of age, when they have any particular object in view.

2. “To condemn Lord Chatham’s behaviour to Mr. George Grenville,” says Mr. Taylor p. 101., “was in effect to support the latter. But Junius took a decided part; and by the manner in which he advocated Mr. Grenville’s cause, he has given rise to a suspicion that he was biassed by interested motives. This is denied by Junius, who affirms that he is personally unknown to Mr. Grenville: — ‘it is not my design to enter into a formal vindication of Mr. Grenville upon his own principles. I have neither the honour of being personally known to him, nor do I pretend to be completely master of the facts.’ (1,193.)” Mr. Taylor, in advocating the claims for Sir Philip Francis, sets himself seriously to prove that Sir Philip in all probability did not personally know Mr. George Grenville. But no faith is to be placed in the declarations of Junius on such occasions; for he took great pains to prevent the public from identifying himself, as *Veteran*, with *Junius*, (see Taylor p. 76-7.) and in one *private Letter* to Woodfall he instructs him to disavow a *Letter* which had even appeared under the signature of *Junius*. We may justly place far more confidence in reasoning about Junius from his actions than from his declarations. Now what is the fact with respect to Junius and George Grenville? “Of all the poli-

tical characters of the day, Mr. Grenville appears to have been our author's favourite; no man was more open to censure in many parts of his conduct, but he is never censured, while, on the contrary, he is extolled, whenever an opportunity offers." (Junius 1, 81. Note by the editor of Woodfall's edition.) Mr. Taylor (p. 103.) writes thus:—"As the situation Sir Philip Francis held in the War-Office, was obtained at the time Mr. George Grenville came into power, as his expectation of patronage lay chiefly on that side, and the appointments he had already received, were the gift of that party, it may fairly be presumed that his sentiments concerning Mr. Grenville were in unison with those of Junius." Now Lloyd was the private Secretary of George Grenville, and must be supposed to have the private attachment to him, which was so evidently felt by Junius; and I have already shewn that Junius's denial of a personal knowledge of George Grenville is entitled to no more credit than Peter's denial of Christ. Junius in many *Letters* to Woodfall expresses great anxiety for the safety of his printer, and yet in other *Letters* seems to disregard it; in one *Letter* he says that Woodfall shall know him, and yet he never revealed himself.

I remain, dear Sir,

Very respectfully and faithfully yours,

Thetford, Jan. 20th, 1827.

E. H. BARKER.

P. S. In reference to what I have said in p. 48, I would add the following remarks:—Sir Wm. Jones had sketched the plan of an epic poem in eleven books, which appears to have been privately circulated, among his choice friends, in print. A copy of the paper is in the possession of Earl Spencer, to whose courtesy I am indebted for a sight of it, and for permission to transcribe it. His Lordship



informs me that he knows of no other copy. As a specimen of the versification, an extract from the first book is subjoined, and in it occur these lines:—

What chief, what sage, what hero train'd by thee  
 To wisdom, first on this delightful Isle  
 Struck his advent'rous prow? That sacred form  
 Of state, self-balanc'd, harmony sublime,  
 Freedom with sov'reignty in sweet accord,  
 Who constituted first? The Prince of Tyre,  
 Long wand'ring, long depress'd, yet e'er impell'd  
 Right onward, till fair triumph bless'd his toils,  
 By godlike worth and beauty's heavenly charm.

No name is affixed to the Prospectus, and if I had been asked who wrote it, I should have had no hesitation in replying Sir William Jones, guided by his *Letter* to the celebrated foreigner, Reviczki, where he thus 'vividly describes the shape and aspect of the British Constitution:— "The original form of our Constitution is almost divine, to such a degree, that no State of Greece or Rome could ever boast one superior to it, nor could Plato, Aristotle, nor any legislator ever conceive a more perfect model of a State. The three parts, which compose it, are so harmoniously blended and incorporated, that neither the flute of Aristoxenus, nor the lyre of Timotheus, ever produced more perfect concord. What can be more difficult than to devise a Constitution, which, while it guards the dignity of the sovereign, and liberty of the people, from any encroachment by the influence and power of the nobility, preserves the force and majesty of the laws from violation by the popular liberty?"

*Aug. 20th, 1827.*

E. H. B.

THE CLAIMS  
OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS  
TO THE  
AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS DISPROVED,  
*In a Letter addressed to Sir James Mackintosh.*

---

*Sir,*

I give to myself the pleasure of addressing to you this Letter on a subject, which cannot, amidst your other literary pursuits, and even amidst "the weightier matters of the law," have failed to attract your notice. Permit me to add, that in your excellent understanding, your great acquirements, your ample and minute knowledge of persons, and parties, and events, and facts, and circumstances, historical, political, and private, — your exquisite taste, your true discernment, your critical *acumen*, your Ciceronian skill in composition, your Aristotelian powers of argument, your professional habits of investigation, and your philosophical spirit of research, I perceive a happy union of those admirable qualities, which should characterise him who undertakes to determine a point of this intricate nicety. It is a question, Sir, not unworthy of your genius and your talents, and on which I will yet indulge the hope of seeing them successfully displayed. I will not admit that a question, — which has for a series of

years been a subject of literary interest among persons of well-cultivated minds, and which will never, till it is decided, cease to be a subject of interest, while curiosity is a property of human nature, — which has exercised and baffled the inquiries of the intelligent, and the sagacity of the ingenious, and the researches of the antiquarian, and the penetration of the statesman, — which involves the biography of the greatest men, who have illustrated our age and our nation, — which is identified with the transactions of public offices, the politics of various administrations, and the history of our beloved country; — Sir, I will not admit that a question of this sort is a mere fruitless speculation of human inquisitiveness, an idle employment of literary leisure, and an unprofitable expenditure of human intellect and human learning.

II. “It is commonly reported and believed,” says Mr. Taylor p. 398, “that the King, the late Lord North, and the present Lord Grenville, were at some time or other made acquainted with the real name of Junius. According to the following anecdote in Wraxall’s *Memoirs* 1, 455, the King acquired this knowledge in the year 1772: — ‘I have been  
 ‘assured that the King riding out in the year 1772,  
 ‘accompanied by General Desaguliers, said to him  
 ‘in conversation, *We know who Junius is, and he*  
 ‘*will write no more.* The General, who was too  
 ‘good a courtier to congratulate upon such a piece  
 ‘of intelligence, contented himself with bowing,  
 ‘and the discourse proceeded no farther. Mrs.  
 ‘Shuttleworth, who was General Desaguliers’  
 ‘daughter, believed in the accuracy of this fact.’  
 As the report of such a discovery having been made is now very generally credited, we may admit the evidence of this anecdote in deciding at what period it took place. The date assigned is the more

entitled to notice, as at that time Lord North was prime Minister, and in that capacity he would most likely become acquainted with the secret. By parity of reasoning it is also probable that Lord Grenville acquired his information at the time he held a similar situation: indeed, without this, it is not easy to conceive how Lord North and Lord Grenville should possess an opportunity of gaining that intelligence, which was denied to others in their sphere."

1. But discredit is thrown on the story by the fact that the Duke of Sussex informed me through his Surgeon and Librarian, and my excellent friend, Mr. Pettigrew, that in the last conversation, which his Royal Highness held with his mother, the late Queen Charlotte, she assured him that George III. did not know who wrote the *Letters* of Junius.

2. It is, however, just possible to reconcile the story with the supposition that the King might, at the time referred to, have believed in the accuracy of his information, and yet might have afterwards found reason to dis-believe it.

3. An intelligent friend has suggested to me, that the King might have possessed the secret, and have kept it so faithfully, as not to impart it even to the wife of his bosom, and the sharer of his throne.

4. But Mr. Taylor cannot in such circumstances be permitted to draw any inferences from the story, as if it were an undisputed fact.

III. I had, on July 16, 1826, at the Bell Inn in Thetford, a conversation about Junius with another intelligent friend, and a learned barrister. He once at the Bury Assizes talked with Lord Chief Justice Dallas on the subject. Dallas was a literary man, (though, according to the testimony of another equally intelligent friend, not very conversant with literature,) was one of the Counsel for Warren Hast-

ings at the time of his trial—Hastings was himself a literary man, and his table was plentifully supplied with the great literary men of the day. The feeling and the conviction of the company, in which Dallas also participated, were that the matter in Junius was supplied by Charles Lloyd, and that some Clerk in the War-Office, (whom Dallas afterwards considered to be Sir Philip Francis,) was employed as the *amanuensis*, and perhaps to furnish occasionally the language, subject to the revision of his employer. Lloyd was known to the party to be a man of talent equal to the composition of the *Letters*. One of the reasons assigned by Dallas against Francis's claim to the authorship of Junius, (and he had several,) was this, that a Clerk in the War-Office could not have the requisite leisure for composing those *Letters*; and the argument is so fair, that the advocates of Francis ought to prove the abundance of his leisure at that time. Now Lloyd had the necessary leisure. Not merely leisure was wanted for the composer of the *Letters*, but the consciousness of full leisure, the feeling of a mind at ease, unencumbered by official duties, unexhausted by the performance of them, undistracted, in moments of relaxation, by the remembrance of them;—powers fresh and vigorous and capable of being at the shortest notice waked into active and awful energy, and wielded by a giant's arm with sure effect, and striking the object of its wrath with the divine force of lightning, rending the knotted oak, and scattering its honours in the dust.

IV. The first prose-work of Johnson was *An Abridgment and Translation of Lobo's Voyage to Abyssinia*, published in 1735, when he was twenty-four years old. "This being the first prose-work of Johnson," says Mr. Boswell, (1, 59,) "it is a curious object of inquiry how much may be traced

in it of that style, which marks his subsequent writings with such peculiar excellence; with so happy an union of force, vivacity, and perspicuity. I have perused the book with this view, and have found that here, as I believe in every other translation, there is in the work itself no vestige of the translator's own style; for the language of translation being adapted to the thoughts of another person, insensibly follows their cast, and, as it were, runs into a mould that is ready prepared. Thus for instance, taking the first sentence, that occurs at the opening of the book, p. 4: — ‘ I lived here above a year, and completed my studies in divinity; in which time some letters were received from the fathers of Ethiopia, with an account that Sultan Segned, Emperour of Abyssinia, was converted to the Church of Rome; that many of his subjects had followed his example, and that there was a great want of missionaries to improve these prosperous beginnings. Every body was very desirous of seconding the zeal of our fathers, and of sending them the assistance they requested; to which we were the more encouraged, because the Emperour's letter informed our Provincial, that we might easily enter his dominions by the way of Dancala; but, unhappily, the Secretary wrote *Geila* for *Dancala*, which cost two of our fathers their lives.’ Every one acquainted with Johnson's manner will be sensible that there is nothing of it here; but that this sentence might have been composed by any other man.

“ But in the Preface the Johnsonian style begins to appear; and though use had not yet taught his wing a permanent and equal flight, there are parts of it which exhibit his best manner in full vigour. I had once the pleasure of examining it with Mr. Edmund Burke, who confirmed me in this opinion, by his

superior critical sagacity, and was, I remember, much delighted with the following specimen:—

‘ The Portuguese traveller, contrary to the general vein of his countrymen, has amused his readers with no romantick absurdity, or incredible fictions; whatever he relates, whether true or not, is at least probable; and he who tells nothing exceeding the bounds of probability, has a right to demand that they should believe him, who cannot contradict him. He appears, by his modest and unaffected narration, to have described things as he saw them, to have copied nature from life, and to have consulted his senses, not his imagination. He meets with no basilisks, that destroy with their eyes; his crocodiles devour their prey without tears; and his cataracts fall from the rocks without deafening the neighbouring inhabitants. The reader will here find no regions cursed with irremediable barrenness, or blessed with spontaneous fecundity; no perpetual gloom, or unceasing sunshine; nor are the nations here described either devoid of all sense of humanity, or consummate in all private or social virtues. Here are no Hottentots without religious polity or articulate language; no Chinese perfectly polite, and completely skilled in all sciences; he will discover, what will always be discovered by a diligent and impartial enquirer, that, wherever human nature is to be found, there is a mixture of vice and virtue, a contest of passion and reason; and that the Creator doth not appear partial in his distribution, but has balanced, in most countries, their particular inconveniences by particular favours.’ Here we have an early example of that brilliant and energetick expression, which, upon innumerable occasions in his subsequent life, justly impressed the world with the highest admiration.

“ Nor can any one, conversant with the writings of Johnson, fail to discern his hand in this passage of the dedication to John Warren, Esq. of Pembroke-shire, though it is ascribed to Warren the bookseller:—‘ A generous and elevated mind is distinguished by nothing more certainly than an eminent degree of curiosity; \* nor is that curiosity ever more agreeably or usefully employed, than in examining the laws and customs of foreign nations. I hope, therefore, the present I now presume to make, will not be thought improper; which, however, it is not my business as a dedicat- or to commend, nor as a bookseller to depreciate.’ ”

In the instance of Johnson, then, his first prose-work, published when he was 24 years old, does exhibit traces of that majestic style and proofs of that deep thought, for which he was in subsequent life so remarkable; and if the world had never been informed by himself that he was the writer of the work in question, we should have had abundant reason for attributing matter so Johnsonian to Johnson himself in defiance of every other claimant. But in the case of Sir Philip Francis, this great and necessary proof of early skill in composition is wanting, and his productions, however good, do not bear the deep impress of Junius’s mind, and do not exhibit the divine energies of his style.

V. “ Johnson’s saying, ‘ I have no part in the paper,’ (*the Adventurer*,) ‘ beyond now and then a motto,’ may seem inconsistent with his being the author of the papers marked *T*. But he had, at this time written only one No.; and besides, even at any after-period, he might have used the same expression, considering it as a point of honour not to own

\* “ See *Rambler*, No. 103.”



them; for Mrs. Williams told me that, as he had *given* those Essays to Dr. Bathurst who sold them at two guineas each, he never would own them; but the fact was that he *dictated* them, while Bathurst wrote.' I read to him Mrs. Williams's account; he smiled, and said nothing." Boswell 1, 223. In the following page is a Note communicated by Dr. Burney:—"Dr. Johnson lowered and somewhat disguised his style, in writing *the Adventurers*, in order that his Papers might pass for those of Dr. Bathurst, to whom he consigned the profits. This was Hawkesworth's opinion." From the above statement we may safely reason thus, 1. that great writers do often write papers, which they never voluntarily acknowledge; 2. that, if they are asked whether they have written any particular papers, they may either decline giving any answer, (in which case we can neither justly infer nor safely deny their authorship of them,) or give an evasive answer, neither affirmative nor negative, or give an answer exactly calculated to mislead the inquirer, because given with a mental reservation; 3. that they often designedly lower their style to avoid the discovery of their pen having been employed to write the papers; 4. hence it is possible for *Junius* to have written the Letters of *Veteran*, though they carry about them marks of an inferior mind and of an inferior style. "Our Author told Mr. Harte that, in order to disguise his being the author of the second *Epistle of the Essay on Man*, he made in the first edition the following bad rhyme:

A cheat! a whore! who starts not at the *name*,  
In all the Inns of Court, or Drury Lane?

And Harte remembered to have often heard it urged, in enquiries about the author, whilst he was unknown, that it was impossible it could be Pope's,

on account of this very passage." Warton's *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* 2, 210. (3d. ed.)

VI. "In 1773. Dr. Johnson," says Mr. Boswell, (2,206.) "wrote or partly wrote an Epitaph on Mrs. Bell, wife of his friend, John Bell, Esq. brother of the Rev. Dr. Bell, Prebendary of Westminster, which is printed in his Works. It is in English prose, and has so little of his manner, that I did not believe he had any hand in it, till I was satisfied of the fact by the authority of Mr. Bell." Then great writers, possessing a particular turn of thought and particular modes of expression, can occasionally either by art so disguise both, or by carelessness write so much below both, as to deceive the very person most likely to detect the author of the composition. "I found in the *London Chronicle* Dr. Goldsmith's apology to the publick for beating Evans, a bookseller, on account of a paragraph in a Newspaper published by him, which Goldsmith thought impertinent to him, and to a lady of his acquaintance. The apology was written so much in Dr. Johnson's manner, that both Mrs. Williams and I supposed it to be his; but when he came home, he soon undeceived us. When he said to Mrs. Williams, 'Well, Dr. Goldsmith's *manifesto* has got into your paper; I asked him if Dr. G. had written it, with an air that made him see I suspected it was his, though subscribed by G. JOHNSON; 'Sir, Dr. 'G. would no more have asked me to write such a 'thing as that for him, than he would have asked 'me to feed him with a spoon, or to do any thing 'else, that denoted his imbecility. I as much believe that he wrote it, as if I had seen him do it.'" (2,211.) Among the anonymous papers contributed by Johnson to the *Literary Magazine, or Universal Review*, was one entitled *Memoirs of Frederick III. King of Prussia*: — "In all these he displays ex-

tensive political knowledge and sagacity, expressed with uncommon energy and perspicuity, without any of those words, which he sometimes took a pleasure in adopting, in imitation of Sir Thos. Browne; of whose *Christian Morals* he this year gave an edition, with his *Life* prefixed to it, which is one of Johnson's best biographical performances. In one instance only in these Essays has he indulged his *Brownism*. Dr. Robertson, the Historian, mentioned it to me, as having at once convinced him that Johnson was the authour of the *Memoirs of the King of Prussia*. Speaking of the pride, which the old King, the father of his hero, took in being master of the tallest regiment in Europe, he says: 'To review this *towering* regiment was his daily pleasure; and to perpetuate it was so much his care, that when he met a tall woman, he immediately commanded one of his *Titanian* retinue to marry her, that they might *propagate procerity*.' For this Anglo-Latian word *procerity* Johnson had, however, the authority of Addison." (1, 276.)

VII. "This masterly argument (of Johnson, on a question of Scotch law,) after being prefaced and concluded with some sentences of my own, and garnished with the usual formularies, was actually printed and laid before the Lords of Session, but without success. My respected friend, Lord Hailes, however, one of that honourable body, had critical sagacity enough to discover a more than ordinary hand in the *Petition*. I told him Dr. Johnson had favoured me with his pen. His Lordship, with wonderful *acumen*, pointed out exactly where his composition began, and where it ended." Boswell (2, 202.) When the same critical sagacity is applied to determine the authorship of Junius's *Letters*, it may have equal success and be entitled to the same praise. And yet of this same Lord Hailes we read

a curious story told in the same work, (2, 304.) Mr. Boswell says in a *Letter* to Dr. Johnson:—“ Lord Hailes writes to me, (for we correspond more than we talk together,) ‘ As to Fingal, I see ‘ a controversy arising, and purpose to keep out of ‘ its way. There is no doubt that I might mention ‘ some circumstances; but I do not choose to com- ‘ mit them to paper.’ What his opinion is, I do not know.” In a Note communicated to Mr. Boswell by the Rev. T. B. Blakeway we are told:—“ His Lordship, notwithstanding his resolution, did commit his sentiments to paper, and in one of his Notes affixed to his Collection of old Scottish Poetry, he says that ‘ to doubt the authenticity of those ‘ poems is a refinement in scepticism indeed.’” Now on the supposition that these poems are the pure inventions of Mr. Macpherson,—a fact, which many intelligent men consider to have been established by Laing in his *History of Scotland*,—the same critical sagacity, which was infallible in the one case, is fallible in the other.

VIII. To shew the caution, which should be used in admitting the declaration of authors about the originality of compositions published under their name, and the caution with which we should receive the declarations of persons claiming to be authors of Junius, we may cite the following memorable instance:—“ There is in this collection (of *Miscellanies* by Mrs. Anna Williams,) a poem ‘ on the ‘ *Death of Stephen Grey, the Electrician,*’ which, on reading it, appeared to me to be undoubtedly Johnson’s. I asked Mrs. Williams whether it was not his. ‘ Sir,’ (said she, with some warmth,) ‘ I wrote ‘ that poem before I had the honour of Dr. Johnson’s acquaintance.’ I, however, was so much impressed with my first notion, that I mentioned it to Dr. Johnson, repeating, at the same time, what

Mrs. Williams had said. His answer was: 'It is true, Sir, that she wrote it before she was acquainted with me; but she has not told you that I wrote it all over again, except two lines.'" Boswell 2, 27.

IX. "Mrs. Piozzi gives the following account of this little composition, ('Verses to a Lady, on receiving a Sprig of Myrtle,' 1734.) from Dr. Johnson's own relation to her, on her enquiring whether it was rightly attributed to him — 'I think it is now just forty years ago, that a young fellow had a sprig of myrtle given him by a girl he courted, and asked me to write him some verses, that he might present her in return. I promised, but forgot; and when he called for his lines at the time agreed on — Sit still a moment, (says I,) dear Mund, and I'll fetch them thee — So stepped aside for five minutes, and wrote the nonsense you now keep up such a stir about.' (*Anecdotes* p. 34.) — In my first edition I was induced to doubt the authenticity of this account, by the following circumstantial statement in a Letter to me from Miss Seward of Lichfield: — 'I know those Verses were addressed to Lucy Porter, when he was enamoured of her in his boyish days, two or three years before he had seen her mother, his future wife. He wrote them at my grandfather's, and gave them to Lucy in the presence of my mother, to whom he shewed them on the instant. She used to repeat them to me, when I asked her for *the Verses Dr. Johnson gave her on a Sprig of Myrtle, which he had stolen or begged from her bosom.* We all know honest Lucy Porter to have been incapable of the mean vanity of applying to herself a compliment not intended for her.' Such was this Lady's statement, which I make no doubt she supposed to be correct; but it shows how dangerous it is to trust

too implicitly to traditional testimony and ingenious inference," [and even positive declarations of personal knowledge;] "for Mr. Edmund Hector has lately assured me that Mrs. Piozzi's account is in this instance accurate, and that he was the person, for whom Johnson wrote those Verses, which have been erroneously ascribed to Mr. Hammond." Boswell 1, 65. But notwithstanding Mr. Hector's positive declaration, Miss Anna Seward persisted in the truth of her story, and Mr. Boswell was drawn into a controversy with her in the *Gentleman's Magazine* Vol. 53. and 54. and it was finally settled by a Letter from Mr. Hector to Mr. Boswell, detailing the history of the Verses. Let those, then, who enter into the controversy about Junius, beware how they rely on the truth of facts, even if they are related to them on what may well be considered good authority.

X. Johnson, speaking of the *Douglas-Cause*, said:—"And I think too that a good deal of weight should be allowed to the dying declarations, because they were spontaneous. There is a great difference between what is said without our being urged to it, and what is said from a kind of compulsion. If I praise a man's book without being asked my opinion of it, that is honest praise, to which one may trust. But, if an author asks me if I like his book, and I give him something like praise, it must not be taken as my real opinion." Boswell 2, 51. We should reason in the same way about the spontaneous or the forced denials of persons as to the authorship of Junius's *Letters*, and in point of fact Johnson himself has so reasoned on this very subject.

"BOSWELL. Supposing the person who wrote *Junius*, were asked whether he was the author, might he deny it? JOHNSON. I don't know what to say to this. If you were *sure* that he wrote *Ju-*

*nus*, would you, if he denied it, think as well of him afterwards? Yet it may be urged that what a man has no right to ask, you may refuse to communicate; and there is no other effectual mode of preserving a secret, and an important secret, the discovery of which may be very hurtful to you, but a *flat denial*; for, if you are silent or hesitate, or *evade*, it will be held equivalent to a confession. But stay, Sir, here is another case. Supposing the author has told me confidentially that he had written *Junius*, and I were asked if he had, I should hold myself at liberty to deny it, as being under a previous promise, express or implied, to conceal it. Now, what I ought to do for the author, may I not do for myself?" (4, 344.)

XI. "Johnson, however," says Boswell (1, 328.) "contributed this year (1761.) the Preface to Rolt's *Dictionary of Trade and Commerce*, in which he displays such a clear and comprehensive knowledge of the subject, as might lead the reader to think that its author had devoted all his life to it. I asked him, whether he knew much of Rolt, and of his work. 'Sir,' (said he,) 'I never saw the man, and never read the book. The booksellers wanted a preface to a Dictionary of Trade and Commerce. I knew very well what such a Dictionary should be, and I wrote a preface accordingly.' Rolt, who wrote a great deal for the booksellers, was, as Johnson told me, a singular character. Though not in the least acquainted with him, he used to say, 'I am just come from Sam Johnson.' This was a sufficient specimen of his vanity and impudence. But he gave a more eminent proof of it in our sister kingdom, as Dr. Johnson informed me. When Aken-side's *Pleasures of the Imagination* first came out, he did not put his name to the poem. Rolt went over to Dublin, published an edition of it, and put

his own name to it. Upon the fame of this he lived for several months, being entertained at the best tables as 'the ingenious Mr. Rolt.'\* His conversation, indeed, did not discover much of the fire of a poet; but it was recollected that both Addison and Thomson were equally dull till excited by wine. Akenside having been informed of this imposition, vindicated his right by publishing the poem with its real author's name. Several instances of such literary fraud have been detected. The Rev. Dr. Campbell, of St. Andrew's, wrote *An Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue*, the MS. of which he sent to Mr. Innes, a Clergyman in England, who was his countryman and acquaintance. Innes published it with his own name to it; and before the imposition was discovered, obtained considerable promotion, as a reward of his merit.† The celebrated Dr. Hugh Blair, and his cousin Mr. George Bannatine, when students in divinity, wrote a poem, entitled *The Resurrection*, copies of which were handed about in MS. They were at length very much surprised to see a pompous edition of it in folio, dedicated to the Princess Dowager of Wales, by a Dr. Douglas, as his own. Some years ago a little Novel, entitled *The Man of Feeling*, was assumed by Mr. Eccles, a young Irish Clergyman, who was afterwards drowned near Bath. He had been at the pains to transcribe the whole book, with

\* "I have had inquiry made in Ireland as to this story, but do not find it recollected there. I give it on the authority of Dr. Johnson, to which may be added that of the *Biographical Dictionary*, and *Biographia Dramatica*; in both of which it has stood many years. Mr. Malone observes the truth probably is, not that an edition was published with Rolt's name in the title-page, but that the poem being then anonymous, Rolt acquiesced in its being attributed to him in conversation."

† "I have both the books. Innes was the clergyman, who brought Psalmanazar to England, and was an accomplice in his extraordinary fiction."



blottings, interlineations, and corrections, that it might be shewn to several people as an original. It was in truth the production of Mr. Henry Mackenzie, an attorney in the Exchequer at Edinburgh, who is the author of several ingenious pieces; but the belief with regard to Mr. Eccles became so general, that it was thought necessary for Messrs. Strahan and Cadell to publish an advertisement in the Newspapers, contradicting the report, and mentioning that they purchased the copyright of Mr. Mackenzie. I can conceive this kind of fraud to be very easily practised with successful effrontery. The *filiation* of a literary performance is difficult of proof; seldom is there any witness present at its birth. A man, either in confidence or by improper means, obtains possession of a copy of it in MS., and boldly publishes it as his own. The true author in many cases may not be able to make his title clear. Johnson indeed, from the peculiar features of his literary offspring, might bid defiance to any attempt to appropriate them to others.

But Shakspeare's magick could not copied be,  
Within that circle none durst walk but he."

If, then, any person of acknowledged abilities had, soon after the publication of the *Letters* of Junius, falsely avowed himself to be the author of them, and had unblushingly put forth an edition with his name in the title-page, there would have been good reason to expect that the forgery would escape detection, because the real author would not venture to contest with him the honour of the authorship, lest, while he established his private right, he should be arraigned as a public criminal, or fall beneath the dagger of some mercenary assassin.

XII. Mr. Taylor p. 96. quotes the following words from a *Letter* of Junius to Mr. Horne, (2,310.)  
"And surely it is not in the little censure of Mr.

Horne, to deter me from doing signal justice to a man, (Lord Chatham,) who, I confess, has *grown upon my esteem*." He adds in a Note:—"It is somewhat remarkable that Sir Philip Francis made use of this same expression in speaking of Mr. Horne himself several years after. *Vide Erskine's Speeches* 4, 135. Horne must certainly have 'grown in the esteem' of Junius, before he would speak in favour of his political conduct." But 1. the fact of Sir Philip's having so spoken of Horne places him in such direct opposition to Junius, that we cannot reasonably be persuaded to identify the one with the other: 2. in my first *Letter* I have shewn in what way Lord Chatham 'grew upon the esteem' of Junius: 3. the application of these words by Francis to Mr. Horne many years after Junius had used them, might be either by a pure accident, or by a mere imitation of Junius, or by an unconscious employment of the same words: 4. Mr. Taylor would not be justified in drawing any inference from the fact that Junius and Sir Philip had used the same phrase, unless it were a phrase *peculiar* to themselves. A single instance from any other writer would at once destroy such an argument. What shall we say to the following passage in Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (1, 224.) first published in 1791.? "Without meaning, however, to depreciate the *Adventurer*, I must observe that, as the value of the *Rambler* came, in the progress of time, to be better known, it grew upon the public estimation."

XIII. Mr. Coventry p. 102-7. undertakes to prove that Junius was an Englishman, not an Irishman or a Scotchman. He quotes the dedication of the *Letters* to the English nation, where Junius speaks of *the rights of an Englishman* and of *our Constitution*. He quotes the preface, where Junius speaks of *every English gentleman*, of *English Bo-*

*roughs and Peerages, of poor England and the King of England.* He quotes *Letter 30*, Oct. 17, 1769. where Junius speaks of *the English Constitution, of an Englishman, of his countrymen, of our being Englishmen.* He quotes *Letter 37*, March 19, 1770. where Junius speaks of our being Englishmen. He quotes *Letter 13*. Febr. 1768. where Junius speaks of *the people of England, of native genuine English, and of our countrymen.* He quotes the dedication of the *Letters*, where Junius speaks of them as written by *one of ourselves.* Now the real value of such an argument is this, that if any Irishman or Scotchman, writing in England, has anywhere used the term *Englishman* instead of *Briton*, the hypothesis falls to the ground at one stroke. Take, then, the following example from a Speech of Burke cited in Woodfall's *Junius* 1, 365. :—“ Consult *the History of the Reign of George III.* In that performance, which will be an everlasting monument of the folly, incapacity, and pernicious politics of our late and present Ministers, you will find it demonstrated that the majority of *Englishmen* have petitioned the King, and have consequently expressed their own sentiments by their own mouth, without the intervention of their deputies.” “ Accordingly we find in Johnson's *London*,” says Mr. Boswell (1, 102.) “ the most spirited invectives against tyranny and oppression, the warmest predilection for his own country, and the purest love of virtue; interspersed with traits of his own particular character and situation, not omitting his prejudices as a *true-born Englishman*, not only against foreign countries, but against Ireland and Scotland. It is, however, remarkable, that he uses the epithet, which undoubtedly, since the union between England and Scotland, ought to denominate the natives of both parts of our island :

*Was early taught a Briton's rights to prize.”*



XIV. Mr. Coventry p. 105. undertakes to prove that Junius was not an Irishman from the following passages. "I beg you will convey to your gracious Master my humble congratulations upon the glorious success of peerages and pensions, so lavishly distributed as the rewards of *Irish virtue*." *Letter* 67th, Nov. 27, 1771. "Or a Scotch Secretary teaching the *Irish people* the true pronunciation of the English language. That *barbarous people* are but little accustomed to figures of oratory," etc. *Misc. Letter* 5th, Sept. 16, 1767. [We may remark by the way that Junius errs greatly in this estimate of the Irish; for the lowest order of Irish use a highly metaphorical language, and the fault of all Irish oratory in its most polished state is that it abounds too much with the flowers of rhetoric.] "Void as you are of every shame, can you without a blush, (*but a blush seldom tinges those happy countenances, which have been bathed in the Liffey,*) can you recommend to the people of England as Ministers, men, whose weakness or villany they have already experienced in office?" *Letter* 57th, June 16, 1769. The value of this argument depends on the fact whether Junius is uniform in the use of such contemptuous language. Hear, then, what Mr. Coventry has omitted to notice:—"But is such a man likely to please the brave Irish, whose hasty tempers, or whose blunders, may sometimes lead them into a quarrel, but whose swords always carry them through it?" *Misc. Letter* 4th, Aug. 25, 1776. (2, 469.)

"Among the peasantry of Grace's Country many traditionary tales, both in prose and verse, are still preserved, illustrative of scenes of feudal warfare between the Barons of Courtstown and the royal Milesian Septs of the Fitz-Patricks of Ossory, and the O'Mores of Leix (or Leas.) The tales of these

exploits are the tales most dear to the descendants of the combatants engaged in these encounters; and, with a filial piety of forgetfulness, they cannot remember one single occasion, upon which they were ever worsted. There are also other poems still extant in the Irish language, of a more domestic character, commemorating births, deaths, marriages, feasts, hunting, and other occurrences of the Grace family. Several of these traditionary effusions have been transcribed from their oral sources, and are far from being destitute of merit. The peculiarity of their style is remarkable for that excessive luxuriance of figurative language and hyperbole of expression, which characterize the poetry of Ossian. The peasantry of the Walsh Mountains, in this neighbourhood, could furnish many a weapon to those, who contend that Ireland is the birth-place of the ancient Bard."

Extracted from *Lines written at Jerpoint Abbey*, Lond. 1823. p. 14., appended to *Memoirs of the Family of Grace* by Sheffield Grace, Esq. F. S. A. Lond. 1823. 8° (an unpublished Work.)

This may be taken as a further proof of the extraordinary mistake made by Junius in speaking of the Irish as a barbarous people, unused to the figures of speech. The observation is false in respect to the Irish in particular, and false in respect to the history of the world, because it is perfectly well known to the traveller and the reader of travels that the language of barbarous people abounds with figures of speech, and that oratory is an art much and very successfully studied among them. What Mr. Grace here says, as we may remark by the way, furnishes no inconsiderable argument in favour of the genuineness of the poems attributed to Ossian, however much they may have been interpolated by Macpherson.



XV. In order to shew the value, which is to be attached to certain arguments on the subject of *Junius*, we may cite the following instance in respect to an author of still higher fame:—

“ Introduction to *the Tale of a Tub*, p. 51. ed. 1.  
 ‘ FOUR SCORE AND ELEVEN Pamphlets have I writ  
 ‘ under three reigns, and for the service of SIX AND  
 ‘ THIRTY factions.’ *Gulliver’s Travels*, V. 1. p. 22,  
 ed. 1. ‘ On each side of the gate was a small win-  
 ‘ dow not above six inches from the ground: into  
 ‘ that on the left side the King’s smith conveyed  
 ‘ FOUR SCORE AND ELEVEN chains, like those that  
 ‘ hang to a lady’s watch in Europe, and almost as  
 ‘ large, which were locked to my left leg with SIX  
 ‘ AND THIRTY padlocks.’ From the curious coin-  
 cidence of the numbers in these two passages, Pro-  
 fessor Porson inferred that both were written by the  
 same person; that is, that Swift was the Author of  
*the Tale of a Tub*. DOBREE.”

*Tracts and Miscellaneous Criticisms of the  
 late Richard Porson, Esq. collected and  
 arranged by the Rev. T. Kidd, Lond. 1815.*  
 p. 316.

I agree with Professor Porson in the propriety of this conclusion: the coincidence could not have been accidental. Dr. Johnson, however, was not able to persuade himself that both these works emanated from one and the same mind, and let us learn from the fact the necessity of exercising an independent judgment, if we wish to arrive at truth in such cases—let us not bend to the authority of names, however great, or yield to the force of example, however general, but prove all things and hold fast that which is good:—“ On Thursday, July 28, we again supped in private at the Turk’s Head Coffee House. JOHNSON:—‘ Swift has a higher reputation than he deserves. His excellence is strong

‘sense; for his humour, though very well, is not remarkably good. I doubt whether *the Tale of a Tub* be his; for he never owned it, and it is much above his usual manner.’ This opinion was given by him more at large at a subsequent period. See *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, ed. 3. p. 32.” Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* 1, 418. “Johnson was in high spirits this evening at the Club, and talked with great animation and success. He attacked Swift, as he used to do upon all occasions. ‘*The Tale of a Tub* is so much superior to his other writings, that one can hardly believe he was the author of it.’\* there is in it such a vigour of mind,

\* “This doubt,” says Mr. Boswell in a Note, “has been much agitated on both sides, I think without good reason. See Addison’s *Freeholder*, May 4, 1714; *An Apology for the Tale of a Tub*; Dr. Hawkesworth’s *Preface to Swift’s Works*, and Swift’s *Letter to Tooke the Printer*, and *Tooke’s Answer* in that collection; Sheridan’s *Life of Swift*; Mr. Courtenay’s Note on p. 3. of his *Poetical Review of the Literary and Moral Character of Dr. Johnson*; and Mr. Cooksey’s *Essay on the Life and Character of John Lord Somers, Baron of Eversham*. Dr. Johnson here speaks only to the internal evidence. I take leave to differ from him, having a very high estimation of the powers of Dr. Swift. His *Sentiments of a Church-of-England-man*, his *Sermon on the Trinity*, and other serious pieces, prove his learning as well as his acuteness in logick and metaphysics; and his various compositions of a different cast exhibit not only wit, humour, and ridicule, but a knowledge, of nature, and art, and life: a combination, therefore, of those powers, when, (as the *Apology* says,) ‘the author was young, his invention at the height, and his reading fresh in his head,’ might surely produce the *Tale of a Tub*.” On the fly-leaf of a copy of the edition 1727, 12° which belonged to Mr. T. Park, the Antiquarian, and which is now in my possession, he has written the following remarks:—“In Dr. Lort’s Sale Catalogue, lot 3,421 of Swift’s Works in 8 vols. contained a note, which positively affirmed that the *Tale of a Tub* was the commencement of a satire on several religious sects, and was written by *Wm. Swift*, a relation, who sent it to the *Dean* for his perusal and critical remarks, a few of which he added, and then printed it, ever after which he became the *reputed author*.” Dr. Lort was born 1725, died 1790. Mr. Park has quoted the following story from some Newspaper:—“‘One of the most elegant scholars of the last century, the Cardinal de Polignac told the celebrated Dr. King of Oxford,

such a swarm of thoughts, so much of nature, and art, and life.' I wondered to hear him say of *Gulliver's Travels*: 'When once you have thought of big men and little men, it is very easy to do all the rest.' I endeavoured to make a stand for Swift, and tried to rouse those who were much more able to defend him; but in vain. Johnson, at last, of his own ac-

'one day in conversation, that Swift was really *un esprit createur*. 'What an eulogium from such a man, and at a time, too, when the French had not prostituted magnificent expressions to little matters!' 'Butler, from his prodigious knowledge of things, surprises us with more witty analogies than are to be found in all other writers collectively; and Swift, from his close and attentive observation of mankind, has been able to detect the most artfully concealed weaknesses of our nature.' *Strada* in the *Champion*, Aug. 14, 1814."

The first edition of the *Tale of a Tub* appeared in 1704. 8vo. I possess a copy of an edition published in 1711, 12mo. On the fly-leaf at the beginning of the book are the following announcements.

'Treatises written by the same Author, most of them mentioned in the following discourses; which will be speedily published:—

*A Character of the Present Set of Wits in this Island.*

*A Panegyric Essay upon the Number Three.*

*A Dissertation upon the Principal Productions of Grub-Street.*

*Letters upon a Dissection of Human Nature.*

*A Panegyrick upon the World.*

*An Analytical Discourse upon Zeal, Histori-theo-physi-logically considered.*

*A General History of Ears.*

*A Modest Defence of the Proceedings of the Rabble in all Ages.*

*A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities.*

*A Voyage into England, by a Person of Quality in TERRA AUSTRALIS INCÖGNITA, translated from the Original.*

*A Critical Essay upon the Art of Canting, Philosophically, Physically, and Musically considered.'*

Matter of this sort, had such treatises really appeared, would have afforded testimony the least liable to suspicion, and more valuable in itself than any declarations of authorship from Swift himself or any positive assertions of his friends. "Donne's introduction to his witty catalogue of curious books was written plainly in imitation of Rabelais, whom also Swift imitated, in a catalogue of odd treatises, prefixed to the *Tale of a Tub*." *Jos. Warton's Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope* 2, 423.



cord, allowed very great merit to the inventory of articles found in the pocket of *the Man Mountain*; particularly the description of his watch, which it was conjectured was his God, as he consulted it upon all occasions. He observed ‘that Swift put his name to but two things, (after he had a name to put,) *The Plan for the Improvement of the English Language*, and the last *Drapier’s Letter*.” Boswell 2, 328.

XVI. In considering the claims of Sir Philip Francis to the authorship of Junius, I am too impartial a judge to overlook or to suppress any favourable testimony, however opposed to my own particular opinion.

“The following Letter, written by Sir P. Francis to Major Cartwright, on his application to him to attend a select meeting of friends to a constitutional reform in Parliament, is thought to be more in the style and spirit of Junius than any former specimen. The Letter is extracted from *the Life and Correspondence of Major Cartwright*, just published:—

‘DEAR SIR,

My resolution on the subject of  
 ‘ your kind Letter received yesterday was founded  
 ‘ on experience, and taken with deliberation. You  
 ‘ are the only person, to whom it would be unbe-  
 ‘ coming in me to say, that I am not young enough  
 ‘ to embark again in what I believe to be a hopeless  
 ‘ enterprise. I doubt the actual existence of an En-  
 ‘ glish public for any great national purpose; and  
 ‘ if it exists, I am not its debtor. As far as I can  
 ‘ judge, the mass of the English population is inert:  
 ‘ the country has lost its passions, and is not fit for  
 ‘ action. This general opinion is open to excep-  
 ‘ tions, and you are one of them.

‘ April 2, 1811.’”

P. FRANCIS.’

*The Times* May 25, 1826.

XVII. ‘Do you think, asked I, that Sir Walter Scott’s *Novels* owe any part of their reputation to the concealment of the author’s name? ‘No,’ said Lord Byron, ‘such works do not gain or lose by it. I am at a loss to know his reason for not giving up the *incognito*, but that the reigning family could not have been very well pleased with *Waverley*. There is a degree of charlatanism in some authors keeping up the *unknown*. *Junius* owed much of his fame to that trick; and, now that it is known to be the work of Sir Philip Francis, who reads it? A political writer, and one who descends to personalities, such as disgrace *Junius*, should be immaculate as a public, as well as a private character, and Sir Philip was neither. He had his price, and was gagged by being sent to India. He there seduced another man’s wife. It would have been a new case for a Judge to sit in judgment on himself in a *Crim. Con.* It seems that his conjugal felicity was not great; for, when his wife died, he came into the room, where they were sitting up with the corpse, and said ‘*Solder her up, Solder her up.*’ He saw his daughter crying, and scolded her saying — ‘*An old hag, she ought to have died thirty years ago!*’ He married, shortly after, a young woman. He hated Hastings to a violent degree: all he hoped and prayed for was to outlive him. But many of the Newspapers of the day are written as well as *Junius*. Mathias’s book, *The Pursuits of Literature*, now almost a dead letter, had once a great fame.” Captain Medwin’s *Conversations with Lord Byron*.

This extract demands some notice from me.

I. It is strange that Lord Byron should have indulged in such idle conversation, so unworthy of his great genius and his literary reputation.

2. It is not fair to say “that *Junius* owed much of his fame to the trick of keeping up the *unknown*.”

His reputation stands on a solid rock, eternal as the pyramids, imperishable as genius, immortal as mind: *manet mansuraque est in animis hominum, in æternitate temporum, famâ rerum.* The trick was, — the necessity of the case; his doom was sealed, if his name was disclosed; and when we have a satisfactory and obvious motive for conduct, let us not ungenerously and unnecessarily look for secret and improper reasons.


3. His Lordship considered the question of the authorship to have been settled; but the world contained other minds besides his own, and in a world, where diversity of opinion is a property of human nature, it becometh a man to speak with diffidence on all doubtful points, and more especially when he has a very superficial knowledge of a controversy, and has perhaps contented himself with reading only that work, which he has made his oracle of truth, and his book of faith, or with opinions obtained in common conversation.

4. His Lordship, having settled the point of authorship, flippantly asks who reads Junius now that the work is known to have been the production of Sir Philip Francis? I answer the question by referring to the enlightened readers of every class, to the numerous editions of Junius, to the still continued and the regular sale of the work, to the still agitated question of the authorship, and to the various pamphlets on the subject, which still continue to issue from the press. He has asked one question, and I will ask another: — Does a work of extraordinary merit necessarily cease to be read, because we know the name of the writer? Did his *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* owe its reputation to the absence of the writer's name? Hath it ceased to interest us, since we have been informed that it was the production of his Lordship?

5. Sir Philip Francis's public character is not affected by his mission to India, whether he were Junius or not. The efforts of Junius had failed to accomplish his political purposes; he had ceased to write as Junius; he was under no obligation to write, and made no sacrifice of political honour by ceasing to write. If the principles and the practices of his Indian government were opposed to the doctrines which Sir Philip had maintained, and to the conduct which he had observed in England, then indeed we might declaim against his utter want of public virtue. But in point of fact the spirit of resistance, which he displayed against the flagitious practices of Governor Hastings, was perfectly consistent with the hatred of oppression, and the love of his country, and the zeal for the reformation of public abuses, and the arraignment of public criminals, which might have been expected from the author of *Junius*. The private motives, by which it is asserted that he was influenced in the prosecution of Mr. Hastings, may or may not have been his *primary* object or an *additional* inducement—I shall not stop to enquire into the fact, till it has been proved that there was no foundation *whatever* for the charges against the Governor; but I will not admit that Sir Philip Francis in this momentous prosecution shewed either any inconsistency with the character of Junius, or any dereliction of public principle, or any want of public virtue. It may often happen in the events of life that the private feelings of an individual prompt him to take the very part, which his public spirit would without that stimulus require from him. The only argument, by which Lord Byron maintains that Sir Philip Francis was not “an immaculate public character,” is that “he had his price and was gagged by being sent to India;” but this argument assumes his identity with Junius, which I deny.

6. If the maxim of Lord Byron were true, "that a political writer, and one who descends to personalities such as disgrace Junius, should be immaculate as a public, as well as a private character," the press would never groan under the weight of political writings, and the Houses of Parliament would have very few speakers, and Lord Erskine and Mr. Fox and many others, who possessed more public than private virtue, should not have championed public rights or redressed public wrongs.

7. His Lordship remarks that "Mathias's book, *The Pursuits of Literature*, now almost a dead letter, had once a great fame." The nature of the work, consisting of short sketches of public and private characters, in the shape of notes to a poem, was such that its popularity could not be expected to live very long; it is still read by scholars; and would continue to be read, like Junius, with the same avidity by readers of every class, if it had rivalled Junius in merit. His Lordship declares "that many of the Newspapers of the day are written as well as Junius." He has not referred to one Newspaper, and most certain it is that Junius has survived them all; 'his laurels wear well for they were dearly earned;' his monument remains, for it was the labour of his own hands; a more permanent glory invests his fictitious name than any political writer has obtained under a real signature; his works were admired by his contemporaries, and will continue to command the admiration of the latest posterity, for their intellectual merits and their rhetorical beauties — the whole nation, (except those who had experienced the weight of his pen, or who had earned and expected his public animadversion, with their connections and dependencies,) trumpeted his applause, and even now the sound reveberates in our ears.



XVIII. Junius says, when he is writing to Wilkes, "I am overcome with the *slavery of writing*." Mr. Taylor p. 382. cites this as an example of the colloquial language in which Junius indulges, and which Mr. T. discovers in the writings of Sir Philip Francis. But though I do not remember on what occasion Sir Philip has used such a phrase, nor how many years *subsequently* to the last *Letter* of Junius he has used it, the example may be fairly turned into a weapon against his claims; for it is unnatural to suppose that such a phrase would fall from the pen of one, who had at the time in question been for upwards of twenty years, and was still employed as a Secretary or as a Clerk. Writing could not be so irksome to *him*; nor could it be irksome to Burke, whose pen was so incessantly at work, though it might be irksome to General Lee or to Lord George Sackville. But it is possible that Sir Philip might, either by mere coincidence with Junius, or by imitation of him, use such a phrase and feel the truth of the idea, after his return from a high station in India, when he had forgotten, or was willing to forget, the secretaryships and clerkships of his youth.

XIX. "And in *evident mistakes*, wherein they differ from all other people, they still agree with each other. Junius says in the MS. from which our engraved fac-simile is taken, 'You shall endeavor to restore annual Parliaments:' and again, 'I will endeavor, (and if I live, will assuredly attempt it,) to convince the English nation.' If it had not been seen in the original Letter, this peculiarity would have remained unknown; for being so glaringly improper, it was corrected by the printer in the first edition. The same cause has prevented it from very frequently appearing in the works of Sir Philip Francis; but in the *Observations*

on *Mr. Hastings's Narrative*, printed in 1786., we find at p. 15., 'The artifices imputed to him, by which he is said to have endeavored to elude payment,' at p. 20., 'I endeavor to fulfil your orders,' and at p. 58., 'The odium of a vindictive, sanguinary character, which the narrative endeavors to fix,' etc. The repetition of the error in all these cases proves that it was not accidental. Again, Junius says to Lord Mansfield, 'I feel for human nature, when I see a man gifted as you are, descend to such vile *practise*,' Edn. 1772. (1,230.) Sir Philip Francis on March 7, 1786. in moving an amendment to the India Bill of 1784., says p. 63. 'Of the present Minister I am ready to submit that so base a *practise* is not to be suspected;' at p. 70. he mentions 'the *practise* and the wisdom of England ever since Parliaments had a being,' and in his admirable Speech on the Revenue Charge, published in 1787. he speaks p. 108. of 'a principle the most profligate, the most corrupt, the most dangerous, — I will not say that ever was avowed, for no man ever avowed such a principle before, — but, that ever was admitted into the *practise* of any Government.' In writings so correct as those of Junius, and with men so well educated as Sir Philip Francis, these partial aberrations from the right road are the more singular: and for my own part, I think that *they alone* are sufficient to settle the controversy." Mr. Taylor p. 380.

Mr. T. in p. 137-9. smiles at the advocate for Burke, when the latter says certain 'specimens of inverted construction' in Burke, corresponding to the style of Junius, would be *wholly satisfactory to his mind*. And yet the said advocate might fairly retort on Mr. Taylor, who attaches so much and too much importance to these orthographical mistakes common to Junius and Sir Philip Francis. A sin-

gle instance of such mistakes occurring in any writer of the same period is sufficient to overturn Mr. Taylor's argument, and such an instance may, no doubt, be found, if it be worth while to search for it. In the present day indeed Mr. Valpy uniformly prints 'endeavor' for 'endeavour,' and rejects the *u* in all cases. Mr. Taylor does not seem to be aware that in those early days, when Junius wrote, the same writer often differs from himself in his orthography even in the same Letter. I found this to be the case in respect to some Letters of General Lee, of which the originals were laid before me through the kindness of a friend.

XX. Had the Author of Junius drawn as much wisdom from life, as he did from books,— had he been accustomed to the busy hum of men,— had he frequented the crowded halls of nobles,— had he often championed popular rights in multitudinous assemblies, the harsher features of his mind would have been gradually softened; cunning would have taught him the necessity of pretending to feel human sympathies, if his heart had not been opened to generous sensibilities; he would have maintained his opinions though in a more subdued tone, with the same intellectual energy; he would have still pursued the public criminals, but would have not forgotten what was due to public decorum; the courtesies of society would have been generally observed, and some kind of specious respect would have been habitually shewn to noble rank, and elevated station, and commanding influence, and high reputation, and professional fame, and sacred royalty. Junius is the only well-educated writer, who seems not in these points to have been actuated by the ordinary feelings of mankind; and how shall we account for this perfect independence of mind and this reckless heart of steel, except by supposing him to have been par-



ticularly circumstanced, to have been placed in unavoidable seclusion, or to have indulged in solitary majesty? If, then, there be any force in this argument, (and there may not be much,) it operates against the claims made for Burke and Sir Philip Francis, while it strongly favours the pretensions of Lloyd.

XXI. Junius gives to us the notion of a writer not early trained to habits of composition, not much accustomed to deliver his opinions in public, through the press; and if there be any weight in this argument, it militates in some measure against the claims of Sir Philip Francis, and most strongly against the claims of Burke. The understanding of Junius belonged to the highest order of intellect; but it had not been well and constantly exercised by free discussions, in the intimacy of social life, with kindred spirits, and therefore it was not capable of exerting its fullest powers. His thoughts were more profound than comprehensive; he could seize a single topic, and handle it with greater effect than any other man, but he could not grasp a vast subject; he could lay his finger on the central point, but could not span the ample circumference; he saw distinctly the column before his eyes, but his vision was not enlarged enough to enable him to form a correct judgment on the fair proportions of an extensive building, surveying with mechanical precision the height and the breadth of every separate part, and with a master's knowledge the harmony of the entire structure. Now, while Burke had, like Junius, a microscopic eye, he at the same time always took a wide and extensive view of the subjects, which came under his discussion, and he in this respect leaves Junius at an immeasurable distance. Burke analyses his topics with the skill of science, pursues them with the penetration of philosophy,

details them with the fidelity of history, illustrates them with the diligence of criticism, and impresses the reader with the strongest admiration of his ample and capacious and comprehensive and universal mind. Junius exerts his mightiest efforts, and apparently exhausts himself, like a brilliant flame consumed in its own ebullition: Burke displays his energies without losing his power; like the luminary of day, retiring in golden splendour, his 'globe of light looking larger as he sets.'

I have the honour to be, Sir,

your respectful Servant,

E. H. BARKER.

*Thetford, Febr. 1, 1827.*

THE CLAIMS  
OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS  
TO THE  
AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS DISPROVED,  
*In a Letter addressed to Godfrey Higgins Esq.*

---

*Dear Sir,*

Accept this offering of respect from a friend, who admires your love of literature, your public principles, your moral worth, your social qualities, your generous spirit, and your frank and manly and independent character.

II. "The impression produced by a well-written pamphlet," (Mr. Taylor's,) says Dr. Parr in a Letter, which has been already laid before the public "and an elaborate critique on it in the *Edinburgh Review*, still direct the national faith towards Sir Philip Francis. He was too proud to tell a lie, and he disclaimed the work. He was too vain to refuse celebrity, which he was conscious of deserving. He was too intrepid to shrink, when danger had nearly passed by. He was too irascible to keep the secret,

by the publication of which he at this time of day could injure no party with which he is connected, nor any individual for whom he cared. Besides, dear Sir, we have many books of his writings upon many subjects, and all of them stamped with the same character of mind. Their general *lexis*, (as we say in Greek,) has no resemblance to the *lexis* of *Junius*; and the resemblance in particulars can have far less weight than the resemblance of which there is no vestige. Francis uniformly writes English. There is Gallicism in *Junius*. Francis is furious, but not malevolent. Francis is never cool, and *Junius* is seldom ardent." In another *Letter*, which has also been laid before the public, Dr. Parr says: — "We must all grant that a strong case has been made out for Francis; but I could set up very stout objections to those claims. It was not in his nature to keep a secret. He would have told it from vanity, or from his courage, or from his patriotism. His bitterness, his vivacity, his acuteness are stamped in characters very peculiar upon many publications that bear his name; and very faint indeed is their resemblance to the spirit, and, in an extended sense of the word, to the style of *Junius*."

Mr. Taylor will have serious difficulty in answering these objections to his hypothesis, made by such a master of style, such a judge of composition, and such an anatomist of the human heart as Dr. Parr. But, whilst I have been accustomed to place the greatest confidence in the critical discernment and accuracy of Dr. Parr, candour obliges me to own what my enlightened friend, the Rev. Dr. Crombie has been so good as to communicate to me by a Letter dated *York Terrace, London*, Febr. 5, 1827.: — "In your *Letter to G. H. Esq.* you state it as the opinion of Dr. Parr, that there is Gallicism in *Junius*. I have devoted considerable attention to the

idioms of the English language, and have had the curiosity to read more than one half of the first volume of Junius, since I received your *Letters*; but I have not detected any Gallicism. It is possible, however, though I am inclined to doubt the fact, that such improprieties may occasionally occur. It is singular, however, if this be the fact, that he should have written half a volume without transgressing. This is not the case with Hume, in whom some Gallicisms are perpetually recurring; nor in Dugald Stewart, who in one particular expression uniformly, I believe, employs a Scotticism. In the other characteristics of the two writers I quite concur in opinion with Dr. Parr." On Hume's Gallicisms I have cited some remarks of Johnson. James Elphinston published *Animadversions upon Elements of Criticism, calculated equally for the Benefit of that celebrated Work, and the Improvement of the English Style, with an Appendix upon Scotticisms, Lond. 1771. 8°.* There is also a Work by Dr. James Beattie, though it was published without any name, with the following title, *Scotticisms arranged in Alphabetical Order, Designed to Correct Improprieties of Speech and Writing, Edinb. 1787. 12°.* pp. 121. In a *Letter* dated *July 20th*, Dr. Crombie says:—"I should like much to have seen how Dr. Johnson could prove that the structure of Hume's English is French. He is chargeable with a few French idioms in certain forms of expression; but I consider the structure of his sentences to be more accordant with the genuine English style than Dr. Johnson's." *July 31st.* "Beattie's *List of Scotticisms* is very defective: Sir John Sinclair errs on the contrary side, rejecting English expressions as Scottish idioms." It is probable that either Johnson spoke vaguely, or Boswell reported incorrectly. Dr. Crombie, in an interesting work entitled *A Treatise on the Etymo-*

*logy and Syntax of the English Language, Edn. 2d.* 1809., has noticed the following Gallicisms in Hume, p. 380. “ ‘He neglected to profit of this occurrence.’ This phraseology occurs frequently in Hume. ‘To profit of’ is a Gallicism; it ought to be ‘profit *by* this occurrence.’ (P. 415. ‘For what chiefly deters the sons of science and philosophy from reading the Bible, and profiting of that lecture, but the stumbling-block of absolute inspiration?’ Geddes. ‘To profit of’ is a Gallicism; it should be, ‘profiting by.’)” P. 418. “ ‘The resolution was not the less fixed, that the secret was as yet communicated to very few, either in the French or English court.’ This passage from Hume I have not been able to find. Priestley observes that it involves a Gallicism, the word *that* being used instead of *as*. If the meaning intended be that some circumstances, previously mentioned, had not shaken the resolution, because the secret was as yet known to few, then Priestley’s observation is correct, and the word *as* should be substituted for *that*, to express the cause of the firmness. But, if the author intended to say, that the very partial discovery of the secret had not shaken the resolution, the clause is then perfectly correct. According to the former phraseology, the circumstance subjoined operated as a cause, preventing the resolution from being shaken; according to the latter, it had no effect, or produced no change of the previous determination. In other words, *the less fixed that* implies that the subject of the following clause did not affect that of the preceding; *the less fixed as* denotes that the latter circumstance contributed to the production of the former. As it is obvious that in such examples the definite article may refer either to the antecedent, or the subsequent clause, the distinction here specified, should, for the sake of perspicuity,

be carefully observed." It should seem that it was a general idea that the style of Hume was not English; for in a pamphlet entitled *Anecdotes of Junius, to which is prefixed the King's Reply*, without any date of the year, but published at Southampton, with an advertisement at the beginning, stating that the *Anecdotes* were collected in 1771., I find these words p. 46. :—" Another passage (in Burke's life) still more exceptionable, is the publication of his pamphlet entitled *Considerations on the Causes of the present Discontents*: in which it is objected against him by some that he has fairly thrown off the mask of the patriot, and exposed the bare face of the partisan. To this we cannot altogether subscribe, though certain it is that the difference of sentiment, with regard to immaterial circumstances, affected by our popular patriots, like the hair-breadth distinctions of polemical divines, have rather served to perplex the general cause of debate, and puzzle the disputants, than to clear up or enforce the main point of dispute. Thus this spirited and elaborate discussion of public grievances, by its authors dissenting in particulars from the mode of relief proposed by others, produced a futile altercation; a war of words with a woman; more profuse in their utterance than accurate in their use. But she was popular — she was distinguishedly called the *Female Historian* — and as such had been long spoken of with recommendatory respect in a great assembly by the pompous, patriotic peer we have so often mentioned; a lord just as capable a critic, as the lady is an author. The Earl of Chatham, however, has declared, and that in a manner which no gentleman will contradict, that Mrs. Macaulay is a most excellent writer; and who, that knows how well his Lordship writes himself, will dare to doubt it, except those who affect to lament,

that of the two most favourite Histories of this country, *the one was penned by a man, who was a perfect stranger to the idiom of the English tongue,* and the other by a woman equally so to the grammar of any language whatever? But the male is a Scotch philosopher, and the female an English patriot; circumstances, which with their respective parties, cover, like charity, a multitude of sins, whether against loyalty, grammar, or common sense."

III. "It remains to consider the claim of Sir Philip Francis. This has been ably brought forward in two pamphlets, intituled, *A Discovery of the Author of the Letters of Junius, founded on such Evidence and Illustrations, as explain all the Mysterious Circumstances and apparent Contradictions which have contributed to the Concealment of this 'most important Secret of our Times.'* And, *The Identity of Junius with a distinguished Living Character established: including the Supplement, consisting of Fac-similes of Hand-writing, and other Illustrations.* (Printed for Taylor and Hessey in Fleet-street.) The external evidence, produced in these pamphlets in favour of Sir Philip Francis, is very strong:—so strong, perhaps, that, if he had been tried upon it for a libel, and the case had rested upon the facts, from which this evidence is formed, the judge would have directed the jury to find him guilty. But the internal evidence against him, from the inequality of his acknowledged writings, is also very strong: if the able author of the article *Junius* in the *Edinburgh Review* for Nov. 1817. had not professed a different opinion, the present writer would have pronounced it decisive. That respectable writer produces several passages from the works, of which Sir Philip was certainly the author, and finds in them a similar tone and equal merit. With due deference to his authority, the Remini-



scent begs leave to think that, if these passages shew that Sir Philip was no mean writer, they also prove that he was not Junius. To bring the question to a direct issue, are the glow and loftiness discernible in every page of Junius, once visible in any of these extracts? Where do we find in the writings of Sir Philip, those thoughts that breathe, those words that burn, which Junius scatters in every page? a single drop of the *cobra capella*, which falls from Junius so often? The advocates of the claim in favour of Sir Philip urge, as a strong circumstance in its support, that without family, without patronage, without any one pretension to the notice of the King or the Minister, he was suddenly raised from an obscure seat in the War-Office, to a situation of dignity and emolument, which a nobleman would be happy to procure for his son. This, they say, shews that something was attached to Sir Philip Francis, which rendered the purchase of him, at that time, even at a very high price, an object to Government. Now at the critical moment, in which Sir Philip was thus promoted, Junius ceased to write:—this, they conclude, makes it highly probable that the silence of Junius was purchased by the promotion of Sir Philip.\* But this is open to several observations. In all his correspondence with Woodfall, Junius describes himself,—and very unaffectedly,—as a man of fortune, mixing at large with the world; and promises to indemnify him

\*“The Reminiscent has been informed by the present (1824.) Bishop of Durham that Sir Philip owed the continuance of his seat in the War-Office, to the kindness of Lord Barrington, the prelate's brother; and that Sir Philip's appointment in India was chiefly, if not wholly, due to his Lordship's recommendation of him to Lord North. After this,—if we consider how Junius wrote of Lord Barrington, we cannot be surprised that, if Sir Philip were the author of Junius's *Letters*, he should wish it to be unknown.”

against any pecuniary loss, which he might sustain in consequence of any prosecution for the *Letters*, leaving him, however, to abide its other consequences. Nothing of this is reconcileable with the situation of Sir Philip Francis at the time, when these *Letters* appeared. — It should be added that Sir Philip was then very young. Junius had evidently been a great constitutional reader: does Sir Philip appear to have been such from any of his writings, even the latest? But to bring the matter at once to issue, we shall transcribe from the article on Junius, in the *Edinburgh Review*, a passage from a publication, in which Sir Philip attacks Lord Thurlow, — then, insert a passage, in which Junius attacks Lord Mansfield. We request our readers will compare them; and afterwards compare the extract from Junius with the passage on Hyder Ally's invasion of the Carnatic, transcribed from one of Mr. Burke's Speeches, in a future part of this publication. Will he not find the inferiority of Sir Philip so great, as to render it impossible that he should have been the author of Junius's *Letters*? On the other hand, will he not find the difference, we do not say in the styles, but in the minds of Junius and Burke, to be such as to render it quite evident that Burke and Junius are not the same person?

*Sir Philip Francis's Character of Lord Thurlow.*

‘ It is well known that a gross and public insult had  
 ‘ been offered to the memory of General Clavering and  
 ‘ Colonel Monson, by a person of high rank in this  
 ‘ country. He was happy, when he heard that his name  
 ‘ was included in it with their's. So highly did he re-  
 ‘ spect the character of those men, that he deemed it  
 ‘ an honour to share in the injustice it had suffered. It  
 ‘ was in compliance with the forms of the House, and  
 ‘ not to shelter himself, or out of tenderness to the

party, that he forbore to name him. He meant to describe him so exactly, that he could not be mistaken. He declared in his place, in a great assembly, and in the course of a grave deliberation, *that it would have been happy for this country, if General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis had been drowned in their passage to India.* If this poor and spiteful invective had been uttered by a man of no consequence or repute, by any light, trifling, inconsiderate person, by a Lord of the Bedchamber, for example, or any of the other silken Barons of modern days, he should have heard it with indifference. But, when it was seriously urged and deliberately insisted on by a grave Lord of Parliament — by a Judge — by a man of ability and eminence in his profession, whose personal disposition was serious, who carried gravity to sternness, and sternness to ferocity, it could not be received with indifference, or answered without resentment. Such a man would be thought to have inquired before he pronounced. From his mouth a reproach was a sentence, an invective was a judgment. The accidents of life, and not any original distinction that he knew of, had placed him too high, and himself at too great a distance from him, to admit of any other answer than a public defiance, for General Clavering, for Colonel Monson, and for himself. This was not a party-question, nor should it be left to so feeble an advocate as he was, to support it. The friends and fellow-soldiers of General Clavering and Colonel Monson would assist him in defending their memory. He demanded and expected the support of every man of honour in that House, and in the kingdom. What character was safe, if slander was permitted to attack the reputation of two of the most honourable and virtuous men, that ever were employed, or ever perished in the service of their country? He knew that the authority of this man was not without weight; but he had an infinitely higher authority to oppose it. He had the happiness of hearing the merits of General Clavering and Colonel Monson acknowledged and applauded in terms, to

' which he was not at liberty to do more than to allude :  
 ' they were rapid and expressive. He must not venture  
 ' to repeat, lest he should do them injustice, or violate  
 ' the forms of respect, where essentially he owed and  
 ' felt the most. But he was sufficiently understood.  
 ' The generous sensations, that animate the Royal mind,  
 ' were easily distinguished from those, which rankled in  
 ' the heart of that person, who was supposed to be the  
 ' keeper of the Royal conscience.'

*Extract from the Letter of Junius to Lord Mansfield.*

' You will not question my veracity, when I assure  
 ' you that it has not been owing to any particular respect  
 ' for your person, that I have abstained from you so long.  
 ' Besides the distress and danger, with which the press  
 ' is threatened, when your Lordship is party, and the  
 ' party is to be judge, I confess I have been deterred by  
 ' the difficulty of the task. Our language has no term  
 ' of reproach, the mind has no idea of detestation, which  
 ' has not already been happily applied to you and ex-  
 ' hausted. Ample justice has been done by abler pens  
 ' than mine to the separate merits of your life and cha-  
 ' racter. Let it be my humble office to collect the scat-  
 ' tered sweets, till their united virtue tortures the sense.  
 ' Permit me to begin with paying a just tribute to Scotch  
 ' sincerity, wherever I find it. I own I am not apt to  
 ' confide in the professions of gentlemen of that coun-  
 ' try, and when they smile, I feel an involuntary emotion  
 ' to guard myself against mischief. With this general  
 ' opinion of an ancient nation, I always thought it much  
 ' to your Lordship's honour, that in your earlier days  
 ' you were but little infected with the prudence of your  
 ' country. You had some original attachments, which  
 ' you took every proper opportunity to acknowledge.  
 ' The liberal spirit of youth prevailed over your native  
 ' discretion. Your zeal in the cause of an unhappy  
 ' Prince was expressed with the sincerity of wine, and  
 ' some of the solemnities of religion. This I conceive  
 ' is the most amiable point of view, in which your cha-

‘ racter has appeared. Like an honest man, you took  
‘ that part in politics, which might have been expected  
‘ from your birth, education, country, and connexions.  
‘ There was something generous in your attachment to  
‘ the banished House of Stuart. We lament the mis-  
‘ takes of a good man, and do not begin to detest him  
‘ until he affects to renounce his principles. Why did  
‘ you not adhere to that loyalty you once professed ?  
‘ Why did you not follow the example of your worthy  
‘ brother ? With him you might have shared in the ho-  
‘ nour of the Pretender’s confidence — with him you  
‘ might have preserved the integrity of your character,  
‘ and England, I think, might have spared you without  
‘ regret. Your friends will say, perhaps, that, although  
‘ you deserted the fortune of your liege Lord, you have  
‘ adhered firmly to the principles, which drove his father  
‘ from the throne ; — that without openly supporting  
‘ the person, you have done essential service to the  
‘ cause, and consoled yourself for the loss of a favorite  
‘ family, by reviving and establishing the maxims of their  
‘ government. This is the way, in which a Scotchman’s  
‘ understanding corrects the errors of his heart. My  
‘ Lord, I acknowledge the truth of the defence, and can  
‘ trace it through all your conduct. I see through your  
‘ whole life one uniform plan to enlarge the power of  
‘ the crown, at the expense of the liberty of the subject.  
‘ To this object your thoughts, words, and actions, have  
‘ been constantly directed. In contempt or ignorance of  
‘ the common law of England, you have made it your  
‘ study to introduce into the Court, where you preside,  
‘ maxims of jurisprudence unknown to Englishmen.  
‘ The Roman code, the law of nations, and the opinions  
‘ of foreign civilians, are your perpetual theme ; — but  
‘ who ever heard you mention *Magna Charta*, or the  
‘ Bill of Rights with approbation or respect ? By such  
‘ treacherous arts, the noble simplicity and the spirit of  
‘ our laws were first corrupted. The Norman conquest  
‘ was not complete until Norman lawyers had introduced  
‘ their laws, and reduced slavery to a system. This one  
‘ leading principle directs your interpretation of the

† laws, and accounts for your treatment of Juries. It is  
‘ not in political questions only, (for there the courtier  
‘ might be forgiven,) but let the cause be what it may,  
‘ your understanding is equally on the rack, either to  
‘ contract the power of the Jury, or to mislead their  
‘ judgment. For the truth of this assertion I appeal to  
‘ the doctrine you delivered in Lord Grosvenor’s cause.  
‘ An action for criminal conversation being brought by  
‘ a peer against a prince of the blood, you were daring  
‘ enough to tell the Jury that in fixing the damages they  
‘ were to pay no regard to the quality or fortune of the  
‘ parties ;—that it was a trial between A and B ;—that  
‘ they were to consider the offence in a moral light only,  
‘ and give no greater damages to a peer of the realm  
‘ than to the meanest mechanic. I shall not attempt to  
‘ refute a doctrine, which, if it was meant for law, carries  
‘ falsehood and absurdity upon the face of it ; but if it  
‘ was meant for a declaration of your political creed, is  
‘ clear and consistent. Under an arbitrary Government  
‘ all ranks and distinctions are confounded. The honour  
‘ of a nobleman is no more considered than the reputa-  
‘ tion of a peasant ; for with different liveries they are  
‘ equally slaves. Even in matters of private property we  
‘ see the same bias and inclination to depart from the de-  
‘ cisions of your predecessors, which you certainly ought  
‘ to receive as evidence of the common law. Instead of  
‘ those certain, positive rules, by which the judgment of  
‘ a court of law should be invariably determined, you  
‘ have fondly introduced your own unsettled notions of  
‘ equity and substantial justice. Decisions given upon  
‘ such principles do not alarm the public so much as they  
‘ ought, because the consequence and tendency of each  
‘ particular instance is not observed or regarded. In the  
‘ mean time the practice gains ground ; the Court of  
‘ King’s Bench becomes a Court of Equity, and the  
‘ Judge, instead of consulting strictly the law of the land,  
‘ refers only to the wisdom of the Court, and to the pu-  
‘ rity of its own conscience. The name of Mr. Justice  
‘ Yates will naturally revive in your mind some of those  
‘ emotions of fear and detestation, with which you always

---

‘ beheld him. That great lawyer, that honest man, saw your whole conduct in the light that I do. After years of ineffectual resistance to the pernicious principles introduced by your Lordship, and uniformly supported by your humble friends upon the Bench, he determined to quit a Court, whose proceedings and decisions he could neither assent to with honour nor oppose with success.’

“ Such, in our opinion, is the state of the question ; all external evidence is in favour of Sir Philip, all internal evidence is against him. Thus the argument on each side neutralizes the argument on the other, and the pretension of Sir Philip vanishes. A third hypothesis is, therefore, necessary: the conclusion, to which it should lead, ought to be such as is consistent with the evidence on each side, and restores to each its individual activity. Now this is done, — and perhaps can only be done, — by supposing that Sir Philip was not Junius, but the amanuensis of Junius — that the real Junius was too high to be bought, so that, when he made his terms with Government, he was contented to remain in a proud obscurity, — but stipulated a boon for his scribe, and was of consequence enough to insist that the boon should be liberal. Now several passages in Junius’s *Letters* seem to shew that he employed an amanuensis. In a Note to Woodfall (1, 210.) he says: — ‘ You shall have the Letter some time to-morrow; it cannot be corrected and copied sooner.’ In another, (1, 214.) he says: — ‘ The enclosed, though begun within these few days, has been greatly laboured. It is very correctly copied.’ In another he mentions ‘ the gentleman, who transacts the conveyancing part of their correspondence,’ and who told him, ‘ there was much difficulty last night,’ (1, 246.) That gentleman, therefore, must have known that a mysterious something attended those *Letters*. Mr. Jackson’s testi-

mony, as reported by Woodfall, is that ‘this gentleman wore a bag and sword,’ (1, 43.) If the recollection of the writer, that Junius’s *Letter to the King* is in a hand-writing different from the hand-writing of the other *Letters*, be accurate, the evidence for an amanuensis is certainly very strong. If the copies, to which Junius refers, were made, not by himself, but, which is certainly most probable, by some other person, it follows incontrovertibly that Sir Philip Francis and Junius were different persons. We do not, however, say that Sir Philip was a mere copyist:—he may occasionally have conveyed useful information, and suggested useful hints to his principal; so that, to a certain extent, he might, without impropriety, be said to have been his collaborator. To this hypothesis the Reminiscent begs leave to say that he inclines: it includes all the *data* required by him for the author of *Junius*; it equally admits the arguments in favour of Sir Philip Francis from external, and the arguments against him from internal evidence, and reconciles and gives activity to each.

“Junius, in his dedication prefixed to his own edition of his *Letters*, declares that ‘he was the sole depositary of his secret.’ This seems not to be easily reconcileable with what he says in one of his *Letters* to Woodfall:—‘The truth is that there are people about me, whom I would wish not to contradict, and who had rather see Junius in the Papers ever so improperly than not at all.’ (*Private Letters* No. 6.) This sounds like the language of a partisan, who felt both his talents and his chains; and it may be thought a confirmation, though slight, of the Reminiscent’s hypothesis.”

*The Reminiscences* of Charles Butler Esq.  
p. 92. ed. 4.



1. I agree with my enlightened and excellent friend, Mr. Butler, in many of his positions; those I shall pass over, and merely notice such as require some observations.

2. Mr. Butler thinks that so strong a case is made out for Sir Philip Francis, that a judge would, in a trial for a libel, have directed the jury to find him guilty. My opinion is that a sagacious, patient, investigating, careful judge would not have discovered evidence enough to give such a direction to a jury; for the case does not rest on many undeniable facts — it is not supported by many strong presumptions — it has not that minute circumstantiality, which is in all doubtful cases a main or the sole test of truth, sometimes of falsehood. I am entitled to make this remark, because I have been engaged in a diligent examination of the evidence, which I have found and proved to be much weaker than the world has supposed. Had I been the advocate for Sir Philip Francis in such a case of libel, I should have in the strongest manner deprecated any such verdict by shewing that the greater part of the evidence produced by Mr. Taylor is consistent with the idea that Sir Philip was not the composer of the *Letters*, but the amanuensis of Junius, and that the remainder of the testimony, to which alone the jury should look, did not bear about it that character of certainty, which would in so doubtful a matter justify a verdict against my client. I shall not on the present occasion examine the claims of Sir Philip to be considered as the amanuensis of Junius; he may or may not have been the amanuensis; I know not what opinion I might on mature consideration form about this point.

3. I perfectly agree with Mr. Butler in thinking that the acknowledged writings of Sir Philip do not exhibit powers of mind and powers of composition

equal to the writings of Junius. Mr. B. has satisfactorily established his point by the fair parallel, which he has made between Sir Philip's character of Lord Thurlow and Junius's character of Lord Mansfield. He must be a bold man, and possess more boldness than judgment, who ventures to contend, unsupported by strong evidence, against the deliberate and solemn and impartial authority of Dr. Parr and Mr. Butler, who are most distinguished writers, and from their scholastic habits and professional pursuits, most admirable judges of literary composition and of legal evidence, that Sir Philip Francis as a writer is not inferior to Junius, and that the traces of equality are so visible in Sir Philip as to justify him in identifying Sir Philip with Junius. Mr. Taylor had delivered such an opinion before he was acquainted with the sentiments of those illustrious scholars; and it remains to be seen whether he will persevere in it now that he has become acquainted with them. It is true that the able writer of the article in the *Edinburgh Review* has expressed the same opinion as Mr. Taylor; but the reviewer had not seen the opposite opinion of Dr. Parr and Mr. Butler, and the question is whether the reviewer would now hold and assert the same opinion? For it is evident that he had not closely investigated the comparative merits of Junius and Sir Philip Francis as writers; he contents himself with quoting *four* splendid passages from the writings of Sir Philip, all of which occur in Mr. Taylor's book, and from them he infers the *general* equality of style between the two writers.

But I must be permitted to remark that Junius, when he writes under the signature of *Junius*, is always true to himself; the same spirit, the same vigour, the same sarcasm, the same point, the same mind, the same heart, the same intelligence, the

same elegance of thought, the same splendour of diction, the same harmony of style, pervades every *Letter*. And when we find Sir Philip Francis 30 or 40 years after Junius had ceased to employ his pen, making Parliamentary speeches, writing pamphlets, essays in Magazines, and articles in Newspapers, we may well expect, if he were Junius, to perceive in every page of his avowed compositions that intellectual energy, which would be alone worthy of the mature mind of Junius, and that rhetorical beauty, which would be alone worthy of his improved taste. Any comparative deficiency in the matter and the style of Sir Philip's avowed productions, or any admitted inequality in them to the papers of Junius, afford to us a very satisfactory and a very safe argument, a most unsuspecting and a most certain criterion for rejecting the claims of Sir Philip to the authorship of Junius.

4. Mr. Butler observes that Junius was evidently a great 'constitutional reader;' I agree with him in thinking so, because I cannot read Junius carefully without discovering the fact. He asks if the speeches and the writings, even the latest, of Sir Philip exhibit equal traces of such reading? This is a question which I leave to Mr. Taylor to answer, with the remark that, if he cannot answer it affirmatively, and on the strength of undeniable facts, he must admit it to be, from its unsuspecting nature, an argument entitled to much weight. Now it is true that Mr. Taylor p. 355. has written thus:—"Without being duly educated for the Bar, each had a considerable knowledge of the law; each entertained a hostile feeling towards those lawyers, whether Lord Chief Justice or Lord Chancellor, who suffered their minds to be swayed by the illiberal maxims and practices of their profession; and each thought that few lawyers could be found, who

were above such influence. Both were profoundly intimate with the theory and practice of the Constitution, and though scarcely any two persons think alike on this widely-branching subject, yet those before us take the same view, from first principles to their remotest consequences." But Mr. Taylor, in making these remarks, was not aware that he would be opposed to the opinion of a 'constitutional reader,' and a profound lawyer, and a reflecting man like Mr. Butler.

IV. Mr. Butler, in a private *Letter* to a friend, who published it in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, and which *Letter* he has re-published in his *Reminiscences* p. 77. ed. 4th, remarks:—"Arguing synthetically, we (Wilkes and I) determined that Junius was a man of high rank, from the tone of equality, which he seemed to use quite naturally in his addresses to persons of rank, and in his expressions respecting them." He adds in a Note (p. 81.) "*Letters to Woodfall*, No. 6. he says: 'Be assured I am far above pecuniary views.' In his *Miscellaneous Letter*, No. 54. V. 3. p. 202. he insinuates that his 'rank and fortune placed him above a common bribe.' In another *Letter*, V. 1. p. 71. he hints that 'his name might carry some authority with it.' His *private Letter*, No. 17. contains this remarkable sentence: 'I doubt much whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you; but, if things take the turn I expect, you shall know me by my works.' This may be thought to intimate an expectation that Government-favour would probably be, before long, at his disposal." The last passage is quoted by Mr. Taylor p. 365. and he has this comment on it:—"Junius certainly hit the mark, though perhaps without intending it, when he told Woodfall, *you shall know me by my*

*works.\** It is by these alone that he is now revealed: no secrecy has been violated, — no sanctuary invaded." But in p. 93. he writes thus: — "At the meeting of parliament in January 1770. a great struggle was made to effect a change of Ministers. On this occasion it is evident how much he was *personally interested*. A fortnight before the opening, he wrote to Woodfall: — 'I doubt much whether I shall ever have the pleasure of knowing you; *but if things take the turn I expect*, you shall *know me by my works*.'" See also pp. 146-346. Hence it is evident that Mr. Taylor agrees with Mr. Butler in the interpretation of these words.

Mr. Butler p. 85. makes these reflections: — "In the Letter, which we have transcribed, notice is

\* Mr. Taylor has also quoted the same passage in p. 114., where he is endeavouring to shew 'the very friendly tone, which pervades the private correspondence (of Junius) with Woodfall,' and the 'anxiety manifested exclusively for Woodfall.' The object is to prove the personal acquaintance between Junius and Woodfall, and thus to identify Junius and Sir Philip Francis, because Woodfall and Sir Philip were schoolfellows. But, in order to shew the fallacy of such reasoning, and the probability that Junius's personal feelings towards Woodfall were only founded on political sympathies, and connected with his private and political objects, we may remark that 'the anxiety' manifested by Junius for his printer in the passages cited is fairly met by the indifference equally manifested towards his printer in other passages also cited by Mr. Taylor, who most innocently says in p. 115.: "Yet in other instances he displayed no such anxiety for the safety of his printer." Amidst 'the anxiety' and 'the indifference' there is no safe anchorage for Mr. Taylor's argument to rest. Junius either had the personal acquaintance with and the personal feeling towards Woodfall; or had not either. Now if he had both, they would appear on all occasions; no exception can be allowed, because all the occasions would be in the *private* correspondence with Woodfall, which would be at the time necessarily *sacred* between them. But in point of fact they do not appear on all occasions. Then he had them not; and we have the positive authority of Junius himself, that he had not a personal knowledge of Woodfall, and that authority, on the principle of Dr. Johnson already adverted to, supersedes all reasoning on the subject, because it was a *spontaneous* admission: — "I DOUBT MUCH WHETHER I SHALL EVER HAVE THE PLEASURE OF KNOWING YOU."

taken of the tone of equality, in which Junius mentions and addresses the very highest personages of his times: how difficult it is for a person of inferior rank to do this, appears from Swift's *Letters*, and anecdotes of him, which have been transmitted to us, in which his consciousness of inferiority, notwithstanding his assumption of equality, pierces through every disguise. To all his illustrious contemporaries Cicero ever writes *en pair*: d'Alembert too, in the midst of all his flattery, (through which, however, his ironical smile is often seen,) keeps the King of Prussia at a respectful distance. How much the learned man or elegant scholar lowers himself by frequenting the tables or the *conversations* of the great, may be seen in a work of d'Alembert, which should lie on the desk of every scholar, his *Essay on the Intercourse of Men of Letters with Persons high in Rank or Office*. The same subject is treated in an agreeable and interesting manner in the *Literary Character* of Mr. d'Israeli, now in its third edition."\*

\* The following matter is presented to Mr. Butler's notice.—“The friendship of two such excellent personages as the Duke and Dutchess of Queensbury, did in truth compensate poor Gay's want of pension and preferment. They behaved to him constantly with that delicacy, and sense of seeming equality, as never to suffer him for a moment to feel his state of dependence. Let every man of letters, who wishes for patronage, read D' Alembert's *Essay on Living with the Great*, before he enters the house of a patron. And let him always remember the fate of Racine, who having drawn up, at Madame Maintenon's secret request, a memorial, that strongly painted the distresses of the French nation, the weight of their taxes, and the expences of the court, she could not resist the importunity of Lewis XIV., but shewed him her friend's paper; against whom the King immediately conceived a violent indignation, because a poet should dare to busy himself with politics. Racine had the weakness to take this anger of the King so much to heart, that it brought on a low fever, which hastened his death. The Dutchess of Queensbury would not have so betrayed her poetical friend, Gay.” Jos. Warton's *Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope* 2,316. The reader will observe the syntactical imperfection of this extract: *Racine, who—she could not*.

The extracts suggest to me some observations, which are not unimportant.

1. Mr. Butler considers Junius to have been 'a man of rank from the tone of equality, which he seems to use quite naturally in his addresses to persons of rank, and in his expressions respecting them,' and from the difficulty, which a man of an inferior rank would experience in maintaining this 'tone of equality.' Now it is rather extraordinary that he should not have applied this remark to Sir Philip Francis, and seized it as a fair and strong argument against his claims. For, 1. Sir Philip was 'a man of inferior rank;' 2. he was a man of inferior station, holding at the time an under-clerkship in the War-Office; 3. he must, at the age of 27, (when the earliest known production of Junius appeared,) be presumed not to have attained what Mr. Butler properly considers to be a matter of difficult attainment, viz. 'the tone of equality' alluded to; 4. the humbling servility of office and the habitual servitude of mind connected with the daily performance of official duties, and the daily submission to superior authority, continued as they were for a series of years, most plainly demonstrate that Sir Philip could not possibly be the Junius of high mind, and of high spirit, and of high rank, and of elevated station, whom we seek.

2. I am ready to admit that Junius might have been a man of high station, or under the influence of men of high station or of high rank, in which case he would on most occasions write conformably to their feelings, though not perhaps on all — it would be essential for him as the person employed and for the interests of his employers, that he should discipline his mind and his style into the art of doing so. All the passages cited by Mr. Butler are consistent with this idea. But I am not prepared to admit

that Junius was himself a man of high rank, or a scion of nobility, because there is a passage in one of his *Letters*, which, on the principle of Dr. Johnson about spontaneous and forced admissions and acknowledgments, is perfectly inconsistent with the notion; — “ Besides that I approve highly of Lord Chatham’s idea of infusing a portion of new health into the Constitution to enable it to bear its infirmities, (a brilliant expression, and full of intrinsic wisdom,) other reasons concur in persuading me to adopt it. I have no objection to paying him such compliments as carry a condition with them, and either bind him firmly to the cause, or become the bitterest reproach to him, if he deserts it. Of this last I have not the most distant suspicion. There is another man indeed, with whose conduct I am not so completely satisfied. Yet even *he*, I think, has not resolution enough to do anything flagrantly impudent in the face of his country. At the same time that I think it good policy to pay those compliments to Lord Chatham, which he has nobly deserved, I SHOULD BE GLAD TO MORTIFY THOSE CONTEMPTIBLE CREATURES WHO CALL THEMSELVES NOBLEMEN, WHOSE WORTHLESS IMPORTANCE DEPENDS ENTIRELY UPON THEIR INFLUENCE OVER BOROUGHS.” (1,290.) This passage may enable us to prove some other points, 1. that Junius was not a member of the House of Lords, because it proves that he was not a nobleman, 2. that Lord Orford could not have been Junius, as some ingenious persons have contended, 3. that Single-Speech Hamilton was not the author, 4. that Mr. Butler and Mr. Wilkes were mistaken, when they “thought Junius’s high-wrought panegyric of Lord Chatham (2,310. Aug. 31, 1771.) to be ironical,” *Reminiscences* p. 80.; for Junius in the passage just cited, which is from a *Letter* addressed to Mr. Wilkes



himself (1,290. Sept. 7, 1771.) justifies the compliments on the grounds both of good policy and of real desert, and in an earlier part of the same *Letters*, is another favourable notice of Lord Chatham: "Lord Chatham's project, for instance, of increasing the number of Knights of Shires, appears to me admirable, and the moment we have obtained a triennial Parliament, it ought to be tried." There is also the following passage in another *Letter* to Mr. Wilkes, (1,320, Oct. 16, 1771.) "Nothing can be more true than what you say about *great* men: they are indeed a worthless, pitiful race. Chatham has gallantly thrown away the scabbard, and never flinched. From that moment I began to like him."

V. "Arguing synthetically," says Mr. Butler, (*Reminiscences* p. 80.) "we (Wilkes and I) determined that Junius was not an author by profession, from the visible improvement, which, from time to time, was discernible in his style. To this opinion the Reminiscent still inclines, — in consequence of the numerous errors of grammar and construction, which may be discovered in these celebrated *Letters*, and which would not have appeared in the works of a person of Junius's exquisite taste and discernment, if he had been accustomed to literary composition."

1. Mr. Butler does not apply the above words to the case of Sir Philip Francis, but they are capable of being so applied with good effect.

2. Mr. B. must be allowed to be a most competent judge as to the facts, whether Junius was, or was not, 'an author by profession,' and whether his style did or did not from time to time manifest symptoms of improvement; I will admit both the facts on his authority.

3. Now, then, I ask Mr. Taylor whether he supposes that an inferior Clerk in the War-Office, which

Mr. T. himself confesses to have required from its officers 'constant attendance,' could, at the age of 27, (when the earliest production of Junius appeared,) have found leisure first to learn the profession of authorship, secondly to practise it, thirdly to commence the practise with writing for a regular series of years papers perfect in their style of composition? The fact is not at all credible; so opposed to common sense and common experience, that, if it had actually occurred, it must be regarded as miraculous, and the testimony even of an ocular witness could not easily work its way to our belief.

4. Mr. Taylor p. 164. writes thus:—“Of a character perfectly similar Sir Philip Francis is an acknowledged scholar, without having studied at either University. There is in all his writings a frequent and happy reference to the Greek and Roman authors, but especially to the latter; and in Horace he has proved himself a very sound and ingenious critic. To the tuition of so profound and elegant a scholar as Dr. Francis, may be ascribed this familiarity with the works of the ancients; and the advantages afforded him in this respect, would amply supply, if they did not surpass, those which are usually met with in a College-education.” And does Mr. Taylor suppose that a scholar of this sort, when he was writing at the age of 27, would have experienced those difficulties in composition, which Mr. Butler justly thinks Junius to have encountered? Let Mr. Taylor consider what he has written in p. 40. :—“The education of Sir Philip was superintended by his father, whose talents and principles, it has been already shewn, were somewhat of the cast of those of Junius. He was a man skilled in political controversy, deeply read in ancient history, and who had mingled not a little with those of the great world, to whom the secret causes of many

events, both interesting and important, were at the time undoubtedly laid open. In the quality of an instructor, — *communi ductus officio et quodam amore operis*, — much might be expected from a man possessing these advantages, but when that instructor was also the father, his advice, experience, and example would weigh much heavier. It is curious to see how these opportunities were improved by the inclination of the son. On this head our authority is again unexceptionable; for Sir Philip Francis thus describes the care, which had been taken in his earlier years, to implant in his mind the seeds of wisdom: — ‘ Ever since I have been concerned in the transaction of public affairs, or indeed of any other, it has been my endeavour and practise, taught me perhaps by instruction, and certainly confirmed by habit, to turn every thing I read, or hear, or see, or observe, in the transactions of life, whether it passes before me, or whether I find it recorded in history, some way or other to my own account, that is, to the improvement of my judgment, or to the direction of my conduct.’ (*Parliam. Deb.* 35, 639.)” Dr. Francis, the father of Sir Philip, was a man of intellect and a master of style, and under such an instructor as Sir Philip himself describes his father to have been, the son would not at the age of 27 have felt those drawbacks in composition, which are admitted to have been felt by Junius.

5. “ In the disorder and embarrassment,” says Mr. Taylor p. 355., “ with which Sir Philip spoke in Parliament, may be traced one cause why the flow of his eloquence did not discover him to be Junius; and another may be found in that habit of composition and selection, which he cultivated in writing, which made composition such a labour to Junius, and which impeded, it is said, the pen of Sir Philip, in drawing up his Indian minutes.” And

does Mr. Taylor suppose that an under-Clerk in the War-Office, who has a literary turn of mind, could, out of the very little leisure, of which his official duties would leave him in possession, find time to indulge his taste for this 'compression and selection' in what he wrote? Had Sir Philip written freely and easily, he could not as an inferior Clerk, have enjoyed leisure enough from the pressing business of the Office, to write the public *Letters* of Junius and to conduct the private correspondence with Woodfall and Wilkes; but, as Mr. Taylor admits Sir Philip to have written with great difficulty, he has only armed me with a weapon, which is triumphantly employed against him.

6. Mr. Butler speaks of "numerous errors of grammar and construction, which may be discovered in these celebrated *Letters*," and I am ready to admit the fact on his excellent authority. But I will ask Mr. Taylor 1. whether he can, in the acknowledged writings and speeches of Sir Philip Francis, discover similar "errors of grammar and construction," and equally "numerous;" 2. whether, if he cannot, he is justified in maintaining the pretensions of Sir Philip? For this sympathy in grammatical and syntactical errors is a most unsuspecting and most safe test of truth: so in invasions of literary property the Court of Chancery regards the copying of typographical errors as a main proof of plagiarism. I do not profess to have compared the *Letters* of Junius with the writings of Sir Philip; I have not the leisure to make so laborious a comparison. But I can with truth affirm that I have in those compositions of Sir Philip, which have fallen under my eye, discovered no instances of grammatical and syntactical errors. Dr. Parr, who detected "Gallicisms" in Junius, expressly declares that "Francis uniformly writes English," and this

is the very highest authority, to which I can appeal on the subject, because I have had abundant opportunities of observing, and possess many proofs of the fact, that Dr. Parr looked at compositions with the accuracy of a grammarian, the knowledge of a philologist, and the judgment of a critic.

7. Mr. Taylor p. 162. has these words:—“ A youth, who acquired no more than the rudiments of learning in his native country, (Ireland,) and who quitted it altogether when he was 10 *years old*, however he might overcome the habits of his youth, would still find it difficult to forget entirely the phraseology, with which he was at first familiar. In all his compositions Junius laboured excessively to make his style pure and classical, yet rich in English idiom; and he generally succeeded. But in the *Miscellaneous Letters* are still to be found many oversights: that they were partly owing to the cause now mentioned, is at least a probable conjecture; and it serves in some measure to explain the reason of that *labor limæ*, which to many persons has appeared so much beyond the necessity of the case.” I should have been glad if Mr. Taylor had pointed out these “ many oversights,” that we might know to what description of errors they belong. For, while Mr. Butler speaks of “ numerous errors of grammar and construction,” Mr. Taylor speaks of “ many oversights” in respect to “ phraseologies with which he was first familiar,” viz. Irish phraseologies. But on the supposition that Junius was an Irishman, it is impossible to believe that he would ever undertake *such* a task, because he could not be sensible of those “ phraseologies” — they would fall too naturally from his tongue and his pen — it would be for Englishmen to detect instances of Irish idiom. Mr. Prior, in his *Memoirs of the Life and Character of Burke*, informs us that Burke took infinite pains

with the composition of his *Thoughts on the French Revolution*, writing and re-writing, correcting, altering, and adding. But his object was not to remove Irish "phraseologies," and Irish ideas, and Irish sentences, but to add strength and polish and accuracy to the language, elegance and vigour and majesty to the thoughts, circumstantialities to the statements, authorities to the facts, corroborations to and illustrations of the arguments; and this would be the object in the *labor limæ* employed by Junius.

VI. "That *Junius* had a personal regard for *Woodfall*, has been noticed by others; and it now appears that *Sir Philip* entertained a similar regard, founded on an acquaintance formed when they were boys. They were together at the same school; with the difference of one year only between their ages. When *Woodfall* declined printing what Junius had sent him, the latter then forwarded it to *Almon* for publication; and *Almon* was also assisted, in a similar way, by the communications of *Sir Philip Francis*." Mr. Taylor p. 356.

1. I have elsewhere disarmed of its point Mr. Taylor's argument about *Woodfall*, and shall here say nothing on this question.

2. The value of Mr. Taylor's reasoning about *Almon* may be ascertained from the fact that there is another printer, about whom Mr. T. is silent, and of whom Junius, in a *Letter to Woodfall*, speaks with the feeling of private friendship, or the conviction of personal knowledge, or the confidence of political sympathy: — "At another time his indifference to the risk of the printer is unreservedly expressed. 'If you should have any fears, I entreat you to send it early enough, to appear to-morrow-night in the *London Evening-Post*. In that case you will oblige me by informing the public to-morrow, in your own Paper, that a real *Junius* will appear at

night in the *London*; MILLER, *I am sure, will have no scruples.*' (1, 214.)"\*


3. With respect to *Almon*, there are reasons to be found, which may explain the cause of Sir Philip's good-will to him, independently of all considerations about Junius; and, as I shall prove the fact to the full conviction of Mr. Taylor, I shall not permit him to employ the argument for the purpose of identifying Sir Philip with Junius. Sir Philip was the friend of Mr. Calcraft, who has handsomely remembered him in his Will, and who was the particular friend of Almon. In the *Memoirs of a late Eminent Bookseller*, pp. 76-86. is inserted a series of *Letters*, (31 in number,) from Mr. Calcraft to Almon, of which the first is dated *Rempston Hall, Sept. 2, 1770.* and the last *Ingress, Aug. 16, 1772.*

\* The *Memoirs of a late Eminent Bookseller*, (Almon,) Lond. 1799. 8vo. p. 61. will make us better acquainted with this inferior bibliopolist: — "At this time, and for some time previous, there appeared a number of political Essays in the public Papers, signed *Junius*; which being written in strong, nervous, and elegant language, soon attracted the public attention, and became the subject of general conversation. The Ministry supposed Mr. Almon knew this writer, and they were not mistaken in this supposition. These essays were frequently copied into the Magazines, and other periodical publications. The printer of one of these monthly pamphlets, whose name was *J. Miller*, and (who) resided near *Pater-noster Row* in the City, advertised his pamphlet, (*the London-Museum* he called it,) to be sold also by *J. Almon* in *Piccadilly*. Mr. Almon gave him no authority for so doing, but it is pretty much the custom, (since the Metropolis has become so large and populous,) for booksellers residing in one part of the Town, to advertise their books etc. to be had also of booksellers residing in another part of the Town. Into one of the Numbers of this *Museum*, Miller copied from the Newspapers one of the *Letters* of Junius, addressed to the King. This *Letter* of Junius the Ministers called a libel; and they ordered the Attorney General to prosecute several printers and publishers. When Miller sent his *Museums* to Mr. Almon's shop, Mr. Almon was out of Town; however he came home in the course of the day, and having heard of the Minister's orders to prosecute the printers, he instantly ordered the sale of Miller's pamphlets to be stopped, and the unsold copies to be returned." See also p. 68—70.

being part of the period, within which Junius began and terminated his politico-literary career. In a *Letter*, dated *Ingress*, Jan. 13, 1772. we read:—

“Your despatch yesterday is very interesting. The marriage makes it impossible for Ministers to gratify *Luttrell*. *Bradshaw’s* language, and *Lord Shelburne’s* visit to the *Queen’s House* on his arrival, confirm your intelligence of that party. Pray tell me, in confidence, what did *Lord Temple’s* visits to *St. James’s* mean? Does he talk as loudly in commendation of *Lord North*, as the Ministers and their friends boast, at *Lady Primrose’s* particularly, as well as other places. If you put in paragraphs, put that MR. FRANCIS is appointed *Deputy Secretary at War*, and continues his present employment also. It will teize the worthy *Secretary*, as I well know, and oblige me. I will give you my reasons, when you will find more folly in that noble *Lord*, than even you thought him capable of. This may be an interesting week. Pray continue your attention to your country-friend.”

In another *Letter*, dated *Ingress*, *Saturday*, we read:—“Thanks for your *Letter*. I was not misinformed; I knew FRANCIS was not Deputy, but wished him to be so; and to cram the Newspapers with paragraphs that he was so. For he is very deserving.” Now from these *Letters* we may fairly suppose that Sir Philip Francis was not particularly known to Mr. Almon prior to their date, viz. in Jan. 1772., when Junius had nearly finished his brilliant career; for, if Francis, the intimate friend of Mr. Calcraft, had been previously well known to Mr. Almon, also the particular friend of Mr. Calcraft, Mr C. could not be ignorant of the fact, and the language of his *Letters* to Mr. Almon would have necessarily contained some such words





as these, *our friend Francis*, 1. because Mr. Almon's intimacy with Francis would have been naturally seized by Mr. Calcraft as a reason why Mr Almon should insert the contemplated paragraph, 2. because Mr. C. asks for the insertion merely on his own account, and not for the sake of a common friend. The real Junius was evidently an *early* friend of Almon, (in *the Political Register for April 1768.*, published by Almon, was inserted a *Letter* from Junius, see Taylor pp. 135-48.) and as I have shewn that Sir Philip Francis was not a friend of Almon prior to Jan. 1772., it is manifest that Francis and Junius were distinct persons.

4. It is well known that Mr. Almon in his *Biographical Anecdotes* published in 1797. and his *edition of Junius*, (of which books I have neither at hand,) maintained that Hugh Macaulay Boyd was the author of Junius, and his pretensions to that honour have been abundantly refuted by Dr. Mason Good in the *Preliminary Essay* prefixed to *Woodfall's edition of Junius*. This is a satisfactory proof that Mr. Almon had no facts, which could lead him to a suspicion of Sir Philip Francis's authorship, though he had derived important assistance from him in the *Anecdotes of the Life of Earl Chatham*, first published in 1791. or 1792.: see Mr. Taylor p. 139. It is also a satisfactory proof that Mr. Almon, himself a man of some talent, of various knowledge, of large information, of literary reputation, and of political connections, had formed no such estimate of the abilities, and the attainments of Sir Philip as to suppose him equal to the composition of the *Letters*, or else he would not have advocated the claims of Boyd. These remarks are not unimportant, when it is confidently stated or broadly insinuated that, because Almon was a friend of Junius, between 1767. and 1773., and because Sir Philip

Francis in 1791. or 1792. made communications to Almon for his *Anecdotes of the Life of Earl Chatham*, therefore Junius and Sir Philip were one and the same person. Mr. Taylor says in p. 148. :— “ So that it appears not only that Junius had a regard for Woodfall, in which he resembled Sir Philip Francis, but that the *next printer*, to whom the *former* had recourse, was equally distinguished by the favours of the *latter*.” But Junius unquestionably had in view chiefly his own political objects. He preferred Woodfall’s Paper, not because Woodfall was his school-fellow and his friend, but because his Paper was on many accounts the fittest receptacle for his articles, — because he could rely on the moral integrity, and the personal courage, and the political consistency of Woodfall. He gave the second preference to Almon for similar reasons, and not from any particular friendship for him. The sort of friendship which he felt for Almon, is manifest from the very little effort which was made by any party to re-imburse Mr. Almon for the expenses attending the prosecution for a libel in publishing Junius’s *Letter to the King* ; from the *Memoirs of a late Eminent Bookseller* p. 76. it appears that the sum of 100*l.* collected by Sir John Aubrey, “ was all the compensation Mr. Almon received for the loss, vexation, trouble, etc. of this prosecution.”

With great respect and esteem I remain, dear Sir,

Very truly yours,

E. H. BARKER.

*Thetford, Febr. 5, 1827.*

THE CLAIMS  
OF  
SIR PHILIP FRANCIS

TO THE  
AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS DISPROVED,

*In a Letter addressed to Uvedale Price Esq.*

---

*Dear Sir,*

I. With pleasure and pride I inscribe to your name a Letter on a much agitated question, which is not wholly uninteresting to you as a man of polite literature and of curious enquiry, though researches of another kind have more justly claimed your attention, and will eventually merit the consideration of reflecting, and the acknowledgments of grateful scholars.

II. " One of the first topics, on which he dilated, after attacking Ministers in the debate on the Address, was (Nov. 27, 1770.) on the power of filing *ex officio* Informations by the Attorney General, as applied to the case of Almon, who was prosecuted for publishing the *Letter* of Junius to the King. which other booksellers had done with impunity. In this he characterized that writer in terms, which first turned from himself the suspicion of being the writer, it not being believed that such a man would descend to praise himself :-

‘ How comes this *Junius* to have broke through the  
‘ cobwebs of the law, and to range uncontrolled, unpu-  
‘ nished through the land? The myrmidions of the court  
‘ have been long, and are still pursuing him in vain.  
‘ They will not spend their time upon me, or upon you,  
‘ when the mighty boar of the forest, that has broke  
‘ through all their toils, is before them. But what will  
‘ all their efforts avail? No sooner has he wounded one  
‘ than he strikes down another dead at his feet. For  
‘ my own part, when I saw his attack upon the King, I  
‘ own my blood ran cold. I thought he had ventured  
‘ too far, and that there was an end of his triumph; not  
‘ that he had not asserted many bold truths. Yes, Sir,  
‘ there are in that composition many bold truths, by  
‘ which a wise prince might profit. It was the rancour  
‘ and venom with which I was struck. But, while I ex-  
‘ pected from this daring flight his final ruin and fall,  
‘ behold him rising still higher and coming down souse  
‘ upon both Houses of Parliament. Yes, he made you  
‘ his quarry, and you still bleed from the effects of his  
‘ talons—you crouched, and still crouch beneath his  
‘ rage. Nor has he dreaded the terrors of your brow,\*  
‘ Sir; for he has attacked even you, and I believe you  
‘ have no reason to triumph in the encounter. Not  
‘ content with carrying away our royal eagle in his  
‘ pounces, and dashing him against a rock, he has laid  
‘ you prostrate, and King, Lords, and Commons thus  
‘ become but the sport of his fury. Were he a member  
‘ of this House, what might not be expected from his  
‘ knowledge, his firmness, and his integrity? He would  
‘ be easily known by his contempt of all danger, by his  
‘ penetration, and by his vigour; nothing would escape  
‘ his vigilance and activity; bad Ministers could con-  
‘ ceal nothing from his sagacity, nor could promises nor  
‘ threats induce him to conceal anything from the public.’

“ Comparing the *Letters* of this writer with the  
*North-Briton* as to their force of composition and  
power over the public mind, he termed the latter

\* “ Sir Fletcher Norton, who was distinguished by a pair of  
large black eye-brows.”

‘mere milk and water papers’; and, on another occasion, ‘a mixture of vinegar and water, at once sour and vapid.’”

Mr. Prior’s *Memoir of the Life and Character of Burke*, 1, 233.

1. I shall not deny that, if Burke\* had been Junius, and was desirous to turn the public attention from his authorship of the *Letters*, he might have so censured and so applauded Junius.

2. But the general integrity of his character and the natural simplicity of his mind forbid us to suppose that, notwithstanding these strong, avowed sentiments, he was the Junius whom we seek.

3. These sentiments flowed from his lips spontaneously, and not in consequence of any attempt, which had been on that occasion made in the House to fasten the authorship on him; and therefore they are entitled to our fullest confidence. Had such an attempt been made, Burke, if he were Junius, might justifiably, even on the principles of a rigid moralist, Dr. Johnson, have replied by a decided negative.

4. But there is an argument against Burke’s claim, which has never yet been brought forward, I believe, and which is of so decisive a character, that I would hang by this solitary rock and bid defiance to every assailant. There was in the mind of Mr. Burke a radical principle of philanthropy — a pervading principle of benevolence — it was con-

\* I am not aware that any person has observed the improprieties of mixed metaphor, which deform this apparently splendid passage in Burke. 1. Junius is compared to a *wild boar of the forest*: 2. he is suddenly metamorphosed into a *bird of prey*, and we read of his *daring flight*, his *rising still higher and coming down souse*, his *quarry*, his *talons*, his *carrying away a royal eagle in his pounces*, and *dashing him against a rock*. It is a problem for exercising the ingenuity and the learning of the age, to determine the name of this ravenous bird, which could carry away an eagle and dash him against a rock?

spicuous alike in his actions and in his speeches — his heart was full of generous affections—he breathed peace on earth and good-will towards man. I do not deny that in indulging this godlike propensity of his nature, he was sometimes hurried into intemperate language and borne away by the tide of passion — this merely demonstrated the infirmity of human virtue; but it proved the sincerity and the zeal, with which he contended for the rights of outraged nations and pleaded the cause of suffering man. Nature soon recovered her possession, and reason soon resumed her seat, and goodness soon regained her throne. The uncharitable feeling existed but for the moment — a lightning too transient to disturb the general serenity of his breast — the bolt might terrify, but did not strike its object — the flame burnt around, but did not consume its victim — it was displayed, and was gone — it ‘sparkled, and was exhaled.’ One single story will shew to the reader that this pervading principle of benevolence was habitual to the mind of Burke even from his boyish years: — “Few anecdotes of him while at school are preserved. It is recorded, however, that seeing a poor man pulling down his own hut near the village, and hearing that it was done by order of a great gentleman in a gold-laced hat, (the parish conservator of the roads,) upon the plea of being too near the highway, the young philanthropist, his bosom swelling with indignation, exclaimed that, were he a man, and possessed of authority, the poor should not thus be oppressed. Little things in children often tend to indicate, as well as to form, the mind of the future man; there was no characteristic of his subsequent life more marked, than a hatred of oppression, in any shape or from any quarter.” Mr. Prior’s *Memoir*, 1, 15. We have many compositions of Mr. Burke, which ap-

peared long before the earliest publication of Junius, and whether we read those papers which preceded, or those which followed Junius, we shall discover traces of the same uniform philanthropy; whether we examine the early or the latter rain of his eloquence, we shall confess the exuberant fountain of goodness, from which it flowed. Even in what he himself says about Junius there is a most unsuspecting testimony to confirm the opinion which I have been delivering, that Burke was too generous-spirited to write the *Letters*: — “It was the rancour and venom with which I was struck,” says he. This ‘rancour and venom’ Burke never had, and no man, who possessed them not, could have written Junius. Burke had not the deliberate, resolute, desperate, merciless, and ceaseless malignity of that formidable writer — he was not the wild boar of the forest — he was not the blood-thirsty bird of prey — he was not the public executioner, whose day was spent in leisurely marking the victims for the night — he was not the evil Dæmon, secretly invading the repose of greatness, and shaking the throne of power, and, like reckless Death, “triumphing not only in the extent of his conquests, but in the richness of his spoils” — he had not the property of the tiger, to crouch peaceably in the covert, and yet spring with deadly aim on all who came within the range of his paw — he was not accustomed ‘to employ the secrecy of a Venetian tribunal, or to strike with the certainty of the Holy Inquisition.’ He advocated popular rights in open Courts — he championed public principles in the light of day — he addressed in his own person assembled Parliaments with the ingenuousness of integrity and the courage of patriotism — he wrestled with principalities and powers, armed only with lawful weapons — he understood not, required not,

tried not the arts of concealment—too frank to wear a mask, too impetuous to endure restraint, too careless for reserve, too magnanimous for caution, and too ambitious of direct praise to enjoy the *shadow* of a name.

III. “As an accuser, his power was truly terrific; he has exhausted the whole compass of the English language in the fierceness of his invective and the bitterness of his censure; for even Junius, with all the advantages of indiscriminate personality, private scandal, and the mask under which he fought, has not exceeded him in severity, while he falls infinitely short of him in reach of thought, command of language, energy of expression, and variety of reproach. Junius is more pungent in his assaults, Mr. Burke more powerful; Junius imparts the idea of keenness, Mr. Burke of force; Junius of possessing powers to a certain degree circumscribed, Mr. Burke of a magnitude nearly boundless; Junius hews down his victim with a double-edged sabre, Mr. Burke fells him with a sledge-hammer, and repeats his blows so often, and in so many different modes, that few can again recognize the carcass he has once taken it in hand to mangle. Much of this wrathful spirit arose from what he thought tyranny or crime, or where great public offences or great supposed culprits were in question, and when he conceived himself bound to summon up every faculty he possessed, not merely to overpower, but to destroy them. In reply to the attack of the Duke of Bedford, though he curbs much of his natural vehemence, from the provocation being personal to himself, there is great vigour, with something of a lofty contempt of his opponent. But few, if any, records of exertions by one man equal in vehemence of censure or variety of reproach, in labour or in talents, those



against the French Revolution and Mr. Hastings. Against the latter his speeches were heard with an awe approaching to terror; and though by some their severity has been censured, the best apologies, to which little perhaps can be added, were volunteered at the moment by two political adversaries, Mr. Pitt and Mr. Wilberforce; but it must be remembered that he solemnly denied having used any of the more offensive expressions and phrases, which were put into his mouth by the idle, designing rumours of the day." Mr. Prior 2, 467.

But all the invectives of Mr. Burke, however tremendously severe, were delivered by him *as a public speaker in reference to public men*, and they do not evince a single particle of that malignant spirit, which actuated Junius; and I therefore contend that till it can be proved that Burke was not in private life the benevolent character which I have described, and that he was the malignant being in private life which we trace in the *Letters* of Junius, we cannot with any propriety consider Burke to be the writer of them.

IV. Mr. Burke, in a Letter to Mr. Thomas Mercer, dated London, Febr. 26, 1790. writes thus: "It is not by calling the landed estates, possessed by old *prescriptive rights*, 'the accumulation of ignorance and superstition,' that can support me in shaking that grand title, which supersedes all other title; and which all my studies of general jurisprudence have taught me to consider as one principal cause of the formation of States; I mean the ascertaining and securing *prescription*. But these are donations made in 'ages of ignorance and superstition.' Be it so; it proves that these donations were made long ago; and this is *prescription*; and this gives right and title."

Mr. Prior 2, 88. observes in a Note:—"The

writer of Junius's *Letters*, in one of his private communications to Wilkes (Sept. 18, 1771.) has a passage so similar in spirit to this as to deserve notice; it is in defence of close Boroughs. 'You ask me ' from whence did the right (of Parliamentary representation in small places,) originate, and for ' what purpose was it granted? I do not see the ' tendency of these questions; but I answer them ' without scruple: in general it arose from the ' King's writs, and it was granted with a view to ' balance the powers of the nobility and to obtain ' aids from the people. But without looking back to ' an obscure antiquity, from which no certain information can be collected, you will find that the ' laws of England have much greater regard to *possession* (of a certain length) *than to any other title whatsoever*; and that in every kind of property, ' which savours of the *realty*, *this doctrine is most wisely the basis of our English jurisprudence.*' "

1. But this may have been an accidental coincidence of opinion between these celebrated writers. Junius's private communication to Wilkes is dated 19 years before Mr. Burke's *Letter* to Captain Mercer. On the supposition that Burke was privy to the communication made by Junius, he would see this *Letter* of Junius before it was sent to Wilkes, and he might have borne in mind the principle of law which it unfolds; but we are not justified in making any such supposition.

2. The coincidence, however, apparently identifying Burke with Junius, should induce us warily to pause before we assent to Mr. Taylor's opinion, p. 193., who seeks to identify Sir Philip Francis with Junius, because the former in his speech April 30, 1792. on Mr. Grey's Motion for a Reform, (*Parliam. Deb.* 32, 495.) agrees with Junius about the disfranchisement of rotten Boroughs by an act

of power and about granting to certain large Towns the right of sending representatives. If Mr. Taylor's argument be sound, then the argument in favour of Burke is equally sound; the argument for either is entitled to no weight, because it is equi-  
 poised by the other. In the same way the argument about the identity of Junius and Sir Philip in respect to hand-writing is valueless, because the hand-writing of Lord George Sackville has been brought forward as identified with the hand-writing of Junius. Thus the one argument neutralises the other, and the reasoning would have weight in respect to either Sir Philip or his Lordship, only in case that no other hand-writing were set up as the writing of Junius. Hence I regard the criterion as false or insecure, and therefore I have avoided making any use of the argument. Mr. Taylor, however, has made some use of it, and of similar arguments, in favour of his hero, Sir Philip, which are, I repeat the observation, entitled to little or no weight, if the same or similar arguments have been fairly adduced in favour of other claimants. In the instance of hand-writing, indeed, it is by many persons admitted that Junius sometimes or always employed an amanuensis, and hence arises a difficulty, which proves the uncertainty of all arguments connected with this branch of the question. Who can decide 1. whether Junius did, (as Mr. Butler in his *Reuiviscences* 1, 100. thinks,) or did not (as Mr. Taylor p. 370. thinks,) employ an amanuensis? 2. Whether he did or did not uniformly employ the same amanuensis? 3. Whether that amanuensis did or did not convey the *Letters* to Woodfall? 4. Whether we have clear, and positive, and certain evidence that the private *Letters* to Woodfall, signed *Junius*, were in the hand-writing of the real Junius, i. e. of him who composed them? 5.

Whether, supposing the hand-writing of the real Junius to have been alone employed, it was on all occasions his *natural*, or on all occasions his *disguised* hand, or sometimes the *natural* and sometimes the *disguised* hand?

3. THE CLAIMS OF A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL CAN BE MORALLY MAINTAINED ONLY BY THE CIRCUMSTANCE THAT THEY ARE PECULIAR TO THAT PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL, INAPPLICABLE TO ALL OTHER CLAIMANTS, AND YET HAVING AN APPARENT CONNECTION WITH JUNIUS. This is the important doctrine which I hold on the question; this is the great lesson, which all who enter on the controversy should learn; *hoc opus, hic labor est*; and by these means alone shall we remove the errors of opinion, and support the certainty of truth. It is from the number and the weight of the peculiar claims of any particular individual, comparatively with other claims, that we shall be able to prove his identity with Junius, to the exclusion of every other claimant.

4. In the instance cited, Mr. Burke is found, consciously or unconsciously, to have preached the doctrine of Junius 19 years after Junius. Then it is not safe for us to endeavour to establish from this circumstance the identity of Burke and Junius, because, however secret might have been the communication of Junius to Wilkes, no man can prove, or even undertake to prove, that Burke never saw and never heard of that communication long before he wrote to Captain Mercer in language to the same effect. Had Burke's *Letter* to Mercer preceded Junius's *Letter* to Wilkes, then indeed there would have been a fair argument for identifying Burke with Junius. Mr. Taylor may profit largely from this remark; for, when he undertakes to shew the uniformity of opinion and the conformity of

action between Sir Philip Francis and Junius, I expect him to prove that Sir Philip so opined and so acted before Junius: then his arguments will have a *primary* force; but as the case stands, they have only a *secondary* force, and in most instances, for anything which Mr. Taylor can prove to the contrary, Sir Philip might have been the mere imitator and copyist of Junius.

V. Sir Philip Francis, in his speech on Mr. Grey's Motion for a Reform, (April 30, 1792. *Parliament. Deb.* 32, 495.) says:—"The part I took on those occasions, was rather negative than affirmative, *I was guided by the natural influence of respectable authority*; by plausibilities and doubts; by possibilities and apprehensions: but above all, I myself doubted, and therefore I stood still." Mr. Taylor p. 197. quotes this speech for the purpose of shewing the identity of matter between Sir Philip Francis and Junius, and on the words *doubts* and *apprehensions* he presents us with this note: "These are the words of Junius on the same subject: 'I own I have both *doubts* and *apprehensions* in regard to the remedy you propose,' (*Letter to Wilkes.*)" But, while the identity of *expression* in Junius and Sir Philip may be a mere fortuitous coincidence, the words of Sir Philip afford to us internal evidence that there was no identity of *person* between him and Junius. For the latter was too high-minded and proud, too conscious of his own intellectual superiority to talk 'of being guided by the natural influence of respectable authority.' If such a sentiment could not have been uttered by Junius at the period when he wrote the celebrated *Letters*, it is infinitely less likely that he should have used it twenty years afterwards; for that high-mindedness and pride and consciousness of intellectual superiority would 'grow with his growth, and strengthen with his strength.'

VI. I will admit Burke to have had a compass of mind infinitely greater than the author of Junius; or I will admit that Burke was in point of mind fully equal to the composition of the *Letters*. But I am not as well prepared to admit that he could have so compressed his diffuse and Asiatic style, as to write those *Letters*. This labour of compression would have been far greater to him than the reader may suppose. A learned friend, never remarkable for a verbose style, wrote a short pamphlet, which he wished to contain the greatest possible quantity of matter in the fewest possible words — he wrote the article in one day, but it required three days to produce the necessary condensation of thought. Is it probable that Burke could for months and months, amidst the vast variety of his public and private business, devote to this subject the large proportion of time which it would demand, and that he could employ the incessant watchfulness which would be indispensable? It may be affirmed beyond all contradiction, and I particularly invite the attention of the reader to the importance and the novelty of the observation, because it is decisive against the claims of Sir Philip Francis and of several other persons, that the author could not have had leisure for any other pursuit or any other business, while he was engaged in writing those *Letters*—he must have lived in the retirement of his own presence, confining his society, when he could admit society, chiefly to those few individuals, who furnished him with facts, and incidents, and circumstances, or in any way favoured his views and facilitated his labours. In solitary majesty, in oriental seclusion, in the realm of silence, and in the land of oblivion, he was ‘left at large to his own dark designs,’ — till, like another Aurengzebe, he came forth,

Fierce from his lair to lap the blood of kings,  
 with Titanian look denouncing  
 Desperate revenge and battle dangerous  
 To less than Gods, —

till arrayed at length in ‘Gorgon terrors,’ and armed with ‘infernal thunder,’ he, as from ‘a firmament of hell,’ ‘spouted his cataracts of fire.’

VII. “I know enough of *Junius* to know that he was of Lord Temple’s school, and that he wrote that paper *from hints* or materials prompted by him. So far he was betrayed in one of the *Letters* to the first Lord Camden; for in that *Letter* he touched upon a fact known only to three persons, Lord Chatham, Lord Camden, and Lord Temple. The latter, during almost the whole period of the *Junius*, was bitter against the two former; and so was *Junius*, though with an air of guard and of candour. Lord Temple had not eloquence or parts enough to have *written Junius*; but I have no doubt that he knew the author. I am as likely to have written it as Lord Shelburne, the conjectured author in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* Nov. 1812. (V. 82. P. 2. p. 499.) I cannot help wondering that, by examining the politicks of each paper, those of his time did not find him out. But these cheats often hold out false colours, and put us upon a wrong scent. For example, if I was the reputed writer of a libel, I should abuse myself, or my bosom-friends, to disarm the suspicion.” *The Miscellaneous Works, in Prose and Verse, of George Hardinge Esq. M. A., F. R. S., F. S. A. Senior Justice of the Counties of Brecon, Glamorgan, and Radnor, 3, 143.*”

Can Mr. Taylor shew to us how the particular fact here alluded to was likely to be known to Sir Philip Francis?

VIII. “A further circumstance,” says Mr. Butler, p. 86., “noticed by Mr Wiles and the remi-

niscent respecting Junius was, his early intelligence of the measures of Government. Those, who recollect the controversy, which took place between the Count de Guignes the French Ambassador in this country, and Salvador the Portuguese Jew, in consequence of certain stock-jobbing transactions, during the disputes between Spain and this country respecting Falkland's Island, and the manner in which the British Cabinet changed on a sudden, from words of war to words of peace, must be surprised at the early intelligence, which Junius gave of this change to Woodfall."

"Junius avows," says Mr. Taylor p. 358., "his acquaintance with the Secretary of State's Office, mentions a circumstance which occurred when Lord Egremont was Secretary, and speaks of him as if he knew him thoroughly. Sir Philip was brought up in the same Office, possessed the favour of the same nobleman, and held a place under him at the time that circumstance happened. And, generally speaking, his opportunities of acquiring information, from his connection with the *public Offices*, were such as fully account for the extraordinary nature, extent, and variety of the intelligence possessed by Junius. From the minute military observations introduced in the controversy with Sir William Draper, from the narrative of General Gansel's rescue in sight of the Horse-Guards, from the notice of Colonel Burgoyne's appointment to the Government of Fort St. George *immediately* after it took place, and from the *premature* announcement of that of Colonel Luttrell to be Assistant-General in Ireland, (*Junius* 2., 156.) it has been long suspected that Junius was in some degree connected with the Horse Guards. But the *Private* and *Miscellaneous Letters* lately published place it beyond a doubt. The War-Office is the *scene* of several dramatic representations; and



there is such precision in the secret intelligence from that quarter, conveyed to Woodfall or to the public, as occurs in no other department of the State, and could not be acquired from this, except by one who had access to the fountain-head for information. The familiar manner in which Junius speaks of Chamier, Bradshaw, Whateley, Lord Barrington, and such others as the chief Clerk in the War Office must have been well acquainted with, connects him still more closely with Sir Philip Francis."

Mr. Taylor considers this to be one of his strongest arguments, and if I succeed in satisfying him that there were secret sources of political information, secret means of obtaining official intelligence, and secret modes of tracing ministerial movements, I may well expect to abate his confidence in the goodness of his cause. Then, the following extracts will be sufficient for this purpose. It appears from the *Memoirs of a late Eminent Bookseller* that Mr. Almon was the great oracle of his day for public news and conversational tattle, — that he had not only the talent for collecting it, but the memory for retaining it, and the ability for detailing it, and the opportunities of narrating it, — that he had acquired a character conformable to this description of him, — that individuals, with whom he was more or less connected, furnished him with public information, because they were aware that he would make a good use of it, — that persons of distinction were in the habit of epistolary correspondence with him, wrote to him in terms expressive of respect, esteem, and regard, and both communicated to and solicited from him information. The reader may easily satisfy himself about the propriety of these remarks by turning to the book itself; I shall endeavour to save him the trouble, by selecting and transcribing a few passages. But it will be proper to premise that "the

originals of the several *Letters* there printed were for three months (from Febr. 14, 1791.) put into the hands of the publisher, for the satisfaction of any gentleman who might doubt their authenticity ;” and that “ the person, who was the subject of those *Memoirs*, (Mr. Almon,) having put all his *Letters* and papers into the hands of a friend, with permission to make any use of them he thought proper, the editor selected *only* such, as did not appear to him in *any* degree confidential.

P. 15. “ He in 1762. dedicated a *Review of Mr. Pitt’s Administration* to Earl Temple, Mr. Pitt’s brother-in-law. His Lordship requested to see the author. Mr. Almon waited upon him, and from that moment was honoured with his Lordship’s favour and countenance, publicly and privately. Lord Temple carried him to the Duke of Newcastle, to make known to his Grace the author of some *Letters*, which Mr. Almon had written in the *Gazetteer*, at the time of the Duke’s resignation. His Grace expressed himself in terms of the warmest friendship, gave him many thanks, acknowledged the great pleasure he had received every day in reading those *Letters*, that they contained his own sentiments exactly, and much more to the same effect. Lord Temple afterwards made him known to the Duke of Devonshire, the Marquis of Rockingham, etc. Mr. Pitt he saw at Lord Temple’s in Pall-Mall, where he did not fail to pay his devoirs once a week at least, and was always admitted. Through the same interest he became known to Mr. Wilkes, and many other gentlemen, who were at that time in opposition to the Court.”

P. 82. Mr. Calcraft in a *Letter* dated *Ingress* Dec. 29, 1771. says :— “ Many thanks to you for your correct and constant intelligence. If Mr. Hamilton (the Right Hon. W. G. Hamilton,) is in Town, I

should like to hear what he thinks will be the consequence. What childish stories do they propagate! You cannot conceive either the questions I am asked, or the innumerable reports about Lord Temple." In another *Letter* dated *Ingress* (*Jan. 1772.*) Mr. Calcraft says:—"My firm belief is that Lord Shelburne was at the Queen's House. I had it from one of his intimates. Be assured that I never shew a line to any body, that comes from you. I have lived long enough to be caution itself, and to no quarter more than where you allude. I send you some Kentish brawn, which I trust you will find good. I doubt about Keene, but it will be material to me to know. When you hear about the speech, movers, and seconders, I shall be glad to know. I am glad there is a prospect of another *Letter* so soon."

P. 88. Are inserted *Letters* from Lord Mountmorres dated *Dublin Nov. 25. Dec. 21. and 23. 1771. Jan. 14. Febr. 14. 1772. Paris, Oct. 4, 1772.* communicating intelligence to Mr. Almon.

P. 93. "His information concerning public affairs, both at home and abroad, was in general early, interesting, and authentic; as may be observed from the uniform tenor of these *Letters*: and with respect to America, there is one anecdote, which it may not be improper to relate. A few months previous to the commencement of hostilities, the Duke of Grafton was called upon in the House of Lords, (the Secretary of State not being present,) to inform the House what number of the King's troops were in America? which he answered. He next was asked, what force the Americans had? To this question the Duke replied, that he did not know; but that those, who wanted information, might probably obtain it by applying to Mr. Almon: Whether his Grace meant this as a sneer, or an

acknowledgement of Mr. Almon's intelligence, is not now material. It certainly was a confession that Ministers knew nothing of the state of their enemy." The following *Letter* from Burke dated *Aug. 6, 1775.* is subjoined to these remarks:— "I am obliged to you for your early communication of the intelligence you have; and wish most ardently that this opening towards a reconciliation on the part of America may be improved by the Ministry here, and prove the means of a lasting peace to this Empire. I am, Sir, your most obedient and humble servant, EDM. BURKE. "This *Letter* related to the Petition brought from the American Congress by Mr. Penn."

P. 102. "The five following *Letters* are written by the Right Hon. W. G. Hamilton to Mr. Almon. *Aug. 14. Mr. Almon,* — 'I thank you for your *Letter*, and hope you will write to me constantly and particularly. Till events happen, I must take up with opinions. Be so obliging, therefore, as to inform me what the Court thinks, and what the Americans, who are in London, think, is the object of Sir William Howe's expedition? Your's, etc. etc.' *Oct. 14. Mr. Almon,* — 'I am much obliged to you for your *Letter*; and beg you would let me know what is the prevailing opinion, as to the fate of New York. I shall be in Town at the meeting of Parliament. I wish to hear from you often. But, instead of sending your *Letters* to my house, as usual, be so obliging as to direct them to me at Henry Shelley's, Esq. at Lewes, Sussex. By that means they will reach me more expeditiously. Your's, etc.' *Hampton Court, Saturday, Mr. Almon.* — 'I am much obliged to you for your intelligence, and beg the continuance of your correspondence. I go from Castoisbury to Stowe about Thursday seven-night, and if you are

‘ then in the country, I shall have the pleasure of  
 ‘ seeing you. Yours etc. W. G. H.’ *Aug. 15.* ‘ I  
 ‘ am much obliged to you for your Letters. Things  
 ‘ are now so very interesting, that I wish to know  
 ‘ not only facts, but opinions. What do they think,  
 ‘ who know the intelligence of Government? What  
 ‘ are the sentiments of those, who form their judg-  
 ‘ ment on provincial information?’ *Oct. 31.* *Mr.*  
 ‘ *Almon*, — ‘ I take it for granted you are dead and  
 ‘ buried, and that this Note will fall into the hands  
 ‘ of your executors. But, if you should happen to  
 ‘ be alive, I desire you would give me a proof of it  
 ‘ by letting me know what news is at present circu-  
 ‘ lating in London. Is it true that there has been  
 ‘ a disagreement between the French Admiral and  
 ‘ the Americans? And is it not intended to carry  
 ‘ on the war against America and France another  
 ‘ year?’”

P. 107. “ Amongst Mr. Almon’s Papers are the following *Note* and *Letter* from the present Right Hon. Mr. Pitt:— ‘ Mr. Pitt desires Mr. Almon will have the enclosed paragraph put into one of the Morning Papers, as soon as he can, without mentioning from whence it comes. *Hayes, Saturday, June 14, 1778.* ‘ Mr. Almon, — I shall be obliged to you, if you will take care to have the Letter I have enclosed to you, inserted in all the daily Papers to-morrow morning, *signed with my name.* I am desirous to have it printed to-morrow, and wish you to do every thing in your power to procure its insertion. I am yours etc. W. PITT.’ ‘ If you cannot get the Letter into all the Papers, let it be in as many as you can. *Chevening, Thursday, Oct. 29.*’ The Letter was addressed to Lord Mounstuart.”

P. 114. “ *Stowe, Aug. 24, 1779,* Lord Temple is much obliged to Mr. Almon for the in-

teresting intelligence he has sent; is perfectly well in health, and not a little unhappy at the state of the country.

————— *quantum mutatus ab illo*  
*Hectore!*”

P. 32. “ Mr. Almon was called *Lord Temple’s man*. His visits to Pall-Mall and Stowe were frequent and notorious. At both places he was always received in the most gracious manner. Had the negotiation for a change of Ministers succeeded in the autumn of 1763., Lord Temple, who was to have been at the head of the Treasury, had designed Mr. Almon for a situation. It was an irreparable loss to Mr. Almon, as well as to some other of Lord Temple’s friends, that his Lordship never chose to accept any of the many offers, which were made to him by the Court.”

“ Mr. Sykes, the Nabob, is a man perfectly well known to the Bramin in India; to Lord Shelburne, and to General Burgoyne, in England. Almon in his curious paper of *no news*, has painted him in the *rough*, and in the *smooth*; so that, like all the rest of Almon’s trumpery, there is no forming a true picture of him.” *The Reformer, by an Independent Freeholder*, No. 1. Lond. 1780. p. 17. In the 4th No. p. 87. the writer says:—“ If the freeholders of Buckinghamshire should hear that Lord Shelburne, Lord Temple, Lord Mahon, and Almon the bookseller are alive, and walk at large, and afterwards should believe what those Lords have openly asserted, and Almon printed, every free and candid man must conclude that these violent Lords have more influence than the Crown; and Almon, their *stoker*, more influence than any Minister under the Crown.”

Having thus shewn that there was one source, from which Junius could draw political and public and official and accurate and recent and secret in-

formation, I will remark that I am not obliged to prove that Junius did in point of fact obtain information from Mr. Almon personally, or by letter, or through the medium of friends, by one or by all of these methods; he certainly might have done so — he most probably did so. But, when it is boldly stated that, because Sir Philip Francis was an under-Clerk in the War-Office, he must necessarily have supplied Junius with all his information about the War-Office, though it should never be forgotten that Junius, (partly under other signatures, and partly under that,) had, for two or three years previously to Sir Philip's quarrel with Lord Barrington, appeared as a political writer, so that Sir Philip, if Junius, is presumed to have incurred a risk without any assigned or any assignable motive — when it is boldly stated that Sir Philip did actually furnish Junius with this information — when it is strongly urged that Sir Philip was connected with other Offices, and that therefore he must have supplied and did supply Junius with intelligence about them, I think it quite sufficient to shew that there was one obvious source of information independent of Sir Philip, and if there was *one*, I may reasonably expect him to believe that there were *more*, and he would unreasonably require me to name the others. However, I will point to one other source of information. Many intelligent persons are inclined to suspect that Lord George Sackville was the writer of Junius — I by no means concur in that opinion — but though he were not Junius, he might, nevertheless, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or accidentally, furnish Junius with information about military matters, and who will undertake to say that he did not?

IX. In the *Memoirs of a late Eminent Bookseller*

p. 83. Mr. Calcraft says in a *Letter* to Mr. Almon dated *Ingress*, Jan. 13, 1772. : — “ If you put in paragraphs, put that Mr. Francis is appointed Deputy Secretary at War, and continues his present employment also. It will tease the worthy Secretary, as I well know, and oblige me. I will give you my reasons, when you will find more folly in that noble Lord, than even you thought him capable of.” In another *Letter* : — “ I was not misinformed; I knew Francis was not Deputy, but wished him to be so; and to cram the Newspapers with paragraphs that he was so. For he is very deserving.”

These extracts merit our attention, 1. in shewing that Sir Philip Francis, in the opinion of Mr. Calcraft, was at the time a man of good moral character; 2. that he was known to him to be a man of talent, and was considered by him to be on both accounts worthy of being promoted to the Deputy Secretaryship at War; 3. that his eventual promotion to a still higher office in India need not in these circumstances strike us with much surprise, and require as for an extraordinary event an extraordinary solution.

X. Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences* fairly stated the argument of the *Franciscans* that the sudden elevation of Sir Philip Francis from a Clerkship in the War-Office to a high station in India, combined with the disappearance of Junius from that time, proves that the silence of Junius was purchased by the promotion of Sir Philip. “ Admitting it possible,” says Mr. Taylor p. 399., “ that Sir Philip was known to be Junius in the year 1772., we at once find a reason for the otherwise inexplicable event of his appointment, at that very time, to India. It certainly was strange that Lord Barrington, with whom he is represented to have had a quarrel, and



from whom he could not obtain the next step of promotion in the War-Office, though it was justly due to him, should in the same year, and while Sir Philip was abroad, recommend him so 'honourably and generously' to Lord North, as to procure for him the rank of a Sovereign in India; it was unaccountable that the dismissed Clerk, who could not retain a salary of £400 a year, should all at once be raised to one of £10,000. But conceive him to be Junius, and every thing is explained. Perhaps Lord Barrington first perceived the truth in the hints, which were thrown out so unguardedly by *Veteran*, and being one of the *coterie* called the *King's Friends*, he may have communicated his surmises to his Majesty, and proposed this honourable mode of banishing the offender." In p. 78. Mr. Taylor has these words:—"The tone and substance of these *Letters*, (signed *Veteran*,) are in themselves worth a thousand arguments. With such express proof that Junius, the writer of them, was in the highest degree exasperated at Lord Barrington for depriving Mr. Francis of his situation, let us turn to the biography of Sir Philip Francis, and see whether any peculiar feeling of hostility was entertained by him on this occasion:—"In 1763. Sir Philip was appointed by the late Lord Mendip, then Welbore Ellis, Esq. and Secretary at War, to a considerable post in the War-Office, which he resigned in the beginning of 1772., in consequence of a difference with Viscount Barrington, by whom he thought himself injured. Possibly Lord B. thought so too, or that something was due to Mr. Francis, as will appear hereafter." Here there is a distinct avowal of a quarrel having taken place between Lord Barrington and Sir Philip Francis, which, for the same cause, and at the same time, subjected his Lordship to the resentment of Junius.

The displeasure of the latter was particularly called forth, when the interests of Sir Philip were in danger: it increased, *pari passu*, as the conduct of his Lordship grew more and more adverse to Sir Philip's views; and it arrived at its highest pitch in the moment when all his hopes were finally sacrificed. But the parallel does not end here. In the *same month* Sir Philip was expelled, Junius wrote a private *Letter* to his printer, (1, 253.) intimating that his labours were at an end, and that he should thenceforth discontinue writing, unless some good occasion offered."

1. The Administration of the day, in appointing a Council for the Government of Bengal, would naturally look round among their own friends, connections, and dependents for a proper person to fill the important office. On enquiry they found Sir Philip Francis well qualified for the situation and recommended to them as such a person. They knew that he had in 1756. held a post in the Secretary of State's Office — in 1758. was appointed Secretary to General Bligh — in 1760. Secretary to the Earl of Kinnoul, Ambassador to Lisbon — and in 1763. had held an important place in the War-Office, which he continued to hold till 1772. His moral character was, therefore, perfectly well known to the Government — they had had abundant experience of his capacity for public business, and his adroitness in official arrangements, and they must have discovered in him the germ of those talents, which he was afterwards found to display, and which amply justified their choice. They were of course aware that he had quitted the War-Office in consequence of a quarrel with Lord Barrington, but this personal affair between him and his Lordship was no sufficient reason why they should decline appointing Mr. Francis to a high office, which he

was in their opinion so well qualified to fill. They justly considered him to have a claim on them for a long career of public services. They would not have appointed him to the Indian post, if Lord Barrington had opposed the appointment; but they perceived that his Lordship not only did not oppose, but even recommended the appointment; and it was not necessary for the Ministry to weigh the motives of Lord Barrington in recommending it — whether he was tendering to the public service a valuable servant, or was merely desirous to deport an incorrigible offender, or to expel a dangerous enemy to India. This seems to me a fair way of accounting for the promotion of Sir Philip.

2. It does not follow that, because Lord Barrington was unwilling to retain him in the War-Office, he would oppose his appointment to the Indian office — on the contrary it is reasonable to suppose that his Lordship would really rejoice to be relieved from the annoying and restless hostility of such an enemy, who had various means of employing the public press against his Lordship, — who might be presumed to have written the *Letters of Veteran*, — and whose cause had been advocated by the powerful pen of Junius. I grant that, if Lord Barrington had been a personage of dæmoniacal malignity, — such malignity as belonged to Junius himself, — he would not only not have consented to the appointment of Sir Philip, but have resisted it in the most determined manner. As, however, I am not disposed to believe that such a spirit actuated his Lordship, and as I do believe that the generality of mankind would in the same circumstances have acted in the way which I have imagined, and under the feelings which I have described, I cannot think that the elevation of Sir Philip is so very *marvellous* an event as to require a *miracle* to attest it; for it is little less

than *miraculous* to make an inferior Clerk in the War-Office the author of Junius's *Letters*.

3. But leaving conjectures to their fate, let us turn to the evidence of facts. Was it not as natural for Lord Barrington, after having had a quarrel with Sir Philip Francis, to advise his appointment to the high station in India, as for Lord Thurlow, after having said in the House of Lords, 'that it would have been happy for this country, if General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis had been drowned in their passage to India,' to court the acquaintance and cultivate the friendship and love the society of Sir Philip Francis? "His observations," say the *Memoirs* of Sir Philip, "on this curious reflection were delivered in the true spirit of a philippic, and with a fury, which, considering the relative situation of the parties, astonished every body. But, what is still more curious, no man was ever so much courted by another, as Mr. Francis was afterwards by Lord Thurlow, who probably had taken time to repent of that idle speech above mentioned. They lived much together in society, and, long before Lord Thurlow died, they were very good friends." The conduct actually observed by Lord Thurlow towards Sir Philip Francis was that very conduct, which Lord Barrington pursued in reference to the same individual, and for the very same reason; a virtuous desire to do substantial justice to an injured individual. The maxim of Tacitus, *Proprium humani generis est, odisse quem læseris*, is more applicable to the tyrant, of whom he was speaking, to despotic kings, and to the ministers of a despotic government, than to human nature in general. Were it right to mention names, I could furnish an illustrious example of a cordial goodwill subsisting between two eminent scholars, one of whom had been much calumniated in a popular

work written by the other; and the public are aware of the friendship, which united Lord Byron and Mr. Moore, though the latter had been severely reprov'd for his licentious writings in *the English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*.

4. With respect to Sir Philip's appointment, there are two sources of information open to us, 1. Sir Philip's own statement, 2. the authentic *Memoirs* of his Life, Let us consult them. "Thus far proceeds the Author of the *Memoirs*," says Mr. Taylor p. 31., "evidently with good authority for all he says; so that if anything adverse to our opinion appears on the face of this record, there can be no contending with it. Of equal validity is what fell from Sir Philip in the course of a speech on India-affairs, when he gave a short account of such particular circumstances of his public life, as bore any relation to his going to India, his conduct there, and his conduct since his return to England.' As this will throw additional light upon the information derived from his biographer, it is useful to our present enquiry. Mr. Francis observed: — ' That he had been bred ' up in the Secretary of State's Office, where he had ' the happiness to possess the favour of the late Earl ' of Egremont, then Secretary of State. That in ' 1763. Mr. Ellis had appointed him to fill a station ' of great trust in the War-Office. That Lord Bar- ' rington, who succeeded Mr. Ellis, had recommend- ' ed him to a noble Lord (whose absence, and more ' particularly the cause of it, he very sincerely la- ' mented,) as a fit person to be sent out to India as ' a Member of the Government of Bengal; till that ' recommendation he had not, (Mr. Francis declared,) ' the honour of being known to Lord North. He ' had, therefore, obtained a seat in the Council at ' Calcutta, not through any private interest or in- ' triguc, but he was taken up upon recommendation,

‘ and *that* the recommendation of persons of high rank, — those who best knew his character and qualifications, and who certainly would not have so far disgraced themselves, as to have recommended an improper person, knowing him to be such, to go out to India in a station of so much power and importance. He had accordingly been nominated with General Clavering, and Colonel Monson in the Bill of 1773.’ (*Parliam. Deb.* 22,97.) Now let us see whether the *Memoirs* (p. 20. of Taylor) do not correspond to this statement: — “ In 1763. he was appointed by the late Lord Mendip, then Welbore Ellis Esq. and Secretary at War, to a considerable post in the War-Office, which he resigned in the beginning of 1772., in consequence of a difference with Viscount Barrington by whom he thought himself injured. Possibly Lord Barrington thought so too, or that something was due to Mr. Francis, as will appear hereafter. The greatest part of the year 1772. he spent in travelling through Flanders, part of Germany, the Tyrol, Italy, and France, with his intimate friend, the late David Godfrey. During his residence at Rome he went to Castel Gondolfo, where he was introduced to Pope Ganganelli, and had a curious conference with his Holiness, of near two hours, the particulars of which are, it is said, preserved in a *Letter* from him to the late Dr. Campbell, with whom he was very intimate. \* In about half a year after

\* I recommend Mr. Taylor to endeavour to obtain a sight of this *Letter*; I have made the endeavour without success. A sight of this *Letter* written in the same year, in which Junius ceased to write, would afford to us some little criterion for judging of the style and the abilities of Sir Philip; and a much safer criterion than any of those published writings of Sir Philip, the *earliest* of which appeared several years after Junius had ceased to write. But who is the Dr. Campbell alluded to? Is he the celebrated voluminous Irish writer mentioned in Boswell’s *Life of Dr. Johnson*, whose works are all specified with their respective dates in Dr.

his return to England, Lord Barrington most honourably and generously recommended him to Lord North, by whom his name was inserted in an Act of Parliament, past in June 1773. to be a Member of the Council appointed for the Government of Bengal, in conjunction with Warren Hastings, Governor General: John Clavering, Commander-in-chief; George Monson; and Richard Barwell."

These *Memoirs*, of which Mr. Taylor observes that the author evidently has good "authority for all he says," were inserted in the *Monthly Mirror for May and June* 1810.; and I do not scruple to declare my full conviction that they bear internal and unequivocal traces of Sir Philip's own pen: we will prove our point by the following examples. Can any man at all acquainted with the sarcastic talents of Sir Philip fail to recognise his own hand in the very commencement of these *Memoirs*? "The origin of this gentleman is not, *like that of some of the greatest names of antiquity, buried in the impenetrable obscurity of un-recorded ages.* He was born in Dublin on Oct. 22, 1740. old style. His father, Philip Francis D. D., is sufficiently known in the learned world. His grandfather, John Francis, was Dean of the Cathedral of Lismore in Ireland, to which he was appointed on July 30, 1722. and his great-grandfather, John Francis, became Dean of Leiglin, by patent, dated Aug. 21 1696. and appears by Ware's *History of Ireland*, to have sat in convocation in Dublin, in 1704. This old gentleman is also supposed to have had a father,

Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*? the author of the *Hermippus Redivivus*? "It may not be improper to give a specimen of this author's, (the Abbé Villars's) manner (in the little French book entitled, *Le Comte de Gabalis*,) who has lately been well imitated in the way of mixing jest with earnest, in an elegant piece called *Hermippus Redivivus*." Dr. J. Warton's *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*, 1, 226.

*whose name and memory are unfortunately lost in the abyss of time. These particulars have been carefully collected from the Herald's Office in Doctor's Commons, and in Dublin.* In the former, it was discovered by a great antiquary, whose business it was to find materials for the pedigree of Sir Philip, on his admission to the Order of the Bath, that previous to the coronation of Richard II., Richard Francis, who bore exactly the same arms as the present Knight, was created a Knight of Bath, *and if Sir Philip does not descend lineally from that person, it was entirely his own fault. The heralds offered to prove it by an exact genealogy, provided always that Sir Philip would pay down £200. for such advantage. After maturely weighing the honour against the price, he is believed to have declined that liberal offer.* His mother's name appears to have been Elizabeth Roe, whose father thought himself descended from the famous Sir Thomas Roe, who lived in the reign of James I, and was sent ambassador to the great Mogul by that learned monarch. *But here again the links are wanting, or the heralds ran mute for want of encouragement."* P. 17. "These *innuendoes* were immediately followed by a challenge from Mr. Francis. They met on Aug. 17. *and he was shot through the body for his trouble."* P. 28. The concluding words of the *Memoirs* are evidently fetched from Sir Philip's OWN armoury: — "This is but a slight sketch of the subject, and a very hasty view of the person. The public life of such a man, so well acquainted with the principal persons of his time, and intimate with many of them, conversant in all the transactions of his country, and mixed in some of them, *though barren of events for the Gazette*, would be interesting and instructive, if it were undertaken and executed by himself. The history of an ardent mind in perpetual action



or pursuit, never succeeding, but never courting repose or yielding to despondence, could not fail to communicate a projectile motion to other minds in parallel directions, and to similar objects. They would see that success is not necessary to happiness, much less to honour, and he who contends against adversity and persists without hope, cannot be wholly disappointed. Human virtue should be encouraged to believe, what *this man's* life has proved to be true, that in some shape or other, though not in prosperity, there is a reward for perseverance in doing right:

Tho' still by folly, vice, and faction crost,  
He finds the generous labour was not lost.

The approbation of posterity would be no recompence, if it could not be anticipated. The posthumous praise, the statue, and the monument, are incentives to others, but are lost upon the dead. *He* virtually and immediately receives the tribute, who is sure it will be paid to his memory;

Enjoys the honours destin'd to his name,  
And lives *instanter* with his future fame."

Even the critique on his writings, which appears in the *Monthly Mirror for March 1810.*, and which is quoted by Mr. Taylor p. 257., is manifestly drawn from Sir Philip's own well:—"The works of Sir Philip Francis resemble, in a great measure, those of Lord Bacon, of whom it was said, that *no man crammed so much meaning into so few words*, or, as Edmund Burke said of his style, *there is no gummy flesh in it*. His language is figurative and expressive in perfection. You never doubt about his meaning. In argument, he lightens rather than reasons on his subject. Vivid flashes from his mind, in rapid succession, illuminate the question, not by formal induction, but by uniform splendour

and irresistible coruscation." " His style is so perfectly musical, and moves to such a sprightly, animated, and interesting measure, that as it has been observed of Greek, there would be a delight in hearing it read, even if one did not understand it. The sentences are so constructed, that they roll down of themselves, and, like Sisyphus's stone, the moment they reach the bottom, rebound, and mount again on the other side. This excellence is not, however, produced by a sacrifice to pedantic or affected phrases. The essence of language is to be intelligible. New-fangled terms, and sesquipedalian words, may please fools, and deceive them into a belief that they cover sense; but sense, were it ever accompanied, would be disgraced by such ornaments. As Sir Philip has a fine ear for the collocation of words, so has he a true taste in their selection. The first of Latin critics has said: *Utinam et verba in usu quotidiano posita minus timeremus.* Our author has felt the weight of that remark, and by it acquired a noble simplicity of expression, worthy of his thoughts. Every thing in his writings, whether profound or otherwise, is plain and clear. He that runs may read, and dulness itself may comprehend." In confirmation of our opinion that the *Memoirs* emanated from Sir Philip's own pen, we may remark that the same periodical, which had in 1810. inserted them, contains in the No. for Jan. 1811. Sir Philip's paper on the Regency-Question, evidently communicated by Sir Philip himself.

Now, whether we suppose the *Memoirs* of Sir Philip to have been written by Sir Philip, (as I maintain, guided solely by internal evidence,) or by a friend of Sir Philip, who was acquainted with the facts, they must be considered to be, as Mr. Taylor does consider them to be, authentic; and in

the one case we have two authorities for the statement of the circumstances, which led to the appointment of Sir Philip, and in the other we have Sir Philip's own statement, which being not forced from him, but spontaneously given by him, is, on the principle of Dr. Johnson, to which Mr. Taylor p. 7-8. has subscribed, entitled to full credit; and this statement is directly opposed to the hypothesis of Mr. Taylor, who in that appointment unwarrantably traces the *silenced* and the *bribed* Junius.

5. But decisive as this testimony is, it has received so remarkable a confirmation from a quarter, where the truth must be presumed to have been known, where there is no room for suspicion, that Mr. Taylor himself cannot, as a fair reasoner, fail to be satisfied with the evidence, and, as an honourable man, will be ready to concede the point in dispute. Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences* p. 94. edn. 4th, writes thus: — “The reminiscence has been informed by the present (late) Bishop of Durham, that Sir Philip owed the continuance of his seat in the War-Office to the kindness of Lord Barrington, the Prelate's brother; and that Sir Philip's appointment in India was chiefly, if not wholly, due to his Lordship's recommendation of him to Lord North. After this, — if we consider how Junius wrote of Lord Barrington, we cannot be surprised that, if Sir Philip were the author of Junius's *Letters*, he should wish it to be unknown.”

6. Mr. Taylor, then, has reasoned from gratuitous assumption, and I have counter-reasoned from a real fact, attested by Sir Philip himself, by his biographer, and by Lord Barrington's brother: — a fact in no respect liable to suspicion; — a fact of which neither judge nor jury could entertain a doubt; — a fact, which was gravely stated by Sir Philip in the House of Commons, in the hearing of

many persons, who would have been able to contradict it, if false, and who, as political opponents of Sir Philip, (the Ministers and their advocates,) or, as personal enemies of Sir Philip, (the friends of Warren Hastings,) would have rejoiced in the opportunity of contradicting it; — a fact, which was 20 years after the statement of Sir Philip in a Parliamentary speech, confirmed by his biographer in a most unsuspecting narrative; — a fact, which cannot, in reference to the authorship of Junius, be supposed to have been untruly told, because the biographer wrote his sketch of Sir Philip (1810.) before Mr. Taylor had first (1813.) intimated his belief that Sir Philip was the author of Junius's *Letters*.

7. "In the *same month* that Sir Philip was expelled," says Mr. Taylor p. 85., "Junius wrote a private *Letter* to his printer, intimating that his labours were at an end, and that he should thenceforth discontinue writing, unless some good occasion offered." P. 360. "From the commencement to the termination of the *Letters* of Junius, Sir Philip Francis held a situation in the War-Office, requiring almost constant attendance. When he quitted that Office, and went abroad in 1772., the *Letters* ceased; and when he returned to England at the beginning of 1773., a *Note* finally closing the correspondence, was transmitted to Woodfall. From that time till 1781. Sir Philip was engaged in the Government of India."

I must confess that these are singular coincidences; but, if circumstances of this kind are to be considered as decisive evidences, the pretensions of many other claimants are so far equally good. For 1. it appears from Dr. Girdlestone's pamphlet that General Lee was during the *reign* of Junius supposed to be absent on the continent, and three *Letters* from him to Sir Charles Davers, dated

*Vienna, Dec. 24, 1769. Florence, May 14, 1770. Lyons, 1772.* were fictitious with respect to the dates of place, as he in point of fact was not absent from England during that 'reign of terrou,' but was at Rushbrooke, in Suffolk, busily employed in writing.\* 2. The final Note of Junius to Woodfall is dated Jan. 19, 1773., and Lloyd died on the 23d of the same month. 3. Junius quotes from speeches of Lord Chatham, when they were not in print at the time, though afterwards reported by Sir Phillip Francis. 4. A speech of Burke was reported by Junius, sent to Almon for publication, and is the only existing report of the speech. 5. Junius writes with a minute knowledge of military affairs, and Lord George Sackville is thence supposed to have written the *Letters* of Junius. 6. Junius and General Lee coincide in personal hatred of the Duke of Grafton, in the use of certain very remarkable phrases, and in a quotation from Seneca. 7. It would be easy to multiply instances of curious agreement between Junius and several of the claimants; but the aggregate number of similar instances, in reference to the entire number of claimants, may serve to convince the wary that it is not safe, in the case of any particular claimant, to rely confidently on any such argument.

XI. All this applies exactly to Sir Philip Francis," says Mr. Taylor p. 371.; "easy access to his writing might be had at that time both in the War-Office, and in the Secretary of State's Office.


\* "The person, who was at the baptism, declares that General Lee was moving from and to Rushbrooke the greatest part of that summer, (1770.) with books and papers before him, and that he was a terrible nuisance to the cook; for he had chosen the kitchen for his place to write in, and that his night-cap and dressing-gown were only taken off a few minutes before the dinner was ready to be sent upon the table. Here then is a decided proof that these *Letters* were fictitious with respect to place." P. 7.

During the 14 years that he was occupied in those departments, it must have met the eye of many persons, both in administration and out of power. Lord Chatham knew it well; for Sir Philip at one time acted as his Secretary. Lord Holland, the Earl of Egremont, the Earl of Kinnoul, Mr. Calcraft, to whom he had been in the habit of writing short Notes, respecting the proceedings in Parliament, and many others were no strangers to it. To Lord Barrington the character was familiar; and the different Clerks, Bradshaw, Chamier, etc. might have recognized it in spite of the disguise."

Mr. Taylor must excuse me for saying that he is in the above-cited words pleading against his own cause and advocating mine. It is allowed on all hands that Junius ran an immense risk in publishing his celebrated *Letters*—he was fully sensible of it—he took infinite pains to protect himself from discovery—obliged to communicate with Woodfall, his printer, he perpetually enjoins him to use the most vigilant caution, and exacts it from him in every possible way. In these circumstances nothing can be more improbable than that Sir Philip Francis, if the actual composer, should be the actual writer of the *Letters*; (for Mr. Taylor in the same part of his work argues, and with some good reasons, against the probability that Junius employed any amanuensis;—) nothing can be more improbable than that he, whose hand-writing was employed, should be a person, who was in 'almost constant attendance' at the War-Office, who was daily writing in the Office, who was continually dispersing throughout the country specimens of his hand-writing in answering communications addressed to the Secretary at War on the business of his office, who having, for some years before the earliest known composition of Junius, been employed in that Of-

fice, must have acquired a regular system of hand-writing quite incapable of being so disguised as not to be instantly recognised; — nothing can be more improbable than that an inferior Clerk in the War-Office, with whose hand-writing were acquainted so many political personages, who are more or less mentioned in the *Letters*, and who had each his private reasons for wishing to detect the author, should engage in so perilous a task, that the flattery of hope itself could not induce him to believe in the possibility of escaping detection. So much courage, so much talent, so much experience of life, so much knowledge of the world, so perfect an acquaintance with official characters and official business, with public men and private individuals, with the history of the times, the course of passing transactions, the secret motives for ministerial measures, and the secret biography of great statesmen, so much knowledge of city-politics and court-manceuvres, were required from him, who should undertake the task of writing the *Letters* of Junius, combined with the necessity of disguising his hand-writing, that an inferior Clerk in the War-Office, habituated to ‘the insolence of office’ by long servitude, would have shrunk with horror at the thought of making even the attempt.

XII. It seems to be quite certain that Sir Philip Francis had no private pecuniary resources beyond the emoluments of his Clerkship in the War-Office, which Mr. Taylor estimates, and I dare say correctly enough, at £400 a year. Now, from various passages in the private *Letters* of Junius to Woodfall it is apparent that Junius had good pecuniary resources; for he assures his printer that he shall be indemnified for any expenses, which the latter might incur by prosecutions for libel. But had Sir Philip Francis this command of money, — an inferior Clerk



in the War-Office? It is impossible to believe it, and if Mr. Taylor expects me to believe it, he is required to produce his authority to substantiate the inference, or his evidence to prove the fact. 2. A very little consideration will satisfy us that, in order to evince the authorship of Sir Philip, Mr. Taylor has not only to shew that Sir Philip could command any sum of money necessary for paying the expenses of a public trial, but to demonstrate that he could spare from his very limited income the cash, which would be wanted to bring out the *Letters*, in paying for pen, ink, and paper, in collecting political information and private news, in paying postage, and carriage, and portorage, in remunerating waiters, and in attending taverns, and in a hundred other respects, which would materially abridge an annual income of £400. 3. Mr. Taylor has not undertaken to establish that Sir Philip, if the writer of the *Letters*, had the pecuniary support of any political party, or that he was identified with any political party in feelings and in designs. He therefore supposes him, (*credat Judæus apella!*) to have launched a vessel for a most dangerous voyage on his own private account; he supposes the inferior Clerk in the War-Office to have been inspired with the purest patriotism, and to have been prepared to immolate himself on the altar of his country; — or else that the sole object of hazarding his official situation and his personal safety was ‘the desperate chance’ of ameliorating his condition in life, and participating in the benefit of ministerial changes! For my own part, I have not so learned human nature, as to entertain such a wild hypothesis and such extravagant ideas. 4. On the supposition that Lloyd was the writer of the *Letters*, we have no difficulty in respect to pecuniary resources; for he could draw on the purse of George Grenville; nor



in respect to a political party; for the opinions of Junius on the great questions of America and of Wilkes were those of George Grenville: see the observation of Sir James Mackintosh, subjoined to the *Edinburgh Review* of the *Icon Basilice*, where there is a mention of Lloyd's claims on this particular account.

XIII. Another difficulty, in which Mr. Taylor places himself, is in respect to Welbore Ellis Esq., the late Lord Mendip, who was the early patron of Sir Philip Francis, and has received the unmeasured abuse of Junius. The Parliamentary statement of Sir Philip himself already cited, informs us "that in 1763. Mr. Ellis had appointed him to fill a station of great trust in the War-Office," and in the *Memoirs* we are told "that in 1763. he was appointed by the late Lord Mendip, then Welbore Ellis Esq., and Secretary at War, to a considerable post in the War-Office." Let us now see how Junius (2, 128.) treats Mr. Ellis:—"The little dignity of Mr. Ellis has been committed. The mine was sunk;—combustibles provided, and Welbore Ellis, the Guy Faux of the fable, waited only for the signal of command. All of a sudden the country-gentlemen discover how grossly they have been deceived;—the Minister's heart fails him, the grand plot is defeated in a moment, and poor Mr. Ellis and his motion taken into custody. From the event of Friday last, one would imagine that some fatality hung over this gentleman. Whether he makes or suppresses a motion, he is equally sure of his disgrace. But the complexion of the times will suffer no man to be Vice-Treasurer of Ireland with impunity." Junius favours us with the following Note:—"About this time the courtiers talked of nothing but a Bill of Pains and Penalties against the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, or impeachment at least. Little

*mannikin* Ellis told the King that, if the business were left to his management, he would engage to do wonders. It was thought very odd that a motion of so much importance should be entrusted to the most contemptible little piece of machinery in the whole kingdom. His honest zeal, however, was disappointed. The minister took fright, and at the very instant that little Ellis was going to open, sent him an order to sit down. All their magnanimous threats ended in a ridiculous vote of censure, and a still more ridiculous address to the King. This shameful desertion so afflicted the generous mind of George III., that he was obliged to live upon potatoes for three weeks, to keep off a malignant fever. Poor man! — *Quis talia fando — Temperet a lacrymis?*” “On Sir Philip’s return from Lisbon,” says Mr. Coventry p. 24., “he was recommended to the notice of Welbore Ellis, afterwards Lord Mendip, who was at that time Secretary of War. This gentleman also patronised him, and gave him an important situation in his office. Junius invariably speaks of Welbore Ellis with the utmost contempt, 2, 128. ; 2, 239. ‘Welbore Ellis, what say you? Is this the law of Parliament, or is it not? I am a plain man, sir, and cannot follow you through the phlegmatic forms of an oration. Speak out, Grildrig — say yes, or no.’ Is this the language of one who was under personal obligations to his friend?” In these circumstances we may well expect Mr. Taylor to prove, before we can entertain any idea of Sir Philip Francis’s authorship, 1. that Sir Philip, who was patronised by Welbore Ellis, had in the character of *Junius*, no sense of gratitude and no sense of decency to restrain him from the contemptuous abuse of his patron, 2. that he has *anywhere* in his acknowledged writings abused Welbore Ellis, 3. that he had any

real or supposed *private* and *personal* reason for abusing him under the signature of *Junius*. But it is impossible for Mr. Taylor to satisfy just enquiry on this point, when Sir Philip, in stating the particulars of his life, as he did in Parliament on the before-mentioned occasion, observes a profound silence, and when his biographer is equally silent. Before we can admit that a man in the dependent situation of Sir Philip Francis, with the golden prospects of life before him from his public services, and his conscious integrity, and his aspiring genius, and his established official character, would mark out for the victim of his satire the very person, who had secured to him 'a considerable post in the War-Office,' we have a right to enquire for a private and personal reason, apart from all political and ministerial considerations, which private and personal reason has not been shewn, and cannot be shewn, by Mr. Taylor to have influenced the conduct and directed the language of Sir Philip Francis in the mask of *Junius*.

XIV. Supposing Sir Philip to have been the author of *Junius*, how will Mr. Taylor account for the personal and rancorous hostility to the Duke of Grafton, which was manifestly felt by *Junius*? In the case of General Lee we have ample evidence of this feeling, and though this is one of the tests for detecting the author of *Junius*, I do not require it to be applied to every individual claim; but in the case of Sir Philip Francis, who is a demi-official personage and *quasi*-public character, a frequent speaker in Parliament and an experienced writer of pamphlets, it is fair to require its application, because in the life of Sir Philip subsequent to the disappearance of *Junius* there were occasions, when this feeling towards the Duke of Grafton, if he had ever entertained it, would have been manifested by the fearless Sir Philip.

XV. After the patronage, which Sir Philip Francis had in early life experienced from Lord Chatham and Lord Mendip, and after the severity, with which they have been treated by Junius, any attempt to identify Sir Philip and Junius, *if successful*, would be only to procure for Sir Philip literary reputation by the total sacrifice of public and private character; — TO PROVERBIALISE HIS NAME, MEMORIALISE HIS CRIMES, AND ETERNISE HIS INFAMY.

XVI. I am concerned to disturb the happy sensations and the *italicised* energy and the glorious ovation, with which Mr. Taylor choseth his ingenious and elaborate work: — “It is hardly necessary to mention,” says he p. 401., “after what has been adduced, that in all his researches the writer *never met with one fact, one thought, one word, which in the slightest degree impeded the course of his demonstration.* This is a negative criterion of the truth, but of no small value after so extensive a survey, and it properly crowns the whole pile of evidence.” That cannot be “met with,” which is not suffered to come into the view — that may not be found, which is not sought — that may not be discovered, which we take no pains to discover. I have looked, and have seen — I have searched, and have collected — I have examined, and have argued — I have proved, and may expect the honour of the triumph.

I remain, dear Sir, with great esteem  
your faithful friend and respectful servant,  
E. H. BARKER.

Thetford, Febr. 8, 1827.

P. S. I. Having in the *Letter to Sir James Mackintosh* adverted to a legal blunder of Junius, pointed out by my excellent and enlightened friend, Mr. Charles Butler, I will transcribe the remarks of an acute and intelligent friend, who has commented on my paper: — “I differ from your ano-

nymous, however 'intelligent legal friend,' and agree thoroughly with C. Butler, that no lawyer by trade, conveyancer, chancery or common lawyer, could have applied the term *fee-simple and trustee* in the metaphorical senses Junius has done. Here really arises internal evidence, if it were wanting, to negative Junius being a professional lawyer. But, faith, he had somehow a capital *both-holder* afterwards." "The legal expressions sometimes used by Junius," says the *Edinburgh Reviewer*, (himself a distinguished lawyer,) "where he is not discussing any point of law, have been held by many as an evidence of his belonging to the learned profession, notwithstanding his own repeated denial. Thus, 'savouring of the realty,' etc. But in some cases he uses law-language with a degree of inaccuracy, which we should never have found in one of his habits of distinct and correct thinking, had he been a lawyer. Thus, in the dedication, he makes a confusion between the *quality* and the *species* of an estate, where he says 'that the Legislature is the *trustee*, not the *owner*; the *fee-simple* is in the *people*.'" "The mind of our *Freeholder of Antrim*, (Boyd,) is strongly impregnated with the the very essence of Junius: he has his flowery style, his dexterous sophistry, and his anarchical violence. The principle, and indeed, the pen of the mysterious Junius, are discernible, by an attentive eye, in the preface, and, I was going to say, in every paragraph of our *Freeholder*. The first Letter of the *Freeholder* is dated on the 5th of Febr., and the last on the 9th of April 1776. His first *motto* is the well-known Jacobinical principle of Junius: 'They are the trustees, not owners of the estate; the fee-simple is in us.' Theobald Wolfe Tone could not have gone beyond this! The *Freeholder* sets out in the following manner:—'The

‘ great writer, whose words I have placed at the head  
 ‘ of my paper, is justly acknowledged to excel, in  
 ‘ splendour of imagery, and in strength of diction.  
 ‘ But his excellence extends to points still more  
 ‘ important. No writer has investigated with such  
 ‘ sagacity, nor with such clearness pointed out, the  
 ‘ true nature of our admirable constitution. The  
 ‘ wisdom and learning of Locke had ascertained some  
 ‘ great fundamental maxims, which constituted, or  
 ‘ at least contributed to form the basis of our liber-  
 ‘ ties. But it remained for the succeeding address  
 ‘ and eloquence of Junius, to encounter and to sub-  
 ‘ due at least, in the fields of argument, the more  
 ‘ refined corruptions of latter times.’ Here, then,  
 is the father fondling his child, in a place where he  
 supposed himself to be unknown, and at a time when  
 the filiation could not easily be suspected.” George  
 Chalmers’s *Author of Junius ascertained from a Con-  
 catenation of Circumstances, amounting to moral De-  
 monstration*, Lond. 1817. p. 30. It would require  
 a larger measure of credulity than I possess, to be-  
 lieve that the writer of the *Freeholder*, who uses the  
 words quoted by Mr. Chalmers, was the author of  
 Junius’s *Letters*. The legal mistake of Junius, as  
 the reader will observe, is copied by Mr. Boyd.

2. Mr. Butler having remarked that Junius “ had  
 evidently been a great constitutional reader,” puts  
 this question: “ Does Sir Philip appear to have  
 been such, from any of his writings? even the latest?”  
 I was ready to take the fact on Mr. Butler’s autho-  
 rity, supposing him to have examined the point, and  
 knowing him to be a competent judge. I called on  
 Mr. Taylor to disprove the fact or to submit to the  
 fair inference. But I had overlooked what Mr. T.  
 says in p. 229.: — “ In the conclusion of his *Essay*  
 (on the Regency Question, Dec. 24, 1810. *Monthly*  
*Mirror Jan.* 1811., Taylor p. 215.) Sir Philip pro-

fesses to go much beyond his first propositions : and in doing so, he observes, ‘ I stand on the constitution of my country, *which I have studied as long, and I believe as carefully, as any man in it :*’ words applicable in the highest degree to Junius.” Sir Philip himself, then, does claim the credit of being ‘ a great constitutional reader,’ and the question is whether the claim be as well founded as Junius’s ? The writings and the speeches of Sir Philip are sufficiently numerous to enable Mr. Butler or Mr. Taylor to determine a point, which I do not pretend to have examined.

3. “ Junius had ceased writing under that signature, when the name of Sir Philip Francis was mentioned by him. *Jan. 25, 1772.* Junius informs Mr. Woodfall,—‘ having nothing better to do, I propose to entertain myself and the public with torturing that Barrington.’ Three days afterwards, a severe invective against that nobleman followed, which was two months before the public were apprised of the dismissal of Sir Philip Francis ; and after this dismissal we have a long account of Lord Barrington’s life ; an attentive perusal of which must convince every reader that such a narrative proceeded from a very different quarter than from the pen of Sir Philip Francis. Events are referred to, which happened before Sir Philip Francis was born, but of which Junius had a thorough knowledge ; he confesses ‘ Lord Barrington and he were old acquaintance,’ and in taking ‘ a short review of him from his political birth,’ comments on many subjects, which could only have been known to one, who moved in a very different circle to Sir Philip Francis. Lord Barrington had become unpopular in consequence of having discharged Sir Philip Francis from his office without just cause. He afterwards endeavoured to clear his character

from Junius's imputations, and in furtherance of this measure he took an early opportunity of applying to Lord North on Sir Philip Francis's behalf, when he found he had arrived in England from his tour. Lord North accordingly gave him an appointment in India. If Lord Barrington had had the most distant idea that Sir Philip Francis was in any way concerned in the authorship of the *Letters*, would he thus generously have recommended him to the notice of Lord North?" Mr. Coventry p. 26. Now, while I fully admit that Lord Barrington *might* from good motives of compunction or of policy, — prompted by the secret reproaches of his conscience, or goaded by the public remonstrances of Junius, — have felt the propriety of recommending the promotion of Sir Philip Francis; while I may reasonably conclude that Lord Barrington *did* recommend him for one or for the other, or for both of these motives, because the biographer of Sir Philip expressly says that the latter quitted his post in the War-Office, "in consequence of a difference with Viscount Barrington, by whom he thought himself injured," and that "possibly Lord B. thought so too, or that something was due to Mr. Francis, as will appear hereafter;" while I fully admit that it was as natural for Lord Barrington thus to think and thus to act towards Sir Philip, as for Lord Thurlow to relish the society and enjoy the friendship of that gentleman after his famous declaration about him, I am not equally prepared to admit that either Lord B. would have recommended the promotion, or Lord T. would have tolerated the company of Sir Philip, had they entertained the least idea that in him lurked the author of *Junius*. It is one thing to promote a person, whom we feel ourselves to have treated with unmerited harshness, and it is another thing to promote a person, who



has forfeited all claims to our justice by having taken his own public revenge, and to our respect by having dealt out to us the most unqualified abuse. Mr. Taylor, in attributing the promotion of Sir Philip to Lord Barrington as the price of Junius's silence, argues not only against all human probabilities, but against the positive declarations of Sir Philip and of his biographer, against all human experience, and against the principles of human nature, and it is never safe for one moment to place any reliance on reasoning so tortuous and so unsound.

4. "There was nothing extraordinary in Sir Philip Francis taking a tour to France after his dismissal from the War-Office, where he had been so closely confined to business. He had no other employment to attend to, and having never been in France before, it was a novelty. Whereas Junius expressly states a circumstance, which he saw with his own eyes, before Sir Philip was born, viz. 'The Jesuitical books burnt in Paris by the common hangman.'" Mr. Coventry p. 57. I admit the fairness of this argument.

5. "Sir Philip Francis was an *Irishman*: it is proved by incontrovertible evidence that Junius was an Englishman." Mr. C. p. 27. This 'incontrovertible evidence' has been successfully controverted by me.

6. "The family of Sir Philip Francis," says Mr. C. p. 27., "lived on intimate terms with David Garrick, for whom they entertained the highest esteem. The tenor of the correspondence proves that Junius had no regard for Mr. Garrick whatever." I admit the facts and the inference of Mr. C. I consider the argument to be perfectly fair, and entitled, from its unsuspecting nature, to much weight. If, then, (believe it not,) Sir Philip Fran-

cis was such an ingrate towards his benefactors, patrons, and friends, Lords Chatham and Mendip, without any assigned or assignable motive; if he, without any motive, had the rancorous feeling towards the former, manifested by Junius in the commencement of his career, while he, in his avowed writings, to the latest moment of his life, professed the warmest attachment to the person and the deepest veneration for the character of Lord Chatham; if he scrupled not to sacrifice the friendships of his family on the altar of his malignity, then I say that the records of history hold up to our execration no such public criminal, — poetic fiction has fabled no such heroic monster, — and hell itself contains not within its womb a fouler fiend!

7. “ Sir Philip Francis wrote to Sir Richard Phillips, stating that it was ‘ *a malignant falsehood*,’ to attribute the authorship of the *Letters* to him. What language could be stronger, or more to the point? Upon the receipt of this communication, Sir R. Phillips immediately abandoned any further enquiry, perceiving the theory was built on an erroneous supposition. It would have been well for the reputation of other literary critics, had they followed so wise an example.” Mr. Coventry p. 27. To this *Letter* of Sir Philip, addressed to the renowned biblioplist, Mr. Taylor p. 7. applies Johnson’s logic about spontaneous and forced admissions. I allow the general propriety of the distinction; I would have allowed the distinction in the present instance, if Sir Philip had confined himself to a simple denial of the fact by declaring the report to be ‘ a falsehood,’ but the case is materially altered, when Sir Philip characterises the report as ‘ *a malignant falsehood*.’ The *spontaneous* epithet is opposed to the *forced* declaration; I am constrained to admit the preponderance of the former, and in fact to do

homage even on this occasion to the principle itself, for which Dr. Johnson contended.

8. "To have approved at the same time of Mr. Grenville and Lord Chatham was impossible. The conduct of the latter, during the period he was last in office, was calculated to wound the feelings of all Mr. G.'s friends. Not content with Lord Temple's consent to give up his brother, for the purpose of forming a new and comprehensive administration, Lord C. is said to have required so many other sacrifices from that nobleman and his party, that he lost the most favourable opportunity of really benefiting his country. What added to this misconduct, as it was generally deemed, was the countenance he gave, by retaining place, to the ministry of the Duke of Grafton. To this part of Lord C.'s life Sir Philip probably adverts, when he affirms, that his Lordship's character was in some respects *faulty*; and Junius, by the severity of his attack on his Lordship at this particular period, evinced that it excited his displeasure, (2, 467. signature, *Anti-Sejanus*.) This cause, however, did not continue long." Mr. Taylor p. 100. 1. This part of Lord C.'s history and of Junius's conduct greatly favours the pretensions of Lloyd, the private Secretary of G. Grenville. 2. I have elsewhere shewn that Junius's aversion to Lord C., as well as his subsequent liking to him, was entirely political, whereas Sir P. F. had no political or personal aversion to his Lordship, and has nowhere in his avowed writings, whether prior or posterior to his Lordship's death, (when he was at liberty to speak freely,) spoken irreverently of him. 3. In these circumstances, then, can Mr. T. fairly draw inferences in favour of his hero? 4. Sir Philip speaking of Lord C. as 'a great, illustrious, *faulty* human being,' wholly differs from Junius's language and spirit, describing the same Lord C. as a dotard,

maniac, and criminal. 5. The only apparent censure of Lord C. by Sir P. F. is so *equipoised* by the accompanying praise, as to make it a nice point to determine whether it be any censure, and whether it be not rather the highest eulogy by impressing the reader's mind with the writer's discrimination and impartiality. By *faulty* he doubtless meant the impracticable and domineering pride of Lord C. which led to great difficulties on occasions and to serious errors in conduct, and he might have so thought and spoken, if he had never written or read a line of Junius. 6. If Sir P. F. as Junius spared neither Lord C. nor Lord Mendip, though his patrons, why, let me ask Mr. T., should he as Junius have spared Lord Holland, also the patron of Sir P. F., as Mr. T. says p. 4. 111.? If he had any good feeling in the latter case, he would not have wanted it in the other; and it is inconsistent in Mr. T. to argue at one time (p. 100.) from Sir P. F.'s, *i. e.* Junius's, dislike, and at another (p. 111.) from his approbation of Lord C.; at one time from Sir P. F.'s ingratitude to his patrons, Lords C. and M., and at another time from his gratitude for his patron Lord H. Hence the characters of Junius and Sir P. F. are irreconcilable to each other; there is the broadest line of distinction between them. 7. Sir P. F. was, (speaking generally,) throughout his political career, a consistent character; M. Taylor admits this fact; his book proceeds on this ground; but he has not perceived that in seeking to identify Sir P. F. with Junius, he makes him the most inconsistent, ungrateful, and unprincipled of men.

9. The *Letters*, which I have printed on this curious and interesting question, are not published for sale, but only privately distributed; and my desire is to obtain the candid opinions of my literary friends and acquaintance, that I may profit by their remarks,

before I publish any work on the subject. I have written strongly, where I have felt warmly; frankly, where I have a decided conviction; freely, as becometh the spirit of a Briton; but I am unconscious of having pushed any arguments to an unwarrantable length, or of having planted any on weak grounds. I shall, however, readily review any opinions, which are considered to be not well founded, and I shall with real pleasure retract any errors of the head or of the pen, which are pointed out to me by the severity of criticism or the sincerity of friendship. I profess not to have minutely examined the whole question about the authorship of Junius, or about the particular claims of Sir Philip Francis; I want the leisure, not the inclination to pursue the enquiry — but I have attended to certain points in the controversy, and I have viewed with an impartial eye the principal claims of Sir Philip, intermingling observations on the claims of other persons. On a future occasion I shall extend my researches and supply any present deficiencies, more intent on investigating the truth, than on maintaining an opinion; and in forming any opinion, desirous to support it by fair inferences and right conclusions and undeniable facts, rather than by ingenious conjectures and Athenian sophistry and imperfect statements. My endeavours have not been fruitless: for honourable and well-informed and wise men have intimated their great satisfaction with the arguments for rejecting the claims of Sir Philip Francis; they have encouraged me to continue my exertions; and they have furnished me with facts and circumstances and remarks, which will be employed by me, when my papers undergo the proper revision.

*Febr. 24, 1827.*

E. H. B.



A FURTHER REFUTATION  
OF THE  
Claims of Sir Philip Francis.

---

I. I have already intimated my opinion that hand-writing is a very fallacious criterion for determining the authorship of Junius's Letters; and I would remark that in any ordinary case proof founded on hand-writing, though generally in the courts of justice considered the least liable to suspicion, is often in the courts of conscience very insufficient evidence to demonstrate guilt. It ought in no case of importance to be received as satisfactory proof *in itself*, though it may justly be admitted as confirmatory of other evidence. The testimony of an accomplice, if unconfirmed by other witnesses, is rejected, and I would put on the same footing testimony of this kind: let it be regarded as a collateral, not as a substantive proof, as proving amanuensis-ship, not authorship. Cases continually occur, where the personal identity of a prisoner is positively sworn to by a witness, while the prisoner himself establishes the fact of his non-identity: hence I desire to see courts of justice governed by this rule, that the personal identity of a prisoner should not be admitted on the oath of a prosecuting witness, unless the identity should be shewn by corroborating circumstances. With what propriety can a court of justice solemnly, but from mere inspection, declare any particular Letter, produced before its eyes, to be the composition

and the writing of any specific individual, unless the court has satisfied itself that no other individual could write a very resembling hand? For what crime is more common than the forgery of hand-writing? and what fraud oftener succeeds in eluding the vigilance of the persons most accustomed to see the real hand? But the difficulty of judging from the hand-writing in the case of Junius is great indeed; 1. because we have before us a mere fictitious personage, 2. because we have no evidence to shew that all the *Letters* of Junius were written in one and the same hand, 3. because we have no proof to shew that if that were the case, the writing is not the hand of some amanuensis, 4. because it is an unascertained point whether Junius, (as Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences*, 1, 100. thinks,) or did not, (as Mr. Taylor p. 370. thinks,) employ an amanuensis, 5. because it is an equally undecided point whether if any amanuensis were employed, he did or did not convey the *Letters* to the office of Mr. Woodfall? 6. because it is equally an undecided point whether the writing, to whomsoever the hand belonged, was a real or a disguised hand? This branch of the question, then, is involved in so much doubt and difficulty, that all reasoning about it is either unsatisfactory or insecure; and I must strongly impress on the reader the necessity of looking at it with the greatest caution, and the keenest suspicion, because the advocates for particular claims appeal to hand-writing as one of the best tests for detecting the author of Junius. I have remarked that any argument in favour of an individual, grounded on this test, will have peculiar and striking force, if the same argument be not employed to support other claims; but that, if it be so employed, it loses much of its effect, and half of its value: its strength lies in its exclusive adaptation to one particular claimant.

Well, how stands the fact in respect to Junius? The acute Mr. Taylor feels no doubt and is tormented by no difficulty in identifying the hand-writing of Junius and Sir Philip Francis; the patient Mr. Coventry is equally well convinced that Lord George Sackville's hand is the same as the mysterious hand of Junius; and the worthy Dr. Girdlestone triumphed in the certainty of this test, and its applicability to the writing of General Lee. Thus the argument in favour of one hand-writing is neutralised by the argument in favour of another; and such is our perseverance in opinion, our blindness in prejudice, or our devotion to self-love, that we are unable to discern the unsolid foundation of this reasoning, or to break through the thick mist before our eyes.

1. Mr. Butler (in his *Reminiscences* 1, 78.) states that a *Letter*, addressed by him to Mr. Wilkes, was detained at the post-office from its supposed resemblance to the hand-writing of Junius. "Business having carried me to Ireland in 1776, I wrote to Mr. Wilkes from Holyhead: on my return he informed me that my *Letter* had been stopped at the post-office, from the similarity in the hand-writing to that of Junius."

2. Some time ago, I had occasion to write to a clerical gentleman in the county in which I reside; I had no personal knowledge of him, and had never exchanged a *Letter* or *Note* with him; on the arrival of my *Letter* he and his wife were perfectly astonished at the striking resemblance, which they found between my hand-writing and the hand-writing of the lady's grandmother. I afterwards visited them at their cottage, and they then mentioned the circumstance to me, and the husband declared that, if he had been suddenly called into a court of justice, and asked by some learned Barrister whether a *Letter*



bearing my signature was not in the hand-writing of his wife's grandmother, he should have replied in the affirmative.

3. On Aug. 6. 1827, I was favored with the company of a legal friend to dinner. I introduced the subject of Junius, and of the fallacy of arguments drawn from hand-writing. He informed me that he some years ago received from Messrs. Leigh and Sotheby, of the Strand, an account written, by some clerk of their establishment, in a hand so similar to the writing of his uncle living in Nottinghamshire, that he could have sworn it to be a specimen of his penmanship. His uncle, from a little defect in his hand, formed certain letters in a particular manner, and a simliar conformation of those letters was observed in the communication from the Strand.

4. " I am greatly indebted to you for your two additional *Letters* on the subject of Junius, which, I frankly acknowledge, are to me quite unanswerable. At the same time I ought also to own that I have entered very little into the question. Tired, not persuaded, I used to listen to Dr. Girdlestone's arguments in favour of General Lee, and I had little other feeling on the subject but a desire to get away from Junius, the General, and the Doctor. As a strong proof of the justice of your remark how insecure is the inference to be drawn from hand-writing alone, I recollect one evening, after Dr. Girdlestone had given me a part of a Letter from General Lee, to prove his point, in which I thought he failed, he gave me, without any reference to Junius, another from Mrs. Cooper, the wife of Dr. Cooper, our Minister here, and the coincidence of the autograph with that of Junius was more striking than can easily be imagined. I have the Letter now, and hope I shall recollect to shew it to you. I have ever since doubted if Junius might not have

employed his wife as his amanuensis." *Extract from a Letter of Dawson Turner Esq. to E. H. B., dated Yarmouth, Sept. 17, 1827.*

5. From my amiable and valuable friend, General Cockburne, I received the following communication.

*Shanganagh, June 12, 1827.*

" My dear Sir,

The day after I despatched my last Letter, I received your's, and I write this to inform you of a curious circumstance as to hand-writing proof, and you are at liberty to make what use you please of it.

" A few months ago I spent some days in the same house with the ex-Judge Johnstone. He was prosecuted in London, about 18 years ago, for a libel on the Lord Lieutenant. viz. the famous Letter signed *Juverna*, and published in Cobbett's *Register*. Cobbett, (as he was allowed to do,) gave up the MS. Two witnesses swore positively that it was the hand-writing of the Judge, and it did happen to be very like; and he was found guilty. However, he was not called up for judgment, and he retired from the bench on a pension. He is a man of strict truth, very clever, and *much esteemed*, and he ASSURED ME on his sacred honour thus: —  
 ' Well, now it is all over, I declare on my honour,  
 ' I not only never wrote a line or a word of it, but  
 ' I may say I never composed it. I neither wrote  
 ' it, nor published it, nor was privy to it in any way.'  
 And yet his hand-writing was positively sworn to. And now to tell you how this happened.

" Judge Johnstone was for many years in the habit of keeping a journal, and *privately* making his remarks on politics and other matters. The book lay on a shelf in his library — he had made some comments on the events of that particular *time*; I

think during or soon after Emmett's rebellion, as it was called. A young friend on a visit copied many of these remarks, without the Judge's knowledge, and he was afterwards set on by a noble lord to write against Lord H., as I think Charles Lloyd was by the Grenvilles to write *Junius*, and he wrote and published *Juvena*, certainly having taken much or many hints out of the Judge's journal. When the Judge was prosecuted, the young man came and offered to avow himself; but the Judge said — 'No, they cannot prove it against me, and if you avow, they may go the length to say, I got you to avow merely to screen myself.' This and some *other circumstances* determined the Judge, and yet he was found guilty; though, as you now see, neither the composer nor actual writer by pen and ink, nor publisher. So much for the testimony or proof of hand-writing.

"I am better since I came here, but still very weak.


"Sincerely your's,

"G. Cockburne."

6. "The writer," says Mr. Taylor p. 365., "knows Sir Philip Francis solely as a public man; and was even unacquainted with his *hand-writing* till this work was in the press. Since then he has seen it, and HE CAN ASSURE THE READER THAT IT RESEMBLES IN EVERY RESPECT THE HAND-WRITING OF JUNIUS. THE CHARACTERS HAVE THE SAME PECULIAR SHAPES, AND A GENERAL LIKENESS IS VISIBLE AT FIRST SIGHT, IN SPITE OF THE DISGUISE. In the construction of the private Notes, there is a singular degree of uniformity; they usually begin without the ceremony of an address, though written in the first person, and conclude without signature, as in the Notes to Woodfall; but where the signature is added, it generally consists of the initials

P. F. with a strong dash of the pen above and below, exactly like the signature C. in the *fac-simile* of Junius. These particulars are mentioned, lest it should be thought that the hand-writing is dissimilar, and that for this reason a specimen is not given. FROM THE IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO EVIDENCE OF THAT KIND, it cannot be supposed that pains were not taken to obtain it, but no piece of writing of sufficient length, and early enough in point of time, could easily be met with. This notice may perhaps draw from some friendly quarter the proper documents. For these, however, the writer is less anxious, because he was not guided in his own inquiry by any such assistance. He considered the subject as *a question of history, affording a fair field for literary investigation*; and if he has not made good his cause in an honourable manner *by the aid of books alone*, he will be contented to lose it."

These concluding observations of Mr. Taylor do him great honour, and I must own that what he has said on the subject of hand-writing is sufficiently discreet, though he is too confident as to the identity between the hand of Junius and Sir Philip Francis. The following statement with the subjoined remarks afford a memorable instance not only of the uncertainty of all reasoning on this subject, but also of the fallacy of supposing, 1. that Sir Philip Francis alone wrote a hand exactly resembling the writing of Junius, and 2. that he is, therefore, by this argument alone, identified with Junius. For, if Mr. Dawson Turner, who is the most distinguished collector of autographs, was deceived in respect to the hand-writing of Sir Philip Francis, who will henceforth venture either to rely on the perfect identity of writing in Junius and Sir Philip Francis, or even to consider such an argument in any case entitled to much weight?



7. " Mr. Valpy may probably have told you that at the time, to which I have just referred, he was good enough to give me your *Letter to Mr. Uvedale Price* upon the claims of Sir Philip Francis to the authorship of Junius, in consequence of my stating to him a singular circumstance, which it is right you should know, and I will therefore take the liberty of here mentioning it, even at the hazard of a repetition. The very evening before I dined with Mr. Valpy, I had passed with Mr. Upcott, who shewed me the Garrick Papers, and while turning them over, said, — ' Here is a Letter of ' which I am sure you do not know the hand-writ- ' ing.' I instantly replied, — ' It is from Sir Philip Francis,' and I would almost swear to it: it was the original Letter from Junius to Garrick. Those from Junius to Woodfall I have never seen, but, according to the *facsimile*, the autograph is quite different. I give you the fact without comment. and you will draw from it what conclusion you think fit. Your own arguments, I frankly admit, are to me incontrovertible on the opposite side." *Extract from a Letter of Dawson Turner, Esq. to E. H. B. dated Yarmouth, April 12, 1827.*

On the receipt of this intelligence I applied to my friend, Mr. Coventry, who was acquainted with Mr. Upcott. His answers to my interrogatories shew, 1. that Mr. Dawson Turner was mistaken in the identity of the hand with the writing of Sir Philip Francis; 2. that the Letter in question is a copy from the original, which is in Mr. Woodfall's possession; 3. that it was written by Mr Woodfall's Attorney, who lived in Paternoster-Row. But it may be satisfactory to the reader to have before him Mr. Coventry's own words: — " May 15, 1827. I have seen the original Letter that Junius sent to Garrick, or rather I have seen a copy of it made by

---

Junius's order. The original was retained by Woodfall. THE HAND-WRITING IS UNLIKE THAT OF FRANCIS OR JUNIUS. It is in Mr. Upcott's possession, as well as Garrick's rough draught of an answer. The composition does Garrick great credit, being the best Letter I ever read from the pen of that great man." "July 10, 1827. To return to Garrick, you ask me if my assertion of Junius's Letter to the great actor being in Mr. Woodfall's possession, is founded on fact? To which I reply, it is — I have handled it and read it at Mr. Woodfall's house. I have also read the copy in Mr. Upcott's possession." "July 26, 1827. "It was Mr. Woodfall's lawyer, who lived in Paternoster-Row, that copied Garrick's Letter in Mr. Upcott's possession."

II. The introduction of Garrick's name reminds me to gratify the reader by laying before him a very different Letter of Junius to Garrick, of which no notice is taken in Mr. Woodfall's edition of Junius, and which Mr. Woodfall never saw till I sent it for his inspection through Mr. Coventry. Mr. Woodfall, then, has no documents to prove, and no recollections to disprove, its genuineness. Perhaps some of my readers may be able to point out the source whence it was obtained; and that will guide us as to the genuineness and the authenticity of it. I can discern in it no marks of imitation — it supplies no materials for argument against its own genuineness and authenticity — the imperfection of the date and the signature, so characteristic of Junius, and the correctness of the intelligence about Mr. Ramus, actually confirmed by the subsequent edition of Woodfall, and by the *Reminiscences* of Mr. Butler, are solid reasons for believing in both the genuineness and the authenticity, while the brevity of the composition implies an original pen, because an imi-

tator would have been so much pleased with the exercise of his talent, that "the excursions of his genius" would have been "immense,"—copious in novelty of thought, and redundant in prodigality of phrase, "his imperial fancy would have laid all nature under tribute, and have collected riches from every scene of the creation, and every walk of art;"\* Archilochean in bitterness of expression, and wielding the lightning of heaven with a god-like arm.

The *Letter* was found in a copy of Junius belonging to the late T. Park, Esq. the celebrated antiquarian—he had cut it out of a newspaper, but unfortunately has omitted to furnish the date of the newspaper.—

“ Garrick and Junius,

“ A curious political Anecdote.

“ At the close of Junius’s political warfare, Mr. Garrick received a *Note* in his dressing-room from the present Mr. Henry Sampson Woodfall, informing him that the *Public Advertiser* of that day contained the last *Letter* that would be published by that very celebrated writer. Convinced that the tidings of such an event would be highly acceptable at *Buckingham House*, Mr. Garrick instantly wrote to Mr. Ramus, then *royal factotum*, as follows:—

‘ My dear Ramus,

‘ Junius writes no more!

‘ Your’s ever truly,

‘ D. G.’

“ Mr. Ramus, as may be supposed, lost not a moment’s time in conveying this agreeable intelligence to the Sovereign’s ear, and that with the utmost privacy: notwithstanding which, Mr. Garrick, to his unspeakable astonishment, received the following *Letter* the next day, in the *identical hand-*

\* The Rev. Robt. Hall’s *Apology for the Freedom of the Press* p. 49. ed. 7th.

*writing* of Junius; for which extraordinary circumstance he was unable to account to the day of his death.

“ Copy.

‘ Monday.

‘ Sir,

Your prudential habits might have prevented you from becoming the unnecessary intelligencer of my designs. I stood not in need of your offices to proclaim my intentions. Probably the measure was suggested by some personal vanity: in that case you shall not long remain ungratified; for having done with the baneful politics of Princes, I have now full leisure to descend to the mimic monarchs of the stage.

‘ JUNIUS.’”

I ought not in justice and candour to omit the fact, noticed to me by Mr. Coventry, that, while the Garrick papers contain a copy of that *Letter* of Junius, which is published in Woodfall's edition, together with a copy of Garrick's answer, no trace is found of the above-mentioned *Letter* of Junius addressed to that eminent actor, and that Mr. Garrick seems carefully to have preserved all the *Letters* and *Notes*, which were sent to him by distinguished characters. But that the reader may exercise his own judgment, I will set before him the matter contained in Woodfall's edition. Junius concludes a private *Letter* to Woodfall dated *Friday Nov. 8, 1771.* with this postscript. “ (Secret) Beware of David Garrick. He was sent to pump you, and went directly to Richmond to tell the King I should write no more.” The editor of the work presents us with this explanatory note: — “ Garrick had received a *Letter* from Woodfall just before the above Note of Junius was sent to the printer, in which



Garrick was told, in confidence, that there were some doubts whether Junius would continue to write much longer. Garrick flew with the intelligence to Mr. Ramus, one of the pages to the King, who immediately conveyed it to his Majesty, at that time residing at Richmond, and from the peculiar sources of information, that were open to this extraordinary writer, Junius was apprized of the whole transaction on the ensuing morning, and wrote the above post-script, and the Letter that follows it, in consequence."

" To Mr. David Garrick.

" Nov. 10, 1771.

" I am very exactly informed of your impertinent inquiries, and of the information you so busily sent to Richmond, and with what triumph and exultation it was received. I knew every particular of it the next day. Now mark me, vagabond — Keep to your pantomines, or be assured you shall hear of it. Meddle no more, thou busy informer! It is in *my power* to make you curse the hour, in which you dared to interfere with

JUNIUS."

Junius adds in the *Letter* to Woodfall:—" I would send the above to Garrick directly, but that I would avoid having this hand too commonly seen. Oblige me, then, so much as to have it copied in any hand, and sent by the penny-post, that is, if you dislike sending it in your own writing."

Now every reader of taste will prefer the unacknowledged *Letter* of Junius to this one admitted into Woodfall's edition; as having more delicate and dignified reproof, and at the same time more pointed energy of style and more concentrated essence of satire. But one difficulty occurs, and that is how it happened that there were two *Letters* of Junius to Garrick on the same occasion, containing the same matter, but differently worded? This of

itself seems to imply that, if the one was real, the other was forged, and in that case the one published by Woodfall will have a better claim to be considered genuine and authentic. It is possible, perhaps not probable, that Junius, after having sent the one to Woodfall, penned the other, which may not have been forwarded to Garrick by either Junius or Woodfall, and may yet in some way or other have crawled into a Newspaper, whence Mr. Park extracted it.

Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences* 1, 77. inserts a private *Letter*, which he in July 1799. addressed to a friend, who without permission inserted it in the *Anti-Jacobin Review* for that year. This *Letter* details the conversations between Mr. Butler and Mr. Wilkes, which passed between the years 1776. and 1784. He in p. 82. says: — “ We also believed in the story that while Garrick was writing a *Note* to Mr. Ramus, or some other of the pages, Woodfall, or some one from him, came in and informed him that Junius intended writing no more; that Garrick mentioned this circumstance in the *Note*; and that almost instantly after the *Note* was sent, a thundering *Letter* came from Junius to Garrick, abusing him for making free with his name.” Mr. Butler, then, agrees with the account extracted from Mr. Park’s copy of Junius and with Woodfall’s edition in representing Ramus to have been the person addressed by Garrick, but he differs from Woodfall’s edition in assigning too early a period, after Garrick’s *Letter* to Ramus, to Junius’s *Letter* to Garrick, and this difference is important, because it magnifies the miracle; and he differs from Woodfall’s edition, as well as Mr. Park’s printed extract, in stating that Garrick’s communication to Ramus contained other matter and was not sent on this specific account.

But, (so difficult is it to arrive at plain truth even in trifling things !) there is another story connected with Junius's *Letter* to Garrick, related in Mr. W. Seward's *Anecdotes of some Distinguished Persons*, 2, 422.

“ Mr. Garrick had been told that no more of *Junius* would appear in the *Public Advertiser*. He mentioned to a nobleman about court what he had heard. Junius, who had eyes everywhere, was informed that Garrick had given this intelligence. He caused a *Letter* to be sent to him at the theatre, just as he was going upon the stage, to play one of his great parts, hinting to him that he might well be contented *plausu sui gaudere theatri*, and not interfere in politics. The *Letter* produced its effect, and this wonderful actor for once played ill.” These *Anecdotes* were first published in the *European Magazine* for Oct. 1789. under the title of *Drossiana*, and in two volumes separately under the title of *Anecdotes* in 1794. and three more volumes in the three succeeding years: and in 1799. two more under the title of *Biographiana*. The writer was a most amiable and intelligent and accurate man, the friend of Johnson and the schoolfellow of Parr. It should seem, then, that Mr. Butler learnt his story between 1776. and 1784., and that Mr. Seward learnt his story prior to 1789. Here we have a *nobleman* substituted for *Ramus*; but this may have been the unintentional substitution of the person, from whom Mr. Seward received the account. Here too we have mention made of a *Letter* to Garrick written on the very same occasion as that referred to in Woodfall's edition, Park's printed extract, and Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences*, but purposely delivered at a time best calculated to distract the mind of Garrick; whereas it appears from Woodfall's edition that credit is, by Mr. Seward's story, given to Junius for a deep manœuvre, of which Junius was

innocent, though the *Letter* might by accident have been thus opportunely delivered. A *Latin* quotation is also assigned to Junius, which does not appear in either copy of Junius's *Letter*, as given in Woodfall's edition, or as given in Park's printed extract. The statement of Mr. Seward as to the opportune delivery of the *Letter* to Garrick, and its instantaneous effect on the mind and its visible effect on the acting of Garrick, is unaffected by either of the other accounts. Finally, we may remark that we have copies of two *Letters* as actually addressed by Junius to Garrick on one and the same occasion, both warranted as genuine and authentic, and one referred to by a respectable writer as used on the very same occasion, and as equally genuine and authentic. Such is the certainty of human affairs, such the truth of human narratives, such the accuracy of human minds, and such the correctness of human logic!

III. In arguing on literary questions of this kind, the public mind is often turned to points, which are either almost irrelevant to the case, or urged with too much zeal. Numerous coincidences in respect to thought and style, notions and opinions, views and doctrines, may be traced between Junius and any great man like Burke; and he who is at the pains of collecting them, conceives that he has established his hypothesis in favour of a particular individual; wonders that any person, to whom he has submitted his evidence, can entertain any doubt about the identity; and, though he has not examined the contrary evidence, is ready to maintain his opinion at the point of the pen, and sometimes, Indian-like, to run a muck at all he meets in the field of argument. This is the fatal mistake, into which Mr. Taylor has fallen about Sir Philip Francis, and others have fallen into a similar mistake in advo-

cating other claims. In order to shew the general insufficiency of certain reasoning about the identity of Junius, and the little credit which is due to much of Mr. Taylor's reasoning about Sir Philip Francis, I shall produce a few quotations to prove that such arguments have been adduced to favour the claims of Burke, and yet Mr. Taylor himself has rejected those very arguments as insufficient testimony.

1. "Every reader of Junius remembers with what an unrelenting severity he has attacked the Scotch in all parts of his writings. It is needless to go into any detail of his motives here; but it cannot be irrelevant to show, that Mr. Burke also spoke of them sometimes with no greater respect. This will be evident from a passage in a *Letter* from him to Thomas Burgh, Esq. in 1780.:— 'To this influence, (the overbearing influence of the crown,) the principle of action, the principle of policy, and the principle of union of the present minority are opposed. These principles of the opposition are the only thing, which preserves a single symptom of life in the nation. That opposition is composed of the far greater part of the independent property and independent rank of the kingdom; of whatever is most untainted in character, and of whatever ability remains unextinguished in the people, and of all which tends to draw the attention of foreign countries upon this. It is now in its final and conclusive struggle. It has to struggle against a force, to which, I am afraid, it is not equal. *The whole kingdom of Scotland ranges with the venal, the unprincipled, and the wrong-principled of this*; and if the kingdom of Ireland thinks proper to pass into the same camp, we shall certainly be obliged to quit the field.' Such a passage as this requires no comment." Mr. Roche's *Inquiry concerning the Author of the Letters of Junius*,

p. 269. If, then, the identity of Junius with a particular character be determined by his antipathy to the Scotch, Dr. Johnson will be best entitled to the honour of having composed the *Letters* of Junius!

2. "The new Editor (of Junius,)" says Mr. Roche p. 273., "infers from the following passage in one of the private *Letters* of Junius to Mr. Woodfall, that he could not be much less than 50 years of age. 'After *long experience of the world*,' says he, 'I affirm before God, I never knew a rogue who was not unhappy.' There is another passage of a similar tendency in one of his *Letters* to Mr. Wilkes, written about the same time, (towards the end of the year 1771.) where he says:—'Many thanks for your obliging offer; but alas! my age and figure would do but little credit to my partner.' Junius, to prevent suspicion, may, as in this last passage, pretend that he was older than he really was; but it does not follow from the former that he could not be much less than 50. Mr. Burke, at that time, was just 41 years old; and when we consider his penetration, sagacity, talent for observation, and the great knowledge of the world, which he is well known to have possessed at that time, after having mixed for about 20 years in London with all classes of people, we shall not be at all surprised to find him mentioning his long experience of the world at an age when we must be satisfied he knew more of it than most men do at the end of the longest life." From these passages of Junius Mr. Roche draws an inference in favour of Burke, while Mr. Taylor, as we have seen, thinks "that from the words in question no positive inference can be drawn with respect to the writer's age; and that, if it be allowed to extract conclusions at this rate, the most contradictory opinions may be supported," though he himself from passages of an opposite tendency, hesitates

not to infer the youth of Junius. When we find the same passages made to uphold different opinions, it is high time to abandon them as affording no solid ground for any opinion!

3. "There is another respect," says Mr. Roche p. 273., "in which Burke's situation corresponds exactly to that of Junius. Whoever Junius was, it is clear that he must have resided almost constantly in London, or in its vicinity, during the time of his correspondence with Mr. Woodfall. This will be evident from an examination of the dates of his *Letters*. His last *Junius* appeared on Jan. 21st, 1772.; and the last of all his *Letters* in the *Public Advertiser*, under the signature of *Nemesis*, was on May 12th, of the same year. Between Jan. 21st, and May 12th, 1772. he wrote eleven private *Letters* to Mr. Woodfall. After that date it is not known that he ever wrote to him more than once, and that was on Jan. 19, 1773. after a silence of more than eight months. If any *Letters* passed between them afterwards, all traces of the correspondence are lost. His *Letters*, signed *Junius*, took up exactly a period of three years; all his public *Letters*, under this and various other signatures, somewhat more than five. Now what serves in a particular manner to identify Burke with Junius, is that during the time the latter wrote, the former resided, (with the exception of a few short visits into the country,) constantly in London, or in its vicinity. And it is not a little remarkable, though hitherto unnoticed, that Burke went over to France in the summer of 1772. immediately after Junius ceased to write in the *Public Advertiser*. It was after his return, that he took occasion, in the House of Commons, in the beginning of 1773., when a bill for the relief of Protestant Dissenters was under discussion, to point out to the attention and vigilant jealousy of Parlia-

ment, those plans for the subversion of all order, religion, and government, which, even at this time, he perceived to be rapidly hastening towards maturity in France." Now it so happens that Mr. Taylor has used a similar argument in favour of Sir Philip Francis, and thus the one neutralises the other.

4. "If the reader will turn back to pp. 84-5. of this *Inquiry*," says Mr. Locke p. 280., "he will find one example of the use of the same mode of expression both by Burke and Junius; and although there is no species of proof, of which it would be easier for me to give numerous examples, a few must suffice for the present. 'This cur *plays fast and loose*, just as I bid him,' Junius 2,490. 'They put statesmen and magistrates into an habit of *playing fast and loose* with the laws,' Burke 10, 27. *To open himself* upon a topic, or *to lay it open*, was a favourite expression with Mr. Burke. 'It is worth while *to lay this affair a little more open*,' Junius 3,14. 'You had all that matter *fully opened* at your bar,' Burke 3, 45. 'Which it will not be amiss *to lay open* somewhat more largely,' 3,49. 'Permit me *to open myself* a little on this subject,' 145. In his speech on American taxation, he says, 'I shall therefore *open myself fully* on that important and delicate subject.' 'I see no medium between such a temporary accommodation and either the miseries of civil bloodshed, or *the established tranquillity of servitude*,' Junius 3,274. Burke has '*the dismal, cold, dead uniformity of servitude*,' 3,70. Similar also is the phrase, '*to sink into the dead repose of despotism*,' at the end of his *Thoughts on the Causes of the present Discontents*. '*I feel warmly on this subject, and I express myself as I feel*,' Burke 3,195. 'This is the language of *my heart*,' says Junius, '*it comes home to us all*.' 'Whether those measures are supported openly by the power of government or *masked under the forms of a court of*



*justice,*' Junius 1,60. ' *The act prepares a sort of masked proceeding, not honourable to the justice of the kingdom,* and by no means necessary for its safety.' Burke 3,138. Alluding to a project of the ministry, that the crown should make no more grants of land in America, Burke talks of this 'avarice of desolation, and this hoarding of a royal wilderness,' 3, 63. Junius, speaking of the conduct of the ministry relative to the *Nullum Tempus* Act, says, — 'It seems 'that they had hoarded up those unmeaning powers 'of the crown,' etc. 3, 16. Burke shows his powers of invention frequently, by the use of new combinations of language; so does Junius: — 'My little 'share in this great deliberation oppressed me,' Burke 3, 26. 'I now appear before you to make 'trial, whether my earnest endeavours have been so 'wholly oppressed by the weakness of my abilities, as 'to be rendered insignificant in the eyes of a great 'trading city,' 3, 8. Speaking of the desire of some of those, who formed Mr. Pitt's coalition-administration in 1766., to get rid of him, he says: — 'The 'other party, \* \* \*, seemed rather pleased to get 'rid of so oppressive a support.' The following examples from Junius are of a similar nature: — 'Our warmest patriots would disclaim me as a burden to their honest ambition,' 2, 206. 'The household of directors was cursed with the concurrence of government, and even the miserable Dingley could not escape the misfortune of your Grace's protection,' 1, 117. 'Far from regretting your retreat, they assure us very gravely that it increases the strength of the ministry. According to this way of reasoning, they will probably grow stronger and more flourishing every hour they exist; for, I think, there is hardly a day passes, in which some one or other of his Majesty's servants does not leave them to improve by the loss of his assistance.'

2,104. Mr. Burke remarks in the same spirit: — ‘On the principle of this argument, *the more mischiefs we suffer from any administration, the more our trust in it is to be confirmed.*’ *Be assured, — rest assured, — assuredly, — most assuredly, — depend upon it, — I doubt much, — in my poor opinion, — I am a plain man,* etc. etc. are forms of expression, which are frequently used both by Burke and Junius. The verb *to propose* is uniformly and improperly used by both instead of *to purpose*. ‘The use proposed to be made of it,’ says Junius, ‘will be the subject of my next paper.’ He should have said *purposed*, that is *intended*. ‘I do not, (says Burke,) *open them* here, *proposing* only to give the reader some taste of the difficulties, that attend all capital changes in the constitution.’ ‘For the purpose of counteracting the benefits *proposed* by the repeal of one penal law.’ And again: — ‘If the wealth of the nation be the cause of its turbulencce, I imagine *it is not proposed* to introduce poverty as a constable to keep the peace.’ As neither of them ever departs from this usage, further examples are unnecessary. Junius uses the words: — ‘What is substantial and beneficial in a trial by jury.’ ‘By this act,’ says Burke, ‘so construed and so applied, *almost all that is substantial and beneficial in a trial by jury* is taken away from the subject in the colonies,’ 3, 139. It is needless to prosecute this topic further.” But reasoning of the same sort has been employed by Mr. Taylor in favour of Sir Philip Francis, and if Mr. T. conceives that it has no force in the one case, he must excuse me from admitting its force in the other.

5. “Burke and Junius also agree in another particular,” says Mr. Roche p. 278.; “for both are frequently hurried by the force and rapidity of genius into a mixture of plain and figurative language,

and a confusion of metaphors, which, it has been remarked, a slower mind, with an ordinary recollection of common-place precepts, would have avoided. 'With what countenance can you,' says Junius to the Duke of Grafton, 'take your seat at the Treasury-Board, or in Council, when you feel that every *circulating* WHISPER is at your expense, and STABS you to the heart?' 'Thus,' says Burke, 'are blown away *the insect race of courtly falsehoods*. Thus perish the *miserable inventions* of the wretched *runners* of a wretched cause, which they have *fly-blown* into every weak and rotten part of the country, in vain hope that, when their maggots had taken wing, their importunate buzzing might sound something like the public voice.'"\* If to arguments

\* One instance of *mixed metaphor* in Burke's notice of Junius has been in a former page produced. A very intelligent friend favoured me with the following remarks in a *Letter* dated March 19, 1827: — "In the passage quoted from Burke in p. 1. of your *Letter to Mr. Uvedale Price*, is the *mixed metaphor* so obvious as you consider it to be? Having finished with the boar of the forest, the writer may then be supposed to speak of Junius in *his own person*: 'For my own part' etc. The *new metaphor* of the *bird of prey* may be supposed to commence at the words, 'But while I expected from his daring flight' etc. Whether this bird is real or fictitious, — whether he has any prototype in nature, or is the mere creation of fancy, is a matter of no consequence, provided the attributes of a bird be consistently preserved." To this *Letter* I, on March 30th, replied: — "I shall be glad to defend Burke about the *mixed metaphor*, if I can. But I think that it was an oversight. Irishmen are very liable to write in that manner. I do not believe that we can defend Burke on the principle, which you mention. If in what preceded the mention of the attributes of a *bird* by himself, he had put a speech into the mouth of the court-myrmidons, in which Junius was called a *wild boar*, then I would admit the defence. But Burke is throughout speaking in his own name: the *wild boar* is his own, as well as the *bird*. A man might 'crouch' beneath the rage of a *wild boar*, but not of a *ravenous bird*; and this is a fair argument for shewing that Burke still kept in mind the *wild boar*, when he began to change his metaphor to a *ravenous bird*. Dashing a man 'against a rock' is better suited to a wild boar's strength than to a *ravenous bird's*, so that by this argument also I consider Burke to have kept in mind the one metaphor, while he was pursuing the other. I think that, if Burke places a wild boar in con-

of this sort much weight is to be attached, we shall be able to enroll Horace among the combatants for the authorship of Junius : —

URIT *enim* FULGORE *suo qui* PRÆGRAVAT *artes etc.*

IV. “ Though Junius was evidently a friend to Ireland,” says Mr. Roche p. 272., “ and though the wretched mode, in which that country was governed, afforded him exhaustless sources of attack against the ministry, it is not a little remarkable that he never enters upon the affairs of that kingdom at large, but only touches upon them incidentally. When, however, he touches upon them, it is clear that he does so with all the warmth and sincerity of a sanguine friend. It strikes me, as in the highest degree probable, that the motive of Junius for abstaining so generally from the affairs of Ireland, was an apprehension, if he entered upon them often and fully, that this circumstance would go far towards a discovery, by strongly identifying him with Mr. Burke.” The greater probability, in my opinion, is that Junius abstained from entering on the subject of Ireland, 1. because he wanted leisure to do justice to so prolific a subject, 2. because he found a sufficient number of *domestic* topics to occupy his pen, 3. because his object was to effect a change of ministers, and he was more likely to accomplish the point by confining his attention to England, the English Parliament, the English ministers, and the English Court. If he had been disposed to ramble in quest of subjects, India \* and the colonies would have fur-

test with men, he must keep to the attributes of a *wild boar*, to what really occurs in nature under such circumstances ; and so, if he compares Junius to a *ravenous bird*, and makes men the objects of attack, he must not travel beyond nature, but keep to the properties and the powers of a *ravenous bird*, and his metaphor will lose all dignity and all force, if the bird be not really existing in nature, prototyped in the ornithological creation.”

\* The mention of India brings to my recollection what I have in a former page said about Warren Hastings. In a recent cri-

nished him with *enough and to spare*. When sufficient and adequate motives of a public nature can be assigned for the conduct of Junius, it is idle to refer to a private and personal reason. I agree with Mr. Roche in thinking that the author of Junius was an Irishman.

2. "It was my intention in this part of my *Inquiry* to prove by a variety of expressions taken from

tique on the Correspondence between Dr. French Lawrence and Mr. Burke the following judgment is passed:—"Warren Hastings had a task to perform in India, which few could have accomplished, and none without incurring similar imputations. It has been observed that, if his accusers did not prove his guilt, he did not prove his innocence. This is true: it would not have been practicable to prove the innocence, abstractedly, of Hastings. His constructive innocence, if the phrase may be allowed, resulted from a comprehensive and charitable consideration of all the circumstances of his difficult situation, and the real benefit, which was the fruit of his policy. But the contemplation of isolated facts produced in the ardent and sanguine mind of Burke, imbued with a thorough hatred of tyranny and oppression, a gust of indignation, which hurried him along in defiance of the cool dictates of his judgment. Party-feelings and political prejudices, though they did not generate, yet contributed to foster his resentment. His late biographer, encomiast as he is, admits,—'that it is possible, remembering how the inquiry was approved by Mr. Fox, that some latent feeling existed of indirectly justifying the India-Bill, by exposing more fully to general indignation the enormities that measure was meant to correct'; though he considers that the great and direct inducement to the measure was,—'a detestation of any thing like oppression or injustice inherent in the man.' This is doubtless the verdict which impartial posterity will deliver. A late historian, (Mr. Mill,) has taken occasion, from the conduct of Burke in the matter of Warren Hastings, to say that Burke's mind was not a generalizing mind—that it seldom ascended higher than individual cases, except when impelled by unusual circumstances. This is an unfair estimate of the character of that great man, whose distinguishing quality was the faculty of generalization. Mr. Mill seems to have fallen into the very error he condemns, by making an induction from the particular case of Mr. Hastings unfavourable to Mr. Burke's general habits of intellect." *The Times*, Sept. 12, 1827. It is worth while to compare what Dr. Johnson says on this subject:—"1783. We talked of the accusation against a gentleman for supposed delinquencies in India. JOHNSON. 'What foundation there is for accusation I know not, but they will not get at him. Where bad actions are

the *Letters*, that Junius must have been an Irishman; and then to show, by a large selection of expressions, some of them identical, others analogous and similar, taken from the writings of both, that the *Letters* of Junius must have been written by Mr. Burke. To avoid prolixity, I shall illustrate the former point by one, and the latter only by a few examples. Junius, speaking to Lord North of Colonel Luttrell, says: — ‘I protest, my Lord, there is in this young man’s conduct a strain of prostitution, which, for its singularity, I cannot but admire. He has discovered a new line in the human character; *he has degraded even the name of Luttrell*, and gratified his father’s most sanguine expectations.’ In the words — ‘he has degraded even the name of Luttrell’ — there is an allusion, which no Englishman understands, and a severity, therefore, which he cannot perceive. The name of *Luttrell* in several parts of Ireland, is synonymous with the words *traitor* or *betrayed*, owing to a tradition, which prevails there among the people, that it was on account of the treachery of an officer of the name of Luttrell, and of the same family, that King James lost the battle of the Boyne. Without such an explanation as this, the words of Junius are unintelligible; and as it was not possible for him to

committed at so great a distance, a delinquent can obscure the evidence till the scent becomes cold; there is a cloud between, which cannot be penetrated: therefore all distant power is bad. I am clear that the best plan for the government of India is a despotick governour; for, if he be a good man, it is evidently the best government; and supposing him to be a bad man, it is better to have one plunderer than many; but, if despotick, he sees that the more he lets other plunder, the less there will be for himself, so he restrains them; and though he himself plunders, the country is a gainer, compared with being plundered by numbers.” Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* 4,226. In p. 68-75. is inserted a high character of Hastings by Boswell, a *Letter* from him to Boswell, and three *Letters* from Johnson to Hastings, in which Johnson speaks of him in the warmest terms of respect and esteem.

become acquainted with this traditional fact, or with the proverbial use of the word *Luttrell* in some parts of Ireland to signify a traitor, from any written or printed publication, it is clear that he must have been an Irishman." I think that Mr. Roche is for the reason assigned right in his conclusion; and I have already assigned other reasons for the same opinion.

V. "Junius's *Letters*," says Mr. Taylor p. 164., "abound with classical allusions and quotations, and he seems in no respect deficient in scholastic attainments. Of a character perfectly similar, Sir Philip Francis is an acknowledged scholar, without having studied at either University. There is in all his writings a frequent and happy reference to the Greek and Roman authors, but especially to the latter; and in Horace he has proved himself a very sound and ingenious critic. To the tuition of so profound and elegant scholar as Dr. Francis is, may be ascribed this familiarity with the works of the antients: and the advantages afforded him in this respect, would amply supply, if they did not surpass, those which are usually met with in a College-education." Mr. Taylor has somewhat overcharged his statement respecting the critical remarks of Sir Philip Francis on Horace. The reader shall decide between us.

The remarks alluded to occur in the following book: — *A Poetical Translation of the Works of Horace, with the Original Text, and Critical Notes collected from his best Latin and French Commentators. By Philip Francis D. D. A new Edition, with additional Notes by Edward Du Bois Esq. of the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple. In Four Volumes. Lond. 1807. 12mo.* The editor furnishes us with the following information in his preface: — "Of his son, Sir Philip Francis, it is now my business to speak; and here the obligation I owe him, and the esteem

with which his kindness has inspired me, would seem to prescribe that I should expatiate on a theme so grateful; but as in the preceding instance, so in this, the hour is past. His public services, his erudition, genius, and acquirements need no panegyric from me to make them known. They are known already: and it becomes me better to quit this ample field, and bring my contracted views to bear directly on the object before us. The humble office imposed upon me was merely to correct a copy of the most approved edition of Dr. Francis's Horace; and desirous of some information on the subject, I took the liberty of waiting on Sir Philip Francis, who not only courteously instructed me in every thing that I wished to know, but supplied me, after several intrusions on his time, with three very ingenious notes, which enrich the following pages. They will be found with the date 1806. at 1,304. 3,32. 4,312. It will be perceived that the two former remarks prefer a construction differing from that put on them by Dr. Francis; which offers a striking proof of a mind unsusceptible of every disingenuous bias in the pursuit of truth. The first of these comments *Od. 2, 20, 6.* is particularly deserving of attention, since the passage has puzzled all the annotators; who, after turning *quem vocas* as it would bear, and as it would not bear, and even unwarrantably altering the text, were at last compelled to leave the sense at least as doubtful as ever, and it remained for Sir Philip Francis to be the means of preserving a light, which had never beamed on them."

2. The first mentioned note is on *Od. 2, 20, 6.*

*Non ego, pauperum*

*Sanguis parentum, non ego, (quem vocant,)*

*Dilecte Mæcenas, obibo,*

*Nec Stygia cohibebor unda.*

"*Quem vocant.*] *Quem vocas* is the true reading,



confirmed not only by the new and sensible interpretation about to be given, but by the authority of all the MSS. The critics have blundered exceedingly at this passage, and we owe what appears to be the natural and clear construing of the words, to the late Mr. Joseph Fowke of Calcutta, whose judgment Dr. Samuel Johnson and Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, on mature consideration, admitted to be just. For these facts, we have the authority of Mr. Francis. The poet supposes himself changed into a bird, and mounting into the skies, *cycnum* — *in altos nubium tractus*, *Carm.* 4, 2, with Mæcenas anxiously looking up and calling after him; ‘whom you call,’ *que vous rappelez*.

*Siste gradum, teque aspectu ne subtraha nostro :  
Quem fugis ?* *Aen.* 6.

There can be no better illustration of *quem vocas*. The idea of quitting this sublunary sphere in the form of a bird is common to the poets. Our Cowley, in imitation of Horace, exclaims :

Lo ! how the obsequious wind and swelling air  
The Theban swan does upwards bear  
Into the walks of clouds, where he does play,  
And with extended wings opens his liquid way !

See too the commencement of *The Ecstasy* by the same bard. Thus also Virg. *G.* 3, 8.

———*tentanda via est, qua me quoque possim*

*Tollere humo, victorque virtum volitare per ora.*

Still preserving the notion of his flight, he at the conclusion of this Ode desires Mæcenas to abstain from lamentations over his *inane funus*,\* or cenotaph, that is, ‘empty urn;’ empty, because not even his

\* “Andromache and Aeneas, *Aen.* 3. and 6., raise an *inanem tumulum* in honour of Hector and Deiphobus, whose bodies they could not possess. This is affirmed in so many words by the latter, — *te, amice, nequivi* — *Conspicere.* ‘*Un vain tombeau*, says M. Dacier, ‘*ou le corps n’est point.*’”

ashes remained to be deposited in it, he being actually and wholly gone; or *funeral rites*, idle and vain for one who yet lived, though he no longer trod the earth:—

*Nemo me lacrymis decoret, neque funera fletu  
Fazit: cur? volito vivu' per ora virum.*

ENNIUS'S EPITAPH.

Joseph Fowke told Mr. Francis that he had mentioned this criticism many years ago to Samuel Johnson, who, after rolling himself about, *suo more*, said, 'Sir, you are right!' Several years afterwards Mr. Francis asked Mr. G. Wakefield his opinion of the passage, which then ran, with that of most other commentators, in favour of *quem vocas Dilecte*, i. e. *tibi dilectum*, but with which neither he, nor any man of sense, or Latin scholar, could be well pleased. After weighing Mr. Fowke's ingenious interpretation, he said hastily, as if conviction had suddenly flashed upon his mind, 'that there could be no doubt of it.' This use of the word *vocare* is confirmed in different degrees by various passages in the classics. Horace *Carm.* 1, 14.

*Non di, quos iterum pressa voces malo.*

Eurydice, having glided away from Orpheus, vanishing from his sight like smoke 'into thin air,' *ceu fumus in auras tenues*, his head, though severed from his body, still called to her to stop or to return—

*Eurydicen anima fugiente vocabat!*

GEORG. 4.

In the *Æneid*, when Venus quits her son, he would delay her flight by calling, as in the instance of Mæcenas with regard to Horace, *fugientem est voce secutus*, 1, 410. More might be added in support of this reading; but an apology is perhaps even now necessary for having called so many witnesses to so clear a case. *Sept.* 1806."

Now with respect to this valuable note, the credit of the interpretation belongs to Mr. Fowke; and as Mr. Fowke was, no doubt, prepared with evidence to support it, we are justified in supposing that the passages quoted to defend it were selected by Mr. Fowke himself, and therefore the note affords no proof of critical sagacity or philological learning in Sir Philip Francis.

3. The second note occurs on the *Epistle to the Pisos*, v. 361.

*Ut pictura, poesis; erit quæ, si propius stes,  
Te capiet magis; et quædam, si longius abstes:  
Hæc amat obscurum; volet hæc sub luce videri,  
Judicis argutum quæ non formidat acumen:  
Hæc placuit semel; hæc decies repetita placebit.*

“*Si propius stes.*] Aristot. l. 3. (see the passage quoted and commented on by Lambinus in his edn. of Hor. fol. p. 406.) observes some such distinction as this in a public speaker, with respect to his haranguing ‘the many,’ *οἱ πολλοί*, or addressing the ‘judicious few.’ A *σκιαγραφία*, a rough outline or loose sketch, suits the former; but a more finished picture, and one that will bear inspection, may be presented to the latter. The remark is perfectly just. I have heard Edmund Burke say ‘that it was impossible the political orations of Demosthenes could have been intelligible to a popular assembly in their present, close, compact form.’ SIR PHILIP FRANCIS.” In this note I can discern neither erudition nor *acumen*, but only good sense. For the reference to Aristotle he acknowledges himself indebted to Lambin’s Horace.

4. The third note is this, — *Sat.* 1, 2, 85.

*Regibus hic mos est: ubi equos mercantur, opertos  
Inspiciunt; ne, si facies, (ut sæpe,) decora  
Molli fulta pede est, emptorem inducat hiantem,  
Quod pulchræ clunes, breve quod caput, ardua cervix.*

“ *Apertos.*] *Opertos*, confirmed by the greater number of MSS., is the right reading. *Operiunt eos*, says the old Scholiast, *ne pulchritudine inducti, emant equos mollibus pedibus*. Montaigne was of this opinion, and has afforded us a very pleasing comment on the passage, which we shall transcribe: — *Vous n’achetez pas un chat en poche : si vous marchandez un cheval, vous luy ostez ses bardes, vous le voyez nud et à descouvert : ou, s’il est couvert, comme on les présentoit anciennement aux princes à vendre, c’est par les parties moins nécessaires, afin que vous ne vous amusiez pas à la beauté de son poil, ou largeur de sa croupe, et que vous vous arestiez principalement à considérer les jambes, les yeux, et le pied, qui sont les membres les plus utiles ; Regibus etc. Pourquoi estimant un homme, l’estimez-vous tout enveloppé et empaqueté ? Il ne nous faict montre que des parties qui ne sont aucunement siennes : et nous cache celles, par lesquelles seules on peut vrayement juger de son estimation ?* ESSAIS Tom. 1. liv. i. c. 42. This latter part exemplifies in some measure what Horace would say of the Roman matrons, and their peculiar dress. Xenophon, in his tract *de Re Equestri*, has well illustrated the importance of the feet of horses, by comparing them to the foundation of a house ; which being bad, the rest of the structure, however beautiful is of no value : ὡσπερ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἂν εἴη, εἰ τὰ ἄνω πᾶν καλὰ ἔχοι, μὴ ὑποκειμένων οἶων δεῖ θεμελίων, οὕτω καὶ ἵππου πολεμιστηρίου οὐδὲν ἂν ὄφελος εἴη, οὐδ’ εἰ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοι, κακόπους δ’ εἴη.

“ ‘ My mind,’ says the learned Dr. Parr in a private *Letter* to a friend, ‘ was made up on this passage ‘ in Horace, before I had read Mr. Francis’s *Letter*. I ‘ peremptorily pronounce in favour of *opertos*. You ‘ shall have the history of the reading: all the valuable ‘ MSS. are for *opertos*. Lipsius, puzzled at the passage, offered the conjectural reading of *apertos*.

‘ Faber and Dacier adopted the conjecture, and sup-  
 ‘ ported it by reasonings, which to me are quite  
 ‘ unsatisfactory, and against the context. You will  
 ‘ be glad to hear that Bentley is σύνθετος with our  
 ‘ friend. I see that with his usual, and to me his de-  
 ‘ lightful, eagerness, Mr. Francis declares against  
 ‘ *apertos*. Bentley says very properly: common men,  
 ‘ when they purchase common horses, do not find  
 ‘ them *opertos*, nor is there any occasion for them to  
 ‘ be covered; they have no charms to deceive the eye  
 ‘ of the purchaser, and to seduce him from examining  
 ‘ their feet, or tempt him to infer from the *breve ca-*  
 ‘ *put*, etc. that the foot was not tender. You must  
 ‘ observe that the horses of the ancients did not wear  
 ‘ shoes — that hardness of feet was therefore an es-  
 ‘ sential point — and that in training them the joc-  
 ‘ keys accustomed them to tread upon rough and  
 ‘ hard pavement for the purpose of strengthening  
 ‘ the hoof. All this you may find in Beckmann’s  
 ‘ *History of Inventions*, under the article *Horse-shoe*.  
 ‘ Now when horses were brought to *reges*, (a word  
 ‘ which Horace uses for men of wealth and rank,)  
 ‘ they might have the *pulchræ clunes* etc., and these  
 ‘ circumstances might deceive the purchaser, and  
 ‘ draw off his attention from their feet. To prevent  
 ‘ therefore, all deceit, these beautiful parts were  
 ‘ covered; and their effect being destroyed, the pur-  
 ‘ chaser was led to examine the feet. The horses  
 ‘ were actually put into body-clothes, though Mr.  
 ‘ Fox supposes this absurd. They were put so, when  
 ‘ they were beautiful; though, in ordinary cases,  
 ‘ the covering was taken off; and this you may see  
 ‘ in the two passages taken from Seneca, and in one  
 ‘ from Apuleius by Bentley.

‘ I see that the Delphin editor prefers *apertos, ob*  
 ‘ *clariorem sensum*, and upon the authority of some  
 ‘ *antiqui codices*. The *clarior sensus* I cannot disco-

‘ ver. If the horses were *aperti*, one does not see  
 ‘ any peculiar merit in the inspection. But, when  
 ‘ they were *operti*, the *emptor* was in no danger *hi-*  
 ‘ *andi* and of being deceived by his eye *quod pulchræ*  
 ‘ etc.

‘ *Matronæ, præter faciem, nil cernere possis,*

‘ *Cætera, ni Catia est, demissa veste tegentis.*

‘ You cannot, therefore, examine her ; but do not  
 ‘ infer from her having the *niveos viridesque lapillos*,  
 ‘ and perhaps a pretty face, that therefore the *femur*  
 ‘ is *magis tenerum* etc. : for in the *togata* or common  
 ‘ woman, who wore an humble dress, these parts are  
 ‘ often prettier. The *matrona* does not expose them ;  
 ‘ but the *togata* is less delicate : therefore, before  
 ‘ you prefer the *matrona* to the *togata*, imitate the  
 ‘ cautious circumspection of the *reges*. In purcha-  
 ‘ sing a horse, do not infer that the foot is not *mollis*,  
 ‘ because the *facies* is *decora* : in choosing a mistress,  
 ‘ do not infer that the *femur* is *tenerum*, because the  
 ‘ *facies* is *decora*. Imitate the caution of the horse-pur-  
 ‘ chaser, if you will choose ; and as he doubts whether  
 ‘ beauty is accompanied by agility, so do you doubt  
 ‘ whether beauty in the parts visible is accompanied  
 ‘ by beauty in the parts invisible. The circumstance  
 ‘ of covering the *chunes et cervicem* belongs only to  
 ‘ the horse-purchaser, and has no direct counter-  
 ‘ part in the case of the lover. It forms a peculiar  
 ‘ part of his caution, but it is only the general ex-  
 ‘ ample of caution, which the lover is to imitate.’

“ We are indebted to Sir Philip Francis K. B.  
 for the information contained in this note. Nov.  
 1806.”

For this note Sir Philip does merit more critical  
 and philological praise than he can claim from the  
 other two notes.

5. The only other instance of the kind, which I  
 have seen in the writings of Sir Philip, is that about

the Elgin marbles and the statues of Phidias, in the *Letter Missive to Lord Holland* 1816. pp. 61-73. and it is an admirable specimen of his talents for philosophical criticism, which I should be most happy to quote, were it not too long for insertion in this place.

VI. " Mr. Francis, now Sir Philip, visited Ireland in the course of the summer, as appears from part of Mr. Burke's correspondence with Lord Charlemont, which relates to that gentleman, and, what was dear to Lord Charlemont's heart, a bust or likeness of his lost friend, the Marquis of Rockingham.

' *Gerard-Street, June 1, 1787.*

' My dear Lord,

I have an high respect for your Lordship  
 ' of old, as I trust you know ; and as I have the best  
 ' wishes for my friend, Mr. Francis, I am exceed-  
 ' ingly desirous that he should have an opportunity  
 ' of paying his compliments to the person in Ireland  
 ' the most worthy the acquaintance of a man of  
 ' sense and virtue. Mr. Francis has not been in  
 ' Ireland since the days of his childhood, but he has  
 ' been employed in a manner that does honour to  
 ' the country, that has given him birth. When he  
 ' sees your Lordship, he will perceive that ancient  
 ' morals have not yet deserted at least that part of  
 ' the world, which he revisits, and you will be glad  
 ' to receive for a while a citizen that has only left  
 ' his country, to be the more extensively service-  
 ' able to mankind. May I beg your Lordship to  
 ' make my most respectful and most affectionate  
 ' compliments, and those of Mrs. Burke, and my  
 ' son, and all that are of our little family, to Lady  
 ' Charlemont? I hope that Mr. Francis will bring  
 ' back such an account of the health of your Lordship,  
 ' and all your's, as may make us happy. I have the

‘ honour to be, my dear Lord, with the most cordial  
 ‘ attachment your most affectionate and obliged  
 ‘ friend, and faithful servant,

EDM. BURKE.’

‘ *Beaconsfield, July, 19, 1787.* Mr. Francis called  
 ‘ upon me in his way to his own house, charmed, as  
 ‘ I expected he would be, with your character and  
 ‘ conversation, and infinitely obliged by your recep-  
 ‘ tion of him. Give me leave to convey his thanks  
 ‘ to you, and to add mine to them.’” *Memoirs of*  
*the Political and Private Life of James Caulfield,*  
*Earl of Charlemont, by Fr. Hardy, Esq. 2, 155. ed. 2d.*

From the warm manner in which Burke speaks  
 of Sir Philip Francis \* and from the declared fact  
 that on Sir Philip’s arrival in England from India,  
 nobody would speak to him but Edm. Burke, an  
 advocate for the claims of Burke to the authorship  
 of Junius would be very ready to draw too large an  
 inference in favour of that opinion.

VII.

“ Sept. 24.

“ Mr. Urban,

An enquiry was made some months ago in one  
 of the daily papers as to the date of a transaction  
 noticed in one of Junius’s *Letters*, published by Mr.

\* Of Dr. Francis, the father of Sir Philip, we read these words  
 in the *Correspondence of the late John Wilkes by Mr. Almon*, 3, 67.  
 where Wilkes’s notes on Churchill are introduced :—

“ *In spirit I’m right proud ; nor can endure*

*The mention of a bribe.*

The reverend emissary of Lord Holland, (Mr. Francis, the  
 translator of Horace,) who waited on the poet soon after the ad-  
 vertisement of *Aylife’s Ghost*, by C. Churchill, can best explain  
 his passage. The untimely death of the author deprived us of  
 that elegy ; but his Lordship was convinced at last that every man  
 was NOT his price.”

In the *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts, written by Per-  
 sons of Eminence*, Lond. 1788. 8vo. V. 1. p. 5—12. is inserted  
 ‘ *A Letter from the Cocoa-Tree to the Country Gentlemen*, ascribed  
 to Dr. Philip Francis, (Translator of Horace, etc.) written in  
 1762.’”



G. Woodfall, (No 21. dated *April* 1768.) namely, the burning of several Jesuitical books at Paris by the common hangman, which Junius says he witnessed. I have not observed that the desired information has been given; and having lately met with an old volume of pamphlets, containing a translation of a decree of the Parliament of Paris, dated Aug. 6, 1761. which resolves the question, I send you an extract. It orders that the books entitled, (here follows a list of twenty-four works by Jesuits, concluding with *Hermannii Busembaum, Societatis Jesu, Soc. Theol. Licentiati, Theologia Moralis, nunc pluribus Partibus aucta a R. P. Claudio Lacroix, Societatis Jesu, Theologiæ in Universitate Coloniensi Doctore et Professore publico; Editio novissima diligenter recognita et emendata ab uno ejusdem Societatis Jesu Sacerdote Theologo, Coloniae 1757.*) shall be torn and burnt in the palace-yard, at the foot of the great staircase of the same, by the common hangman, *as seditious, destructive of every principle of christian morality, teaching a murderous and abominable doctrine, not only against the safety of the lives of the subjects, but also against that of the sacred persons of Sovereigns.* And the reprinting and selling of the said works, and particularly that of Busembaum, is strictly prohibited. It further appears that on Aug. 7, 1761. the burning was carried into effect. In the said decree," (the books mentioned in the said decree,) "were torn and burnt in the palace-yard, at the foot of the great staircase, by the common hangman. From what is above stated, it is evident that Junius was in Paris early in Aug. 1761. Can it be ascertained whether Sir Philip Francis was in Paris at that time?

"You here see, Mr. Urban, how the Jesuits were looked upon in France near seventy years ago; and yet this dangerous fraternity is again tolerated, and

astonishing to say, has its seminaries in England.”

AN OLD CORRESPONDENT.”

*The Gentleman's Magazine for Oct. 1827. p. 223.*

My friend, Mr. G. Coventry, in his *Critical Inquiry regarding the real Author of the Letters of Junius* p. 27. (cited by me in p. 176. of this work,) has, then, assigned too early a date to this transaction:—“There was nothing extraordinary in Sir Philip Francis taking a tour to France after his dismissal from the War-Office, where he had been so closely confined to business. He had no other employment to attend to, and having never been in France before, it was a novelty. *Whereas Junius expressly states a circumstance, which he saw with his own eyes, before Sir Philip was born, viz. ‘The Jesuitical books burnt in Paris by the common hangman.’*” From the *Memoirs* of Sir Philip it should seem that he might have been in Paris at the time specified, though the great probability is that he was not:—“He was appointed Secretary to General Bligh in 1758. was present at the capture and demolition of Cherburgh, and at the attack on the rear guard of our army at St. Cas. From mere curiosity, and without arms, he was found standing in the ranks, when the French approached very near, and the firing began. In 1760. by the same recommendation, he was appointed Secretary to the Earl of Kinnoul, Ambassador to Lisbon, when the present Queen of Portugal was married to her uncle. The uncle and the niece had a son, the present Prince of the Brazils, who married his mother's sister. Such is the constitution of the house of Braganza. In 1763. he was appointed by the late Lord Mendip, then Welbore Ellis Esq. and Secretary at War, to a considerable post in the War-Office.” I have (p. 176.) admitted this to be a fair

argument in favour of Sir Philip; but with the admission the reader must take the following qualification:—If Sir Philip alone, of all the claimants for the authorship of Junius, were present in Paris on this particular occasion, then the argument would have very great weight indeed; but the force of it will be very much weakened, if any of the other claimants were also present.

In order to shew that Mr. Taylor's evidence, however apparently strong, has not the strength, which has been attributed to it, and that it is rather a series of probable inferences from facts than of certain and irresistible conclusions from them, it will be necessary only to remind the reader of the nature of that evidence as stated by Mr. Taylor himself, p. 352—61. It comprises 16 heads, which I shall specify in Mr. T's. own order.

I. "There is," says he, "a perfect conformity in the general character of Junius and Sir Philip as authors." Now this is not a matter of fact, about which there can be no dispute, but a matter of opinion, which is liable to be controverted, and has been controverted.

II. "Both Junius and Sir Philip Francis shew an equal partiality for certain phrases or forms of expression, scarcely to be met with elsewhere in a single instance, and collectively without parallel in any other writer." This is a mere inference from the positive fact, that such expressions are common to Junius and Sir Philip Francis; and two other facts are assumed to support it, 1. that such expressions scarcely in a single instance occur in any other writer, and 2. that they collectively are without parallel in any other writer. The imbecility and uncertainty of such arguments have been shewn by me, because I have produced some instances of such phraseology, and thence the probability arises

that other instances might with proper diligence and research be found.

III. "Both employ similar *metaphorical* language of an unusual kind,—sometimes whole *sentences* are given word for word the same,—and in an uncommon case of personification (p. 251.) Sir Philip addresses a long paragraph to the House of Commons in the very strain of Junius's *Letter to the King*." If both had so spoken or written in the same year, the argument would have been entitled to great attention; but an interval of several years elapsed before Sir Philip used any such language, and it is impossible for Mr. Taylor to prove—I will not say that the similarity or identity was accidental—but that it was not the effect of mere imitation.

IV. "Both express the same opinions, cautions, maxims, and rules of conduct in nearly the same words. Both adopt the same quotations in three instances. And Sir Philip twice introduces, in one of his speeches, a maxim, which Junius had extracted and translated from the writings of De Lolme." The same answer may be given on this head as on the preceding.

V. "The leading political views of Sir Philip Francis are shewn to be those of Junius by the *Essay on the Regency*," and on various great questions they thought and acted alike. On this head also the same answer may be given.

VI. Without being duly educated for the bar, each had a considerable knowledge of the law," entertained the same feelings about lawyers, the law-profession, and the British constitution. On this head also the same answer may be given.

VII. "Sir Philip Francis was peculiarly qualified for writing the *Letters* of Junius," from his sources of political information, the habits of his mind, his classical attainments, and his Irish birth

and early education, "according with the general suspicion that Junius was a native of the same country." No answer is required on this head, because I have already discussed these matters.

VIII. "Both were of ardent and irritable dispositions, subject to the extremes of zeal and indifference, enthusiasm and despondency. In the disorder and embarrassment, with which Sir Philip spoke in Parliament, may be traced one cause, why the flow of his eloquence did not discover him to be Junius; and another may be found in that habit of compression and selection, which he cultivated, which made composition such a labour to Junius, and which impeded, it is said, Sir Philip in drawing up his Indian minutes. In external appearance Sir Philip resembled the tall gentleman, who was seen to convey a *Letter* from Junius. His portrait is characteristic of the author. And adequate cause is found in the undoubted gaiety and gallantry of Junius, for concluding that his years did not exceed those of Sir Philip." This passage invites much remark. 1. Not a single point here insisted on is entitled to any consideration—it is partly sheer supposition from small and unimportant facts—or partly unintentional misrepresentation of facts. 2. It is untrue that Sir Philip Francis was "subject to the extremes of zeal and indifference, enthusiasm and despondency." The following words in his *Memoirs* (p. 30. of Taylor,) which I consider to be his own composition, disprove the assertion:—"THE HISTORY OF AN ARDENT MIND IN PERPETUAL ACTION OR PURSUIT, NEVER SUCCEEDING, BUT NEVER COURTING REPOSE OR YIELDING TO DESPONDENCE, could not fail to communicate a projectile motion to other minds in parallel directions and to similar objects. They would see that success is not necessary to happiness, much less to honour, and that he,

who contends against adversity and persists without hope, cannot be wholly disappointed." 3. Sir Philip's embarrassment in speech, and his slowness in composition, are no proof that he was Junius, because the latter took great pains in preparing his *Letters*; for a man may speak fluently, and yet write with difficulty — how many of our merchants can act better the part of speaker than writer? On the other hand, some men, like Addison, can write easily and yet speak with embarrassment, or, like Goldsmith, always write elegantly, warmly, and sensibly, and yet very often speak hesitatingly, blunderingly, and ridiculously. 4. There is some very imperfect logic in the structure of the words in this sentence; for, while I can understand why embarrassment in speech may prevent "the flow of eloquence" from discovering a man to be Junius, I am unable to apprehend why "the habit of compression and selection," common to Sir Philip and Junius, should cause "the flow of his eloquence" from "discovering him to be Junius," because, if both wrote with equal difficulty, so far at least there would be an argument for identifying the one with the other. 5. If Sir Philip "did in external appearance resemble the tall gentleman, who was seen to convey a *Letter* from Junius," nay, if the carrier of that *Letter* were acknowledged to be Sir Philip himself, the fact would not identify Sir Philip and Junius, unless Mr. Taylor could prove that Junius was always his own postman. 6. On "the undoubted gaiety and gallantry of Junius," and on the question of his age I have already refuted Mr. Taylor.

IX. On the argument that Junius and Sir Philip are identified, because each "had a personal regard for Woodfall," I have already touched.

X. Junius and Sir Philip are identified, says Mr.

Taylor, because both, though not Members of Parliament, attended the debates in both Houses, and “both were in the House of Lords at the same time on two particular occasions”—“both were accustomed to take notes and report speeches, especially those of Lord Chatham; and two of the latter by Sir Philip, and one of Burke’s by Junius, were sent in a perfect state to Almon for publication. Junius makes reference in his *Private Letters* to portions of Lord Chatham’s speeches then unpublished, though afterwards reported by Sir P. Francis; and the latter to this day sometimes quotes from other speeches of the same nobleman, of which there exists at present no printed record.” These circumstances are not positive proofs of identity, but only strong presumptions; and, as there are strong presumptions in favour of many other claims for the authorship of Junius, we should exercise great caution in receiving such evidence in any particular case. Junius had great and real occasion “to attend the debates,” because he wished “to collect the scattered sweets” of parliamentary eloquence, and to obtain authentic political information; and “to take notes, because he wished to refer to them as guides; and “to report speeches,” because he wished for his own purpose to diffuse the information which he possessed. But Sir Philip Francis, as an inferior Clerk in a public Office, should be presumed to have had very different objects in view, and there is nothing to prove that these objects were political, and every thing to presume that they were not. As a man patronised and befriended by Lord Chatham, whom a youthful mind would in any circumstances admire, and whom Sir Philip in his own circumstances must have loved, there can be no doubt that, if he took notes of and reported any speeches, he would feel particular delight in select-

ing the speeches of Lord Chatham. As a clever man and of steady habits in business, he would very probably be requested to take notes and report speeches, by any person, who for his own purposes wished to have an account of parliamentary proceedings — even Junius himself might directly or indirectly have employed the head and the pen of Sir Philip in this way. An inferior Clerk in a public Office, who possessed shining talents, and constantly resided in London, is precisely the person who would be likely to eke out in this manner the deficiencies of income for a genteel competency; and refined notions of honour, and delicate scruples of conscience must not be expected from a man in that dependent situation.

XI. “Junius seems to have been personally known to Garrick, who was the intimate friend of Dr. Francis, and therefore acquainted with Sir Philip. Junius designedly spared Lord Holland and his family for some very cogent reasons; and to that nobleman Sir Philip and his father were under the strongest obligations. Under the administration of Mr. Grenville, Sir Philip was appointed to the War-Office; with that statesman he most nearly concurred in all political opinions; and Mr. Grenville was above all men the declared favourite of Junius. Sir Philip describes Lord Chatham as ‘a great, illustrious, *faulty*, human being;’ and Junius speaks of him with the same *qualified* admiration.” 1. If the full benefit of this evidence were allowed to Mr. Taylor, it would amount to nothing positive, and very little presumptive. 2. Of Garrick I have already spoken. 3. I have abundantly shewn that Junius and Sir Philip differed most widely about Lord Chatham, and to such an extent as to demonstrate on the plainest principles of reasoning that Junius never can from this circum-



stance be identified with Sir Philip. 4. If Junius did not from motives of friendship spare Garrick, why should he from such motives spare Lord Holland? If Sir Philip Francis were Junius, he was evidently the most unprincipled politician and the most profligate writer that ever lived, and I cannot admit any argument founded on the honour or the delicacy of Sir Philip. 5. There is no particular point in the argument about Mr. Grenville, because it would apply much more strongly to Charles Lloyd, who was the private Secretary of Mr. Grenville, and to Lord George Sackville, who entertained a very high opinion of Mr. Grenville as an individual, and as a statesman: see Mr. Coventry p. 63—6.

XII. "Junius avows his acquaintance with the Secretary of State's Office, mentions a circumstance, which occurred when Lord Egremont was Secretary, and speaks of him as if he knew him thoroughly. Sir Philip was brought up in the same office, possessed the favour of the same nobleman, and held a place under him at the time that circumstance happened. And, generally speaking, his opportunities of acquiring information, from his connection with the *public offices*, were such as fully account for the extraordinary *nature, extent, and variety*, of the intelligence possessed by Junius." I have shewn that Junius, who was connected with Mr. Almon, had in the latter a great fountain of early official intelligence, and, no doubt, there were many other and higher sources of information open to him. At any rate a man, like Junius, conversant with courts and courtiers and ministers and officers, civil and military, and members of parliament, was much more likely to obtain secret news from some of them, than from an inferior clerk in a public office, who could be expected to furnish only facts and circumstances and proceedings of a minor

importance, because they alone would fall within his ken.

XIII. Mr. Taylor contends from several arguments that "Junius was in some degree connected with the Horse-Guards." "There is such precision in the secret intelligence from that quarter, conveyed to Woodfall or to the public, as occurs in no other department of the state, and could not be acquired from this, except by one who had access to the fountain-head for information." Admitting the fact to be so, am I obliged to admit that Sir Philip was the sole oracle consulted? Am I obliged to believe that an inferior Clerk could know all the secrets of his principals in the office? Am I obliged to confess that Lord George Sackville and others could not, directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally, have conveyed some of this secret information?

XIV. "From the commencement to the termination of the *Letters* of Junius, Sir Philip Francis held a situation in the War-Office, requiring almost constant attendance. When he quitted that Office and went abroad in 1772, the *Letters* ceased; and when he returned to England at the beginning of 1773, a *Note*, finally closing the correspondence, was transmitted to Woodfall. From that time till 1781. Sir Philip was engaged in the government of India." 1. If the situation required "almost constant attendance," where was the leisure to compose the elaborate *Letters* of Junius? 2. Coincidences, however remarkable, are very insufficient evidence to determine questions of this sort. Lloyd was absent from England about the same time; the final *Note* of Junius is dated Jan. 19, 1773. and Lloyd died on the 22d. General Lee *feigned* an absence from England during the reign of Junius, and was secretly much employed in writing.

XV. and XVI. relate to Sir Philip's quarrel with Lord Barrington, his dismissal from the War-Office, Junius's vindictory *Letters* on that occasion under the name of *Veteran*, his unqualified approbation of Sir Philip, and his retirement from the public service at that time. 1. I reply:— If the *Letters* of *Veteran* were now known to be the composition of Sir Philip himself, it would not thence follow that Junius, who sent them to Woodfall, was the writer of them, though he took pains to inform him that he was the writer — the subject suited the political purposes of Junius, and that would of itself be a sufficient motive for him to let them pass under the *shadow* of his name. 2. His “unqualified approbation” of Sir Philip might arise solely from *political* considerations without any reference to the *person* — Lord Barrington, as part and parcel of the Ministry, was a target for Junius to fire at, and there was no more effectual mode of hitting the centre of the object than by applauding the Clerk whom Lord Barrington had angrily dismissed from the War-Office. 3. The retirement of Junius from the public service at the period of the dismissal is, certainly, a remarkable coincidence; but the question of Junius's *Letters*, on whichever side we look, to whatever claims we turn, abounds with remarkable coincidences, and if the ONLY remarkable coincidences were those, which concerned Sir Philip Francis, then indeed, and ONLY then, we might be disposed to consider them as supplying matter well worthy of grave consideration.

*Some Enquiry into the Claims of Charles Lloyd, Esq. to the Authorship of Junius's Letters.*

---

I. The earliest mention in print, of Lloyd's name in connection with Junius, occurs in the Rev. Sir Herbert Croft's *Love and Madness, a Story too true, in a Series of Letters*, which was first published in 1780, 12mo. I have not the book at hand, but the passage is of no particular importance to my purpose.

II. "The Secretary to another Minister has been suspected. This was Mr. Charles Lloyd, Secretary to Mr. Grenville. But his talents also were very inadequate to the composition of Junius. He wrote indeed some short *Letters* and paragraphs in the Newspapers, against the Rockingham Administration, and some political pamphlets in the years 1765. and 1766. published by me. These last possessed a very small degree of literary merit, and consequently their circulation was very limited; but a few persons, knowing that he sometimes amused himself in that manner, upon no other foundation raised this hypothesis. When Junius's *Letters* first appeared, he was in a very bad state of health, and obliged to reside abroad, and he died a few months after their completion." Mr. Almon's *Letters of Junius Complete*, Lond. 1806. 2 vols. 12mo, p. xvii.

III. "Lord North, who is remembered as an

eminent public character of these times, was at an early age brought into office as a young man of business. In 1759, he was appointed a Lord of the Treasury under the Duke of Newcastle, in which situation he continued till the change of Administration in 1765. In 1766, he was made joint-Paymaster with Mr. Cooke, Member for Middlesex. When he accepted of this situation, Mr. Grenville was much offended, having thought that Lord North had been attached to him; and Mr. Charles Lloyd, who was that gentleman's private Secretary, wrote a tract upon the occasion, entitled *A Letter to a Noble Lord upon his Acceptance of a Place*, in which he reprimanded his Lordship's eagerness for office in terms of severity. On the death of Mr. Townshend in 1767, he was appointed Chancellor of the Exchequer; and on the resignation of the Duke of Grafton in 1770, first Lord of the Treasury: this latter place he held all the remainder of the time, during which Junius wrote." Mr. Almon's *Note* in his edition of Junius's *Letters*, 1, 50.

IV. "*Charles Lloyd, Esq. : Names of the Tracts written by him.* This gentleman was private Secretary to Mr. Grenville, during the time that gentleman was first Lord of the Treasury, and author of many political Tracts, chiefly written in vindication of that Minister's conduct. They were principally the following: (1.) *The Anatomy of a late Negotiation, earnestly addressed to the Serious Consideration of the People of Great Britain.* The negotiation here spoken of is that which Lord Bute brought on between the King and Mr. Pitt in the autumn of the year 1763. The facts are purposely mis-represented to make Mr. Pitt appear haughty, and Lord Bute versatile." [I possess a copy of this tract, which is in 4to, pp. 28.] ("2.) *A vindication of the conduct of the Ministry in the Case of*

*Mr. Wilkes.* This relates to the apprehension of Mr. Wilkes by the general warrant, his commitment to the Tower, and his discharge by the Court of Common Pleas; highly commending the Ministry for their zeal in defending the honour of the King. (3.) *A Defence of the Majority in the House of Commons, on the Question relating to General Warrants,* [inserted in *The Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts, written by Persons of Eminence*, Lond. 1778. Debrett, 1, 73 — 92. with Mr. C. L.'s name prefixed.] “This was an answer to Mr. Townshend’s *Defence of the Minority* on the same question. It was in reply to this *Defence of the Majority*, that the celebrated *Letter on Libels and Warrants* was written.” [This *Letter*, addressed to Mr. Almon, is inserted in the same *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts*, 1, 93 — 259. It commences thus:— ‘Some weeks after my son’s sending you a *Letter to the Public Advertiser*, I was surprised with the sight of a pamphlet, (*The Majority Defended*,) wherein a contrary doctrine is conveyed, although I cannot say, directly affirmed; from which last circumstance I guess it to be the work of some enterprising Attorney, retouched by his superior, who has ventured to assert in print, what I do not remember to have heard any one gentleman avow in Parliament, and for that reason, among others, has attracted my notice and indignation.’ Throughout the *Letter* the author of *The Majority Defended* is called ‘the Attorney.’] (4.) *An Honest Man’s Reasons for declining to take a Part in the New Administration,* [inserted in the *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts*, 2, 3 — 6.] “This was the administration of 1765, commonly called the Rockingham Administration. The reasons assigned are that Lord Bute removed the late Ministry, and in a little time would remove the present. It was ascribed very generally to

Lord Lyttleton, because his Lordship had refused the offers, which were made to him." [Note prefixed to the article in the *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts* :—' Upon the dismissal of Mr. Grenville's Administration at the end of June 1765, a new Ministry was formed by the late Duke of Cumberland, with the Marquis of Rockingham at the head of it; offers having been made by his Royal Highness to Mr. Pitt, Lord Temple, etc. who declined them. As soon as the principal persons of the new Ministry had kissed hands, the following pamphlet was published. It was ascribed to Lord Lyttleton, but very unjustly; it was believed to have been written by Charles Lloyd, Esq. private Secretary to Mr. Grenville.' It is followed by a reply with this title, 6—24. :—' *A Candid Answer to a late Pamphlet, entitled An Honest Man's Reasons for declining to take any Part in the New Administration.*' This Note is prefixed :—' Ascribed to Grey Cooper, Esq. now Sir Grey Cooper, Bart., who, a short time after the publication of this pamphlet, which was in June 1765, was appointed one of the Secretaries to the Treasury, under the Marquis of Rockingham.'] (5.) "*A Critical Review of the New Administration.* This is an answer to two pamphlets written by Sir Grey Cooper: one was called *A Pair of Spectacles for short-sighted Politicians*; the other, *The Merits of the New Administration truly stated.* See the article of *Sir Grey Cooper.* (6.) *The Conduct of the late Administration examined, relative to the Repeal of the American Stamp-Act.* This tract, (which is upwards of 200 pages,) is an able composition, and the greatest part of it, if not all of it, was dictated by Mr. Grenville himself. Those persons, who wish to see a defence of the Stamp-Act, and a display of what the writer considers the impolicy of

repealing it, will read this work with pleasure. (7.) Mr. Burke having written a little tract called *A Short Account of a late Short Administration,*" (inserted in the *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts* 2, 57—69.) "Mr. Lloyd wrote an answer to it, which was called *A True History of a late Short Administration,*" [inserted in the same *Collection*, with Mr. Lloyd's name prefixed, and printed in double columns, one containing Burke's statement, and the other containing the counter-statement.] "These small Tracts contain all the features of the Rockingham Administration in miniature. (8.) *An Examination of the Principles and boasted Disinterestedness of a late Right Honourable Gentleman; in a Letter from an Old Man of Business to a Noble Lord.* This tract was written upon the change of the Ministry in the year 1766, when Mr. Pitt, who is the Right Honourable gentleman alluded to, was created Earl of Chatham. The noble Lord, to whom it is pretended to be a *Letter*, was Lord North. It is a vindication of Lord Temple's conduct in rejecting the offers of the Court, and blames Lord Chatham for accepting them." [I possess a copy of this tract; it is in 8vo. pp. 34.] "(9.) *A Word at Parting, to his Grace the Duke of Bedford.* This small tract was occasioned by the Duke of Bedford's friends joining the Ministry at the end of the year 1767, and abandoning Mr. Grenville. (10.) Besides these, he wrote many *Essays* and *Letters* in the public Papers, on political temporary subjects, which are now lost. He was brother to the Dean of Norwich." Mr. Almon's *Biographical, Literary, and Political Anecdotes*, 2, 108.

V. "On Lord Bute's resignation, which took place on April 8, 1763. Mr. Grenville was appointed his successor; and Lord Sandwich took the va-



cancy thus occasioned at the admiralty. Other alterations were made, and the necessary parliamentary writs were issued for new elections. The writ, however, for supplying Mr. Grenville's seat, was not moved for till the 19th, (*Commons' Journals*, 29, 646.) the day on which the parliament was prorogued, although he had been appointed immediately on Lord Bute's resigning. This delay arose from his being obliged to apply to his brother, Earl Temple, for permission to be re-elected for the town of Buckingham; a request, which was peculiarly distressing to himself, because at this time there subsisted the most bitter animosity between the brothers. This application was made on the 18th; and Mr. Charles Lloyd, Mr. Grenville's private Secretary, carried the *Letter*, in which was enclosed a copy of the King's speech, (perhaps as a compliment,) to be delivered from the throne the next day. Mr. Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham, was at his Lordship's house in Pall-Mall, when this message arrived; and he added his personal entreaty that Lord Temple would consent to his brother's re-election, with which his Lordship complied. But it does not seem probable that his consent would have been given without Mr. Pitt's intercession; for in the *Remarks on the Letters, which passed between Mr. Allen of Bath and Mr. Pitt*, which Lord Temple himself dictated, there is a very strong insinuation to that effect." *Memoirs of John Wilkes, Esq. by Mr. Almon*, 1, 94.

#### VI. "JUNIUS DETERMINED.

*To the Editor of the Dublin Magazine.*

"SIR — In compliance with your request, I send you my opinions concerning the author of *Junius*; should you esteem them as contributing to settle this long disputed point, they are at your service.

G. COCKBURNE.

“ That Charles Lloyd, who was private Secretary to George Grenville, and his Deputy-Teller of the Exchequer, was the author, I have not the smallest doubt; and I know it is the firm belief of several persons in England, who from situation and circumstances, are likely to form the best opinion on that subject.

“ I shall now give you reasons in support of this opinion; but it would be ungenerous and unjust in me to pretend to have made the discovery myself. You must permit me to go into some detail. The late Peter Walsh, Esq. of Belline, had long given his attention to the discovery of two secrets — viz. ‘ Who was *Junius*? and Who the *Iron-Masked*? ’ I know he investigated both for several years with the greatest industry, and read almost every book or pamphlet published on these points, and it was his firm conviction that Lloyd wrote *Junius*. He intended to publish what he had discovered; but unfortunately deferred it, and I am not yet informed, if he has left any Memoir on the subject. Four years ago I urged Mr. Walsh to publish his reasons, and give me the outline of them.

“ In his answer he says:— ‘ My firm conviction (indeed I cannot have a doubt of it,) is, that Charles Lloyd was the author. Years ago I thought so, and every thing that has been authentically published respecting the writings of *Junius*, since I first formed this opinion, has confirmed me more and more in it. A few years ago, I met by chance some political *Letters* published under the two different signatures *Atticus* und *Lucius*. They were published in 1768, the year before *Junius* first appeared. They struck me as having been written by the same pen that produced the *Letters of Junius*. And I am much flattered by finding in Mr. Woodfall’s full and complete edition of

‘ *Junius*, that the *Letters* signed *Atticus*, and also  
‘ those signed *Lucius*, were written by the author  
‘ of *Junius*, and as such are now printed along with  
‘ the *Letters* signed *Junius* in this new edition.  
‘ But I was still more flattered by finding in this  
‘ enlarged and comprehensive edition, some cir-  
‘ cumstances of which I was ignorant before, which  
‘ confirm my opinion as to the author still more and  
‘ more; so that indeed, I feel a moral certainty that  
‘ what was at first but conjecture, founded upon a  
‘ few arguments, that carried weight in my mind,  
‘ may now be considered as amounting to such cir-  
‘ cumstantial evidence as cannot be reasonably re-  
‘ sisted.

‘ I am to remark that it appears from this new  
‘ publication, (notwithstanding what was long sus-  
‘ pected to the contrary,) that Printer Woodfall  
‘ did not know who his correspondent *Junius* was.  
‘ The Editor of this new edition, which contains  
‘ a great variety of Publications and private *Let-*  
‘ *ters*, combats the opinion of Mr. Lloyd being the  
‘ writer of *Junius*; but I think I could convince  
‘ him, if I had leisure, that he is mistaken in re-  
‘ jecting the claim of that gentleman to the fame  
‘ of being the author. He employs 62 pages in  
‘ mentioning the different persons, who were sus-  
‘ pected at different times, and by different people  
‘ to be *Junius*, and in refuting the claims made for  
‘ them. But he does not devote more than half a  
‘ page to the claim made for this Mr. Lloyd, and  
‘ the argument by which the Editor thinks he refutes  
‘ it, in truth carries no conviction with it. For it is  
‘ founded upon an opinion that even an extremely  
‘ clever man, in the common habit of writing well-  
‘ composed *Letters*, could not write a common *Note*,  
‘ that required no mental exertion, such as the last  
‘ ever written by *Junius* to the late Mr. Woodfall,

· and which is printed in this edition, and does not  
 ‘ contain 20 lines, dated 19th of January, because  
 ‘ he died the 22d of that month, as if it were an es-  
 ‘ tablished certainty that no man can write even a  
 ‘ plain *Note* within three days of his death. Can  
 ‘ any thing be more puerile, futile, and absurd? \*  
 ‘ Your uncle Mr. — who was more intimate with  
 ‘ Mr. Malone, and the first literary characters in  
 ‘ England, told me long ago that Lloyd was cer-  
 ‘ tainly the author of the *Letters* signed *Atticus* and  
 ‘ *Lucius*; and as I observed above, it now appears,  
 ‘ that the same person, (whoever he was,) wrote  
 ‘ *Junius*, and this is no light circumstance.’

“ Now, Sir, that public men in England might make a reasonable guess, is not very extraordinary; but that a private country-gentleman, in rather an obscure and distant part of Ireland, should, from mere investigation, make this discovery, certainly shews a most industrious and investigating mind; such had Mr. Walsh.—Before I sum up my proofs, I must next inform you that about two years ago, I was on a visit to one of the most learned men, and perhaps the best scholar, in England. When about to leave him, he insisted on taking me the first stage in his carriage, and as we journeyed along, he said — ‘ I will now tell you a secret, which few men in England know; but you must promise never to divulge it. I will tell you who wrote *Junius*.’——

“ ‘ Hold Sir,’ said I! ‘ I will tell you myself who *Junius* was, and I immediately mentioned Charles Lloyd.’

\* “ We perfectly coincide in this opinion; and as one instance out of many which we could adduce, Dr. Darwin may be cited in its support. Five or six hours before his decease he commenced a *Letter* to the late Mr. Edgeworth, which death prevented him from concluding. Although for sometime expecting the blow, yet the style is philosophic, bold, and full of hope.”—ED.

“ My friend fell back in the chaise with astonishment, and after some pause — asked, How! How! by what means did you come by this knowledge? I told him, and he then entered into a full discussion, and confirmed me in the opinion of my friend, Mr. WALSH, and he informed me the reasons for secrecy. Whether they were altogether well founded or not, I do not pretend to determine, but that they were the reasons for secrecy, I have no doubt.

“ He conjured me to write to Mr. W., and to communicate those reasons for secrecy. I did so — and with that benevolence, which always characterized him, he promised not to mention Lloyd again.

“ In many *Letters* after, from my English friend, he reminded me in these words — ‘ Be sure to tell your ingenious friend, (as he called Mr. W.,) not to divulge *Junius*.’ He also assured me, that Mr. Fox knew it. I confess I did not think the arguments for secrecy good; but he lately fully absolved me from any further observance of it, and I therefore mention Lloyd as the author of *Junius*, and in further support, offer the following reasons.

“ *Lloyd*,\* from his situation, had the necessary information, and there have been allusions to him, which shew he was believed to be the writer, by some contemporaries, who wrote in the public prints about the same time. One of them, who signed himself *An Advocate in the Cause of the People*, in a *Letter* published in the *Public Advertiser*, in Oct. 1771., says ‘ he thinks *Junius* a Secretary of one of the discarded Ministers,’ which is exactly what Lloyd was. † He had been Secretary to

\* “ *Junius* knew all the public characters. It appears from his 28th *Letter* to Woodfall, that he had the first information respecting the proceedings of administration; and from the 41st, of every thing private at court.” — ED.

† “ In a *Letter* to Woodfall he says, ‘ You know, I do not, nor indeed have I time to give equal care to them all.’ ” — ED.

George Grenville, who might then be reckoned in the class of discarded Ministers.

“ It is allowed he was an excellent writer, and has always been one of the persons to whom *Junius* was attributed.

“ *Junius* never attacks the Grenvilles.

“ *Junius* wrote till within three days of Lloyd’s death, but this last was only a short *Letter* to Woodfall. No *Junius* appeared after Lloyd’s death—the other persons supposed to have written *Junius*, all lived many years after Lloyd died—yet no *Junius* appeared after.

“ At the time *Junius* wrote, all or most of the supposed authors were *poor men* in both finances and power. Even Lloyd himself was poor in finance; but be it remembered, *Junius* tells Woodfall not to be afraid—he would support him—he should have money. How was all this? Burke, Francis, Rosenhagen, Hamilton, Boyd, Lee, and others, had neither money nor power to support any one; but Lloyd was backed by the Grenvilles, and therefore could hold out promises to Woodfall.\*

“ Though many circumstances in favour of Lloyd might apply to others, yet *all* the circumstances apply to no other. Let any one fairly examine the claims of Francis, Boyd, Hamilton, Burke, Flood, or any other, and compare them with those of Lloyd, they will at once see the *superiority*.

“ The pretensions of Rosenhagen, Lee, and most of the others, being now scarcely worth notice, and Woodfall having declared that Rosenhagen, (the head of the *minor* claimants,) was not the author, it only remains to speak of one not, I believe, men-

\* “ In a private *Letter* No. 8. *Junius* says : ‘ The truth is, there are people about me, whom I would wish not to contradict.’ This indicates that he was not perfectly independent, and that, in fact, he was the spokesman of a party.” — ED.

tioned by Woodfall, viz. Dr. Wilmot, who lived near Coventry, and, singular enough, partly educated a great many of the persons supposed to be *Junius*, and Lloyd amongst the rest. I have been told that Wilmot's widow, who afterwards married Mr. Serres, conceived her husband, Wilmot, to have been the author. He was, however, under *such obligations* to many of those lashed by *Junius*, that it is almost impossible he could have acted so basely. But it is some further evidence in favour of Lloyd, that those most anxious to give the honour to Wilmot, say, if *he* was not the author, Lloyd was: and though *Junius's* assertion, of his not being known to Mr. Grenville, is, under all circumstances, truly conjectural, yet we cannot forget that of all the *characters* of the day, Mr. Grenville was *Junius's* favourite — that he never censured him, but embraced every occasion of defending and extolling his conduct and principles, and therefore he *must* have known him.

“ With respect to the other persons most suspected :

“ *Mr. Flood.* — It was utterly impossible he could have the local information of *Junius*.

“ *Boyd.* — I know many persons who were intimate with him, and they laugh at the idea of his being the author, and positively deny it.

“ *Francis.* — If we consider his age at the time *Junius* wrote, and that he was then only in a very subordinate situation in the War-Office, and it was quite impossible he could have the information necessary, we must reject his claim; moreover, though in a late publication, (*Junius identified*,) the author labours hard for him, and certainly produces some strong points, still Francis, if the author, had no reason to deny it; whereas Lloyd evidently had an object in secrecy, namely, his being set to write by

the Grenvilles, and if we couple all the circumstances, we shall find that the identification of Lloyd at the time *Junius* wrote, would have made them a party, at least so far as supplying the information. It is however to be lamented that Francis's vanity did not permit him candidly to deny being the author, before he died.

“ *Mr. Hamilton*, — I never could find any rational grounds for supposing him to be the writer.

“ *Burke*. — Though last in the list, I am aware he is more generally suspected than any other person. You may depend on the truth of the following anecdote. Bishop, then Dean Marley, was at a watering place distant from London. Burke was there at the same time.

Marley suspected him to be *Junius*; but a *Letter* from Junius appeared in Woodfall's Paper. Soon after an answer appeared, to which Junius immediately replied. Burke being at the said watering place, from its distance, could not have seen the *Letter*, (to which the reply of Junius appeared,) in time to have written; on which Marley said to him — ‘ Now Burke, I am clear, I was mistaken in my conjecture, that you are the author of Junius;’ and Burke answered, ‘ I could not write like Junius, and if I could, I would not.’

“ Marley told this to Sir Hercules Langrishe, who assured Mr. Walsh of its strict truth. Burke also, in a speech in the House of Commons, eulogized and praised Junius for his fine writing, which is not likely, if he had been himself the author. Burke was an enemy to triennial Parliaments — Junius a powerful advocate for them. I beg also to observe, Junius always uses an ungrammatical expression, viz. ‘ whether or no’ — Burke, ‘ whether or not.’

“ Burke was a violent American, and against the



principle of taxing them. Junius on the contrary was for it, and says, 'The opposition to it was merely to annoy George Grenville.' I beg further to observe, that Junius not only does not attack the Grenvilles, but defends them. Here I conclude and you will probably say, strong as all I have stated is, after all, it is only the old thing — conjecture. Still

*Stat nominis umbra.*

But where positive evidence is wanting, what can we supply but reasonable conjecture, supported by the strongest circumstantial evidence, and that I think I have given?

"I must however, in candour, say, that I have found one thing against Lloyd. In *Letter* 18. Junius says: — 'It is not my design to enter into a formal vindication of Mr. Grenville, upon his own principles. I have neither the honour of being personally known to him, nor do I pretend to be completely master of all the facts.' Now, as Lloyd intimately knew Mr. Grenville, and must have been master of the facts, it follows, that, either he was the author, or he told a useless falsehood, and one would hope that the writer of Junius, would be above falsehood, under any circumstances.\* I wrote this to Mr. Walsh, unfortunately only a week before his death; so did not get his answer to the objection.

"Others, to whom I have mentioned this cir-

\* "We do not think that Junius has been so scrupulous in his adherence to truth as to warrant a serious doubt on this head. In his 8th *Letter* to Woodfall, alluding to his last published, he says: 'I wish it could be recalled.' Suppose you were to say, 'We have some reason to suspect that the last *Letter* signed Junius, in this Paper was not written by the real Junius, though the observation escaped us at the time?' In his *Letter* dated 16th Oct. 1771. signed ANTI-FOX, we find 'I know nothing of Junius, but I see that he has designedly spared Lord Holland and his family.'" — ED.

cumstance, think nothing of it; for they say secrecy being the grand object of Lloyd, it was innocent and allowable, inasmuch, as it injured no one, and he thereby, (as was his object,) turned public attention from himself." \*

“GENERAL COCKBURNE ON JUNIUS.

[To the Editor of the *Dublin Magazine*.]

“Sir,

According to my promise I send you the opinion of my friend Dr. Parr, in corroboration of Charles Lloyd having been the author of *Junius*; and few men, perhaps, in England are better able to form an opinion on the subject. Moreover, the Doctor gave me the names of several eminent men, whose judgment, (if I were at liberty to name them,) would at least add great weight, and who had not the slightest doubt that Lloyd was the author. I have also very good reason to believe that his late Majesty knew it; he was told it under a promise of secrecy; and, to use the strong expression of my informant on this point—‘As the king was a gentleman, and a man who never deviated from truth, and whose word was sacred, he accordingly kept the secret.’

“In a late *Letter* from Dr. Parr, he says:—

‘I absolve you from all secrecy about *Junius*; and you may mention my name, my firm belief, nay, conviction, that Lloyd was the author.—The reason why this has been so long a secret, you already know—and though \* \* \* \* has little to fear now from any discovery, it may be as

\* “That this act does not merit the name of moral turpitude, we are fully authorised, by the opinion of Paley, Burlemaqui, and other civilians, to assert. The author of the foregoing valuable observations has promised to furnish us with the venerable Dr. Parr’s ideas on this subject.”—ED.

‘ well to avoid the mention of individuals without their consent.

‘ I have been told that the Marquis of \* \* \* once incautiously said, — *I know who JUNIUS was*, and mentioned Lloyd, though at that time it was of importance to keep it a secret. I do not, however, vouch for this.’

“ In another *Letter* the Doctor says : —

‘ In regard to Junius, I broke the seal of secrecy two months ago, and having no restraints of delicacy about it, I communicated the opinion unservedly to Mr. Denman. The impression produced by a well-written pamphlet, and the elaborate critique upon it in the *Edinburgh Review*, still direct the national faith towards Sir Philip Francis. He was too proud to tell a lie, and he disclaimed the work. He was too vain to refuse celebrity, which he was conscious of deserving. He was too intrepid to conceal, when danger had nearly passed by. He was too irascible to keep the secret, by the publication of which he at this time of day could injure no party, with which he is connected, nor any individual, for whom he cared. Besides, dear Sir, we have many books of his writings upon many subjects, and all of them stamped with the same character of mind. Their general *lexis*, as we say in Greek, has no resemblance to the *lexis* of *Junius*; and the resemblance in particulars can have far less weight than that resemblance, of which there is no vestige. — Francis uniformly writes English. There is Gallicism in *Junius*. Francis is furious, but not malevolent — Francis is never cool, and *Junius* is seldom ardent. Do not suppose that I have forgotten the fact, upon which you very properly lay great stress. I have little or no hesitation in supposing, that under all the circumstances of the case, and from

‘ motives of personal regard to George Grenville  
 ‘ himself, his friend and his secretary would ven-  
 ‘ ture upon falsehood, and Woodfall, knowing the  
 ‘ importance of such disavowal, would record, al-  
 ‘ though he disbelieved it. Woodfall stated a fact,  
 ‘ and left his readers to their own conclusion, and  
 ‘ it was the wish, if not the duty of Woodfall, to  
 ‘ keep us in the dark. I retain my old faith, and  
 ‘ in the true spirit of political orthodoxy, I retain it  
 ‘ the more firmly, in consequence of what I think  
 ‘ unsuccessful attacks. You are at liberty to cou-  
 ‘ ple my name with the name of Mr. Walsh as fix-  
 ‘ ing upon Mr. Lloyd for the writer.’

“ In another *Letter* he says:—

‘ I smiled at the scepticism of our sagacious  
 ‘ friend Lord Hutchinson as to Lloyd. We must  
 ‘ all grant that a strong case has been made out for  
 ‘ Francis; but I could set up very stout objections  
 ‘ to those claims. It was not in his nature to keep  
 ‘ a secret—he would have told it from his vanity,  
 ‘ or from his courage, or from his patriotism.

‘ His bitterness, his vivacity, his acuteness, are  
 ‘ stamped in characters very peculiar upon many  
 ‘ publications, that bear his name; and very faint  
 ‘ indeed is their resemblance to the spirit, and in  
 ‘ an extended sense of the word, to the style of  
 ‘ *Junius*.

‘ Burke is altogether out of the question—when  
 ‘ he wrote coolly, as in his book *upon the Sublime  
 ‘ and Beautiful*, and in his imitation of Lord Bolin-  
 ‘ broke, the style is very dissimilar. But in his  
 ‘ political publications there is, what logicians call,  
 ‘ a specific identity. Even in the calmest of them,  
 ‘ (his *Thoughts upon the Popular Discontents*,) we  
 ‘ see the mind of Burke; and yet this is the only  
 ‘ political work, in which there are few or no ves-  
 ‘ tiges of a public speaker. Again, there is a very

‘ marked character in his invectives ; they have not  
 ‘ even the very faintest resemblance to the invec-  
 ‘ tives of *Junius* ; — they have not the coolness and  
 ‘ the poignancy of *Junius*. We have none of  
 ‘ Burke’s amplification, none of his high-wrought  
 ‘ eloquence, none of his aristocratical propensities.  
 ‘ No two writers can be more dissimilar : you, and  
 ‘ I, and Mr. Walsh, shall adhere firmly to our old  
 ‘ creed. I do not blame you for telling the tale to  
 ‘ Lord Hutchinson ; with an exception to Mr. Fox  
 ‘ only, I think Lord Hutchinson’s judgment upon  
 ‘ politics and common life the very soundest I ever  
 ‘ met with ; and he has another noble property — he  
 ‘ has no artifice, he has no ostentation, and he is a  
 ‘ faithful speaker of truth.’

“ I must now, Sir, conclude ; but I beg leave to  
 impress on you the strong circumstance in favour  
 of Lloyd, which I mentioned before, viz. that from  
 the time of Lloyd’s death, *Junius* ceased to write.  
 All the other supposed authors lived many years  
 after, but never favoured us with one line in the  
 style of *Junius*.

“ G. C.”

VII. “ (*Text.*) A simple test ascertains the po-  
 litical connexion of *Junius*, — the only circumstance  
 which he could not disguise, because it could not be  
 concealed without defeating his general purpose.  
 He supported the cause of authority against Ame-  
 rica, — with Mr. Grenville the minister, — against  
 the Stamp-Act. He maintained the highest popular  
 principles on the Middlesex-Election, with the same  
 statesman, who was the leader of opposition on  
 that question. No other party in the kingdom  
 but the Grenvilles combined these two opinions ;  
 and it is very unlikely that a private writer, un-  
 pledged, and unconnected, should have spontane-  
 ously embraced political doctrines, which, though

ingenuity might reconcile them in reasoning, were, in the disputes of that period, the opposite extremes.

“Whoever revives the enquiry, therefore, unless he discovers positive and irresistible evidence in support of his claimant, should shew him to be politically attached to the Grenville-party, which Junius certainly was: and must also produce some specimens of his writings of tolerable length, such as might afford reasonable ground for believing that he could have written those *Letters*, which must be allowed to be finished models, though not of the purest and highest sort, of composition. The general vigour of a man’s mental powers affords little more proof that he would be a good writer, than that he could be a good painter. There may indeed be evidence so positive, as will establish the truth of the supposition, which appeared most improbable, as has actually happened in the case of the *Iron-Mask*. But such possibilities must exist in all moral reasonings. —”

“(Note.) It may be observed, that Junius, who is unfriendly to Lord Chatham in the beginning, loads that nobleman with panegyric, after he was reconciled to Lord Temple and Mr. Grenville. There did, and perhaps there does exist, a private *Letter* from Junius to Mr. Grenville, professing political attachment, and, at the same time discouraging all attempts to pluck off the mask.

“Wilkes was originally Member for Aylesbury and Lieutenant Colonel of the Bucks Militia, under Lord Temple. Hence the extravagantly disproportioned interest taken by Junius in any petty intrigue of Aldermen and Sheriffs, which touched that celebrated adventurer. Though a few *Letters* were written after the death of Mr. Grenville, yet to that event and the dissolution of the party, the

cessation of *Junius* is to be attributed. In these circumstances, and others not yet publicly known, originated the supposition that Lloyd was Junius. But some specimen of his writing is wanting to countenance that supposition.

“ In the cases of Dyer and Francis, the two candidates of most plausible pretension, no proof has hitherto appeared of connexion with the Grenville-party. Some resemblance of style in Francis is a very inconsiderable argument; for almost every contributor to a Newspaper, during the 20 years, which followed the *Letters*, was an imitator of Junius.”

*The Edinburgh Review*, June, 1826.  
(Art. *Icon Basilice*,) 44, 5.

The article, whence this extract is taken, is understood to have been the composition of Sir James Mackintosh, and certainly the extract is worthy of his enlightened mind and sound judgment. I shall submit to the eye of the reader a few observations on it.

1. Samuel Dyer must be struck out of the list of claimants, though his claims are gravely supported by Mr. Prior in his *Memoirs of Burke*: Junius continued to write after Dyer's death; the latest communication of Junius to Woodfall is dated *Jan. 19, 1773*. “ Samuel Dyer, Esq., a most learned and ingenious member of the *Literary Club*, for whose understanding and attainments Dr. Johnson had great respect: he died Sept. 14, 1772.” Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, 2, 15. It is very surprising that the Reviewer should have fallen into this mistake, when the fact of Dyer's death at that time is noticed in the *Preliminary Essay* to Woodfall's edition of Junius 1, 99.

2. The Reviewer has clearly shewn the political connection between Junius and George Gren-

ville, and I therefore subscribe to his opinion that such connection must be proved to have existed in the case of any claimant for the authorship of the *Letters*, or the claims should be at once rejected.

3. His test for proving the ability of any claimant to write those *Letters* is fair, viz. that some compositions should be produced of sufficient length to shew the identity of mind and style between Junius and the claimant; but then it is material to limit the compositions in point of time, for they should be either anterior to, or contemporaneous with, or not much later than, the productions of Junius. If they are, as in the instance of Sir Philip Francis, long posterior to the latest *Letter* of Junius, we cannot determine the identity of Junius and the claimant, because the latter may have been a follower of the doctrines and an imitator of the style of Junius. This test can be applied with the greatest certainty to decide on the claims of Lloyd, because we have papers by him earlier than the earliest *Letter* of Junius.

4. The remark, "that the general vigour of a man's mental powers affords little more proof that he would be a good writer, than that he could be a good painter," aims a decisive blow against the claims made for Lord George Sackville, whose very defence on his trial is stated by Cumberland to have been the composition of Dr. Shebbeare, who was rewarded for it with £1,000.

5. The Reviewer has evidently pointed out the *secret* cause of those panegyrics, with which Junius had lately mentioned the name of Lord Chatham, whom he had, at the commencement of his literary career, loaded with abuse — separation from or connection with the Grenvilles made all the difference in the feelings and the language of Junius. I have shewn that the feelings and the language of Sir



Philip Francis about Lord Chatham never varied, and that this forms the striking characteristic difference between Junius and Sir Philip Francis, while Mr. Taylor by a perverted reasoning has arrived at an opposite conclusion. The early aversion, and the subsequent attachment, of Junius to Lord Chatham, was wholly political, while the juvenile and senile partiality of Sir Philip to Lord Chatham is to be referred to the early protection and the continued kindness of his Lordship towards him, and the revered memory of a patron and a friend.

6. The Reviewer rightly rejects the evidence for Francis founded on "some resemblance of style" to Junius, because "every contributor to a Newspaper during the 20 years which followed the *Letters*, was an imitator of Junius." Boyd in his papers entitled *The Whig*, which appeared in 1779. and 1780., is a striking proof of the necessity of exercising much caution in admitting such arguments; for the imitation of Junius's style appeared so exact to Mr. Almon, that in the *Appendix* to his *Biographical, Literary, and Political Anecdotes*, published in 1797., he has attributed them to Junius without any hesitation or even remark, and this hypothesis he has gravely maintained in his edition of Junius published in 1806. , and it has since received the support of Boyd's biographer, and of George Chalmers, Esq.

7. The Reviewer connects Lord Temple and Wilkes, who was Lieutenant Colonel of the Bucks Militia under his Lordship, and was also Member for Aylesbury, and then accounts for the extraordinary interest taken by Junius in the fortunes of that notorious adventurer, because the Reviewer identifies Junius with the Grenville-party; but the connection could only be very slight between Wilkes and Lord Temple, more political than personal, attaching rather to principles and parties than to private friend-

ship and zealous offices of kindness, and therefore something more is required to account satisfactorily for "the extravagantly disproportioned interest taken by Junius in any petty intrigue of Aldermen and Sheriffs, which touched that celebrated adventurer." Nor can we persuade ourselves that George Grenville himself could have taken any such interest in the fortunes of Wilkes. This part of the mystery still needs explanation. Some light is probably thrown on the connection between Wilkes and the Grenvilles in the *Memoirs of a late eminent Bookseller* and in the 5 volumes of Wilkes's *Correspondence*. At the present moment I cannot stop to examine the point.

8. When the Reviewer describes Junius as connected with the Grenvilles, he should have defined the probable nature of that connection. Was Junius both a personal and political friend of George Grenville, or only a political friend? Was he a retainer of Mr. G., or only an adherent of the party? The probability, as founded on several circumstances, is that Junius was both a personal and a political friend of George Grenville; but at the same time independent in fortune and in spirit. We have sufficient proof of the fact, 1. because he commenced his career without the knowledge of G. G., 2. because he continued it long after G. G. had ceased to exist. This remark is very important, because it reconciles seeming contradictions, which greatly embarrass the enquirer into the authorship of Junius's *Letters*; it unites Junius's dependence on the Grenville-party with his independence on G. G.

9. The Reviewer is disposed himself to draw, or tolerate when drawn by others, an inference in favour of Lloyd from the facts, that only "a few *Letters* were written after the death of Mr. G. in 1770.," and that "that event and the dissolution of

the party," consequent on it, occasioned "the cessation of *Junius*;" but the statement is untrue, and the argument is unsafe, because in point of fact *Junius* wrote from Jan. 1771. to Jan. 19, 1773. (when he altogether ceased to write,) *the private Letters* from No. 27. to No. 63. being 36 communications to Woodfall; he also wrote 10 *private Letters* to Wilkes, of which some are very long; of the *public Letters* he wrote, within the same period, under the signatures of *Junius* and *Philo-Junius*, those which extend from p. 182. to p. 448.; of *the Miscellaneous Letters*, those which occupy the space from p. 309. to p. 457.

10. Mr. Taylor is so far from having proved any connection between Sir Philip Francis and the Grenville-party, that, relying on the veracity of *Junius* in denying all personal knowledge of Mr. Grenville, he has set himself the task of proving that *Junius's* words, though spoken by Sir Philip Francis, might be perfectly true. If Sir Philip was unconnected with Mr. Grenville, he was not *Junius*; if he was connected with him, Mr. Taylor has still to prove the connection, before we can admit Sir Philip even into the list of claimants.

VIII. It is a circumstance very unfavourable to the authorship of Lloyd, that *Junius* continued to write so long after the decease of Mr. Grenville. Mr. G. Coventry, in a *Letter* addressed to me from *Wandsworth-Common*, and dated *March 11, 1827*, writes thus:—

“What evidence you may have to adduce in favour of Lloyd, is of course unknown to the literary world; but unless it is better substantiated than *Sackville's*, the argument in his favour dies a natural death. I believe I stated to you in my last that in my *Enquiry* I did not conceive it my province to disprove the claims of others, inasmuch as I consi-

dered they had all been more ably refuted than I was capable of doing. Still as Woodfall in his last edition does not mention Horace Walpole, and at the time my manuscript was going to press, an able Essay arrived from Sir C. Grey in India, in favour of Walpole's claims, I considered myself bound to refute them, which I have satisfactorily done. This so convinced the Marquis of Lansdowne and others, who had charge of the MS., that they abandoned the publication. In the case of Lloyd, I doubt not but I might refute with equal success; but having only a part of my library here, I cannot have access to sufficient evidence. Suffice it for the present to point out two or three circumstances, which at this moment strike me. In your last pamphlet, p. 16., speaking of Junius's pecuniary resources, you state:— 'On the supposition that Lloyd was the writer of the *Letters*, we have no difficulty in respect to pecuniary resources; for he could draw on the purse of George Grenville.' In reply I ask: How could Lloyd, (supposing him to be Junius,) draw on the purse of George Grenville, who died in 1770. two or three years before Junius ceased writing? Indeed the very circumstances of Grenville's death so soon after the appearance of Junius, are not only quite sufficient to disprove Lloyd's claims altogether, but have always convinced me that Grenville's party had no share in the *Letters*. And now supposing the ridiculous idea that Lloyd continued to write under the auspices of Lord Temple, a different party still, how can we reconcile the circumstance with the fact, that Junius corresponded with Wilkes so late as Jan. 15, 1772. when it is well known that no two persons could live on more hostile terms than Mr. Wilkes and Lord Temple? The last *Letter*, which Mr. Woodfall received from Junius, is dated Jan. 19, 1773. This *Letter*

is written with all the vigour and strength of intellect peculiar to a man in sound health. Lloyd died three days after Junius forwarded this *Letter*. I ask: Is it possible for a dying man to have his ideas so collected and his hand so steady as to pen such a *Letter* to Mr. Woodfall? The receipt of this *Letter* was noticed by Mr. Woodfall. He then had occasion to inform Junius that the books were not finished binding. Doubtless, Junius informed Mr. Woodfall where the books were to be sent, as we find the said books were forwarded to Junius March 7th, six weeks after the death of Lloyd. If Junius at that time was dead, the books would have remained at the Coffee-house, and led to a discovery."

My reply to Mr. Coventry's *Letter*, containing my sentiments at that time, was dated *March 15, 1827*.:—"Junius began to write in April 1767., and if George Grenville did die in 1770., he might still have been able to draw on the purse of G. G. up to that time, and have found means to continue the public contest after G. G.'s death, whether Lord Temple or any body else helped him. Your note does not meet my argument fairly, but only half way." [What I have said above in reply to the *Edinburgh Reviewer*, under Art. 8. contains my present and more matured sentiments.] "2. In respect to your argument about the final *Letter* of Junius to Woodfall being written three days before Lloyd's death, I cannot at all admit its force, unless you can prove that Lloyd was actually incapable of writing or dictating it from want of bodily energy. Men often retain their mental faculties in full vigour till the lamp of life is extinct. The final *Letter* itself is very short, and therefore proves nothing as to intellectual ability. To give the right point to your argument, it should be very long, and exhibit traces of deep thought, and abound with marks of elaborate

composition. 3. Your other argument about the delivery of the books is far better, but not conclusive. For Lloyd, if Junius, might have died unknown to Woodfall, who would deliver the books according to the direction. If you could prove on better authority than Junius's own, that Junius's secret was known only to himself, then the delivery and the receipt of the books would make out a good case against Lloyd. But are you prepared to prove that the books left at the Coffee-house after Lloyd's death, ever found their way into any owner's hand? If not, your case against Lloyd fails."

IX. The final *Note* of Junius, on which Mr. Coventry and others have laid such stress, is this, and the production of it will satisfy the reader that such a *Letter* might have been written by many a man within three days of his death from a chronic disease, who did not suppose himself to be in a dying state:—

"*Jan.* 19, 1773. I have seen the signals thrown out for your old friend and correspondent. Be assured that I have had good reasons for not complying with them. In the present state of things, if I were to write again, I must be as silly as any of the horned cattle, that run mad through the city, or as any of your wise aldermen. I meant the cause and the public. Both are given up. I feel for the honour of this country, when I see that there are not ten men in it, who will unite and stand together upon any one question. But it is all alike, vile and contemptible. *You* have never flinched that I know of; and I shall always rejoice to hear of your prosperity. If you have anything to communicate, (of moment to yourself,) you may use the last address, and give a hint." (1, 255.)

If Lloyd were Junius, and knew before he wrote this *Letter* that he had only three days to live, it is

certain that he would not have taken the pains to write, supposing him to have had sufficient bodily and mental powers. But surely there is nothing in this short *Letter*, which might not be expected from the pen of Junius, as an experienced and a ready writer, even though it were written on the bed of sickness. According to the testimony of Mr. Almon, Lloyd had been long ill before his death; and he, who had continued for many months to labour under serious indisposition, could not, *for anything which we know*, have been prepared to expect death within three days, and there is no evidence whatever to prove that Lloyd had *not* sufficient corporeal and mental energy to write or dictate such a *Letter*.

X. "Mr. H. of Sidney shewed me (*Sept*, 6, 1799.) the copy of a *Letter* from Mason to Gilpin, (with Gilpin's comments,) written on the same day that Mason was struck speechless, and within two of his death: very easy, gay, and spirited; — he had no presentiment of his danger." *Extracts from the Diary of a Lover of Literature*, by Mr. Green of Ipswich, 1810. 4. p. 161.

XI. "Enclosed I send a *Letter* from my late friend, Mr. Walsh, about Junius, which you will be so good as to return. I have observed already the strong fact, that from the moment Lloyd died, Junius died: most of the other supposed authors lived for years, but no Junius appeared again. As to his not being able to write a *Letter* three days before his death, I had an excellent *Letter* of four pages from an uncle of 75, written three days before he died, and he had been seriously ill six months."

*Extract from a Letter of General Cockburne, dated Shangnanagh, June 20, 1827.*

XII. Yet Dr. Mason Good, in the *Preliminary Essay* to Woodfall's edition, 1, 99. writes thus:—

“ The persons, to whom this honour has at different times, and on different grounds, been attributed, are the following: Charles Lloyd, a Clerk of the Treasury, and afterwards a Deputy-Teller of the Exchequer; — it will be sufficient to observe, without any other fact whatever, that Lloyd was on his death-bed at the date of the last of Junius’s private *Letters*; an essay, which has sufficient proof of its having been written in the possession of full health and spirits, and which, together with the rest of our author’s private *Letters to the Printer of the Public Advertiser*, is in the possession of the proprietor of this edition, and bears date *Jan. 19, 1773.*”

XIII. “ Mr. Charles Lloyd,” says Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences* 1, 107. “ a Clerk of the Treasury, and afterwards a Deputy-Teller of the Exchequer, was for some time private Secretary of Mr. George Grenville, and always possessed his confidence. He was strongly suspected by many of being the author of the *Letters*; and several respectable persons, among whom we may mention Dr. Parr, ascribe them to him. One strong argument in his favour is that, when Lloyd died, Junius ceased to write. Junius’s last *Letter* is dated on the 19th of *January*; Lloyd died on the 23d, (22.) His advocates have, however, to encounter the explicit declaration of Junius, — ‘ I have not the honour of being personally known to Mr. Grenville,’ (*Letter 18th.*)”

1. Of Junius’s “ explicit declaration” I have spoken in other parts of this work. 2. The argument, founded on the curious coincidence between the death of Lloyd and the cessation of Junius’s literary labours, would be very strong, if we had not to encounter similar coincidences in the case of other claimants. For Mr. Taylor argues in a similar way



for the claims of Sir Philip Francis; observing, that Junius ceased to write publicly when Sir Philip was in 1772. dismissed from the War-Office, and proceeded to France, and that the final private *Note* to Woodfall was written *Jan. 19, 1773.* when Sir Philip returned to England, and that in *June 1773.* he was appointed a member of the Council for the government of Bengal.

XIV. "Another writer in the *Public Advertiser*,"\* says Mr. Roche p. 261., "who signed himself *An Advocate in the Cause of the People*, also glances at Burke, when he says, 'that Junius is perhaps one 'of our discarded ministers, or rather one of their secretaries; for ministers seldom write so well.'" My friend, General Cockburne, would contend that these words allude to Lloyd. Unless such allusions have something definite in them, they may be applied to various persons, and in the uncertainty as to the particular allusion there is little force in any such arguments. I must, therefore, entreat the reader to bear in mind this observation, as it may be very useful so him in pursuing his enquiries.

XV. "I have now '*Love and Madness*' lying before me. The allusion to Junius is in *Letter XXX.* and is simply this: — 'Another slice of politics — 'Assert boldly that Junius was written by Grenville's 'Secretary. This is *fact*, notwithstanding what 'Wilkes relates of Lord Germaine's Bishop.' Here we have assertion without any clue to support it.

\* In a former page I have cited OXONIENSIS's *Letter* from the first publication of Mr. Taylor, and as Mr. T. gives no reference for that *Letter*, I will supply the omission from Mr. Roche's *Inquiry* p. 261.: — "The *Public Advertiser* in Oct. 1771. contained a *Letter* signed ZENO, which was addressed 'to Junius, *alias* Edmund the Jesuit of St. Omer's; another signed PLINY; a third, QUERIST; a fourth OXONIENSIS; a fifth, SCAEVOLA; and several others also appeared, in which Mr. Burke was directly accused of being the author."

How should he be able to know more than any one else? Can you inform me what Wilkes says of Lord Germaine's Bishop? I do not recollect having seen any allusion in Wilkes's writings. Who was the Bishop? Was it Butler, Bishop of Hereford, a suspected author of *Junius*?"

*Extract from a Letter of George Coventry, Esq. dated Wandsworth-Common, June 1, 1827.*

On this passage we may remark 1. that, though Charles Lloyd is in all probability alluded to, he is not expressly named; 2. that the reference to Wilkes may be to his conversations, not to his writings; 3. that Dr. John Butler, was promoted to the see of Oxford in 1777. by Lord North. "Of his political tracts it may perhaps be difficult to procure a list, as they were published without his name. Some of those in defence of Lord North's measures, are said to have appeared under the name *Vindex*. If Almon may be credited, (*Anecdotes* 1, 70.) his first publications, while connected with the Whigs, and in opposition to Lord Bute, were, 1. *An Answer to the Cocoa-Tree*, (a pamphlet so called,) *from a Whig*, 1762.; 2. *A Consultation on the Subject of a Standing Army, held at the King's Arms Tavern, on the 28th of February*, 1763.; 3. *Serious Considerations on the Measures of the present Administration*, i. e. the Administration of Lord Bute; 4. *Account of the Character of the Right Hon. Henry Bilson Legge*. He must, however, have changed his sentiments, when he afterwards supported the measures of Lord North's Administration: yet we find his name among the list of persons suspected to have written *Junius's Letters* (1, 119.) for which there seems, in his case, very little foundation." Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary* 7,456. The following extract from Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences* 1, 80. will shew that the Bishop, alluded to in Sir Herbert

Croft's *Love and Madness*, was Dr. John Butler; but it does not thence appear why Sir Herbert calls him Lord Germaine's Bishop:—"Mr. Wilkes scouted the notion of Mr. Burke's being the author of the *Letters*. His suspicions fell on Dr. Butler, Bishop of Hereford; but I do not recollect more than two reasons assigned by him for suspecting his Lordship. One, that he had published a *Sermon*, before Junius's *Letters* appeared, the style of which was very like that of the *Letters*; another, after the *Letters* appeared, in a style wholly unlike. These *Sermons*, I think, I have seen, and that they did not appear to me to warrant Mr. Wilkes's observations. The other reason was that the references, in the *Letters*, to the Bible, were not to the received translation, but to the *Vulgate*, (this remark was certainly made by Mr. Wilkes, but are there any such references?) which, he said, the Bishop always used, and which, (by the way,) Mr. Wilkes greatly admired. He described the Bishop to be a saturnine, observing, profound, and silent man, such a one as, *a priori*, we should suppose Junius. But it was a mere suspicion, and we frequently amused ourselves with endeavouring to find a more likely person."

XVI. My amiable and intelligent friend, Mr. J. Bowring, had a conversation, as he informed me by a *Letter* dated *June 17, 1827*. with Jeremy Bentham, Esq. about Junius. Mr. Bentham remembers Charles Lloyd as a writer of political pamphlets, but can give no opinion on his claims to the authorship of *Junius*, because he has never turned his attention to the subject.

XVII. A friend referred me to Mr. Moysey, of Hayes in Kent, and that gentleman favoured me with the following courteous reply to my interrogatories:—

“ *London, Nov. 5, 1827.*

“ Mr. Moysey is very sorry he has it not in his power to satisfy Mr. Barker’s enquiries. Mr. Charles Lloyd was his senior” [at Westminster School,] “ many years; their acquaintance not one of intimacy or of long duration. Since 1766. or thereabouts, Mr. M. knows nothing of Mr. Lloyd, either alive or dead. He can only say that his temper was very cheerful, far removed from reserved or morose habits; and as to faculties, he was a man of very lively parts, and a great deal of wit. He was called by his school-fellows, *Dolly Lloyd*, for reasons which do not appear. He was younger brother of the Dean of Norwich, an eminent character. But Mr. M. cannot recollect any of his cotemporaries *now* surviving, and grieves he can be of no further use.”

XVIII. “ You are, I think, right in ascribing the *Letters* of Junius to Mr. Charles Lloyd, private Secretary to Mr. George Grenville, and afterwards in the same capacity to Lord North. I have more than once conversed with a gentleman, who was in the same office with Lloyd, and knew him personally, and well. He had a great predilection for chemistry, from which science Junius has borrowed expressions, which enrich his style. He was a great oddity in his wardrobe; — fond of walking in the streets unveiled, and generally with a pen behind his ear; — his gait was usually hurried and rapid; — he was evidently a young man, when he addressed his first *Letter* to Lord H. under the name of *Lucius*. Now, my dear Sir, apply these traits to a gentleman, who stepped into old Woodfall’s office early in the day, and chucked up to the person sitting at a lofty desk a MS. written in large characters, which he had brought squeezed in his fist into the shape of a ball, and the pursuit after him down the Strand, — and

his disappearance in the neighbourhood of Charing Cross — which have either been stated to me, or I have read in some pamphlet of the day,—and the person, which you have selected, will, I think, easily be recognized. He made no reply to Dr. Johnson's pamphlet on the Falkland's Islands; he was at that time setting out for Aix-la-Chapelle; — after his death no more *Letters* appeared."

*Extract from a Letter of the Rev. Thomas Kidd, dated Wymondham June 29, 1827.*

XIX. "You have written very sensibly about the author of *Junius*," says Dr. Parr in a *Letter* to Mr. Butler, (without date, but dictated between Jan. 22, and March 2, 1822.) "and we must allow that the pamphlet, which ascribes the book to Sir Philip Francis, and Brougham's critique upon it, contain very striking probabilities; but they make little impression upon my mind; for I, for these 40 years, have had the firmest conviction that Junius was Mr. Lloyd, brother of Philip Lloyd, (Dean of Norwich,) and Secretary to George Grenville. My information came from two most sagacious observers; and when I spoke to the second, I did not tell him what I had previously heard from the first. One of my witnesses was Dr. Farmer, a most curious, indefatigable, acute searcher in literary anecdote, and he spoke with confidence unbounded; the other was a witness of a yet higher order, who opposed, and, I think, confuted Junius, upon the Middlesex Election. He was a most wary observer, and a most incredulous man indeed. He had access, not to great statesmen, but to the officers, who were about the House of Commons and the House of Lords. He rested neither day nor night, till he had made his discovery; and there lives not the human being, upon whose judgment I could rely more firmly for a fact. When you and I meet, I will tell you the

whole story. Let us pursue this subject, when we meet; for all I shall now add upon it is that a very sagacious gentleman of Ireland, who died last year, had, from other premises, worked out the same conclusion. I could, with little effort, refute all that has been said about *Single-Speech* Hamilton, Edmund Burke, *Leonidas* Glover, and Sir Philip Francis." *The Reminiscences of Charles Butler, Esq.* 2, 224.

In another *Letter* from Dr. Parr to Mr. Butler, dated *April 9, 1822.* (p. 243.) we read:—"Your account of *Junius* is very entertaining; but I tell you, and peremptorily I tell you, that the real *Junius* was Secretary to George Grenville, of whom you cannot forget that, having ceased to be prime Minister, he was so provoked as to attend an angry County-meeting in Buckinghamshire. The name of *Junius* was *Lloyd*.—Lord Grenville knows, the late Marquis of Buckingham once dropped three or four significant words; but I will tell you more, when we meet in London. I go thither next week, and we must contrive to meet at the house of our friend, Mr. Denman."

In the *Letter* addressed to me by Mr. Butler, dated *Lincoln's Inn, Sept. 15, 1826.* and inserted in the same volume of his *Reminiscences* p. 258., Mr Butler says:—"The last time Dr. Parr was in town he communicated to me the evidence and arguments, by which he supported his hypothesis, that Mr. Lloyd was the author of the *Letters* signed *Junius*. They appeared to me very inconclusive. A literary gentleman of the highest eminence, to whom also he communicated them, thought the same. I have quite forgotten them."

In the first extract from Dr. Parr's correspondence with Mr. Butler, Dr. Parr appeals to the high authority of three individuals, who had each without any mutual communication arrived at the same

conclusion: he names one, *Dr. Farmer*, and I can inform the reader that the other two were *Dr. Nathaniel Forster* of Colchester, and *Mr. Walsh*, the Irish gentleman already introduced to the notice of the reader in the articles, for which I have been indebted to the kindness of General Cockburne. In the 400th page of the *Bibliotheca Parriana* a volume, containing the following tracts, is mentioned:—

1. Forster (Dr. Nath.) on the Middlesex Election, in Answer to Sir Wm. Meredith, 1769.
2. Answer to Junius on the above subject, 1769.
3. The Sentiments of an English Freeholder on the late Decision of the Election, 1769. (“*supposed to be written by Downley and Mr. Dunning,*” S. P.)
4. Forster’s Answer to the same, 1770.
5. A Letter to the Author of an Essay on the Middlesex Election, 1770. 4to. (“*supposed to be Mr. Rouse.*” S. P.)  
 “*Dr. Forster’s pamphlets are very able indeed.*” S. P.

Now Dr. Nath. Forster, from a particular incident in his biography, was much connected, as Dr. Parr states, with the officers about the House of Commons and the House of Lords. His son, the Rev. E. Forster, Chaplain to the English Embassy at Paris, has in a *Letter* dated Oct. 26, 1827, obligingly communicated to me the following information:—  
 “He wrote a detailed *Plan for an Index to the Journals of the House of Commons*, on which laborious work he was engaged many years.” And in a very curious and most interesting *Letter* of Jeremy Bentham, Esq., written by my desire, addressed to Mr. J. Bowring, and containing notices of the celebrated John Lind, Dr. Nath. Forster, and Dr. Parr, (which will be published in my *Parriana*,) Mr. Bentham says:—“Forster was at that time Rec-

tor of a Baliol College Living at Colchester. He had another, and very different occupation, that of manufacturer of an *Index to several Volumes of the House of Commons' Journals*, for which service his remuneration, if I do not mis-recollect, amounted to £3,000."

XX. "In the *Times* of Aug. 30, are long extracts from *Bibliotheca Parriana*, wherein they say:—'The mention of the name of Lloyd reminds us of a note at p. 407., which conveys the very concise and extraordinary intelligence: '*The writer of Junius was Mr. Lloyd, Secretary to George Grenville, and brother to Philip Lloyd, Dean of Norwich. This will one day or other be generally acknowledged.* PARR.' To which the editor subjoins the following note:—'Yes, on the same day that there is no longer any doubt as to who was the executioner of Charles I., or who was the man in the *Iron-Mask*, but not till then.' By this remark we may conclude that they are not wholly convinced, (neither am I,) that Mattioli was the *Iron-Mask*, or that Charles was the author of *Icon*; although G. A. Ellis has ingeniously brought forward evidence to prove the former, and Wordsworth the latter." *Extract from a Letter of Mr. Coventry, dated Wandsworth Common, Sept. 8, 1827.* If Dr. Parr be positive, dictatorial, and peremptory in his assertion, the Reviewer is equally so in his denial, and at the same time sufficiently disrespectful to the memory of one, who was not accustomed to take up opinions on slight grounds, and was always ready to state his grounds for them. The discussion could not be introduced into the fly-leaf of the book, whence the above-mentioned note was extracted, and the Reviewer should have prudently and charitably inferred that Dr. Parr had some strong reasons for his opinion. The Reviewer supposes that it will never be known who was the



executioner of Charles I; it may not be known at this day, but what wise man will undertake to say that even this disputed point, like many others, will not be determined on satisfactory evidence at some future time? One secret I will communicate to him, and it is a fact, which has never been communicated to the public before, viz. that I have in my possession the black collar, which was taken from the neck of the unfortunate Charles at the place of execution — it has been in the family from that time — we have no traditionary tale accompanying it beyond the simple fact, that it is the collar worn by Charles on that fatal day. If it were an *honour*, my family might perhaps in such circumstances have the best claim to the honour of the execution; the probability is either that one of its members was employed for that purpose, or else that he was in attendance at the time and the place of execution. I have never paid any attention whatever to this question; and if any of my readers be disposed to investigate the matter, I will so far aid them as to say that my late father, the Rev. Robert Barker, was Vicar of Hollym and Rector of Holmpton, in Holderness — that my grandfather, the Rev. Thomas Barker, was Rector of Cherry-Burton, near Beverley, in Yorkshire — that my great grandfather, the Rev. Robert Barker, was Rector of the same church — that my great great grandfather was Edmund Barker, Esq. of Otley, in Yorkshire, and that he was the son of Thomas Barker, Esq. an Alderman of Leeds.

XXI. “ I will now conclude with observing what is quite to the purpose, viz. that I distinctly remember having heard Dr. Parr, *more than once*, declare that he was told by (I think) a Member of Parliament, that after the death of Mr. Lloyd, amongst his papers were found some *published Letters of Junius*, and also some *unpublished*, in the same style

of composition; and I know that in the last conversation I had with him on the subject, he plainly marked his retaining the opinion that Lloyd was the author of *Junius*."

*Extract from a Letter of the Rev. Dr. Martin Davy, dated Caius Lodge, Jan. 20, 1827.*

XXII. "I have received your packet and the last two Nos. on *Junius*. You ask me whether I recollect any observations of Dr. Parr about *Junius*. I remember his telling me that he had had the son of *Junius* with him in the little garden, mentioning at the same time that six months, and I forget the number of days, though he mentioned them, had passed, since he saw him. 'I asked him,' he said, 'whether he knew who he was, and told him he was 'the son of *Junius*.' Though I do not profess to be very much interested in the question as to who was *Junius*, still as it had so long remained a secret, my curiosity was excited. I asked who it was, but the Doctor would not tell me, and I puzzled to no purpose. Once I heard the Doctor say it would remain a secret till after the death of the old King. I believe it was after the death of the King that I heard who the gentleman was. It seems he was a natural son of *Junius*: I think the name was *God-dard*, and that of the father *Lloyd*. The Doctor frequently mentioned *Lloyd* as the writer of the celebrated *Letters*, and I perceive that you, (though I am ashamed to say, I have only just looked at the first No.) are endeavouring to establish his claim."

*Extract from the Letter of a Friend, dated March 3, 1827.*

XXIII. The five following *Letters*, addressed to me by a most eloquent, sagacious, and intelligent friend, will, I doubt not, be read with the liveliest interest.

"My dear Sir, Febr. 1, 1827.  
I have ceased to feel much interest

about the authorship of Junius's *Letters*. It was formerly a question of some political magnitude, and it is now a mere matter of literary curiosity. *Junius*, in his day, was a little in advance of the sentiments of his age; but the accumulation of events, and the extraordinary progress of political knowledge since the period, in which he flourished, have obscured his celebrity, or invalidated his opinions. If *Letters* of a similar description were to appear in the *Newspapers* of the present day, they would excite no interest, and kindle no curiosity.

"I have several times talked with the late Duke of Grafton about the *Letters* of Junius; but if those *Letters* ever inflamed any resentment in his breast, he had outlived that feeling. He even seemed to have been indifferent to the question of the authorship. I am convinced that he did not attach it to any particular individual. As far as he considered it at all, he considered it problematical.\*

"I have often heard Dr. Parr speak with great confidence of Charles Lloyd as the author of the *Letters*. Temerity was not usually a characteristic of the Doctor's judgment in such matters; but in adjudicating the *Letters* to Lloyd, he never appeared

\* "In former days," (says the Rev. G. F. Tavel in a *Letter* dated Sept. 24, 1827., with which he honoured me from *Euston-Hall*.) "I have had many conversations with the late Duke in regard to *Junius*. His Grace had formed no conjecture, nor had he indulged in any fancies with respect to the author. I have often heard him say that, engaged as he was in his official business, he paid much less attention to the *Newspapers*, and *Letters* which appeared in them, than might be supposed. One thing is certain, that I never discovered the least soreness in his mind or the slightest vestige of resentment.

"You allude to some *Journal*, which you suppose the late Duke to have left. Permit me to say that this is quite a mistake: he left no *Journal*, but merely some few *Letters* of persons connected with him in office, or rather copies of them with connecting remarks; but there is nothing in them, which can throw the slightest ray of light upon the authorship of Junius."

to me to have examined the subject with his usual caution, or to have estimated its probabilities or different sides with his accustomed impartiality and discrimination. I never heard him adduce a more satisfactory reason for his opinion, that Charles Lloyd was the author of the *Letters*, than the change, which he remarked in the countenance of his brother, the Dean of Norwich, when the Doctor distinctly avowed his belief, that that brother had the merit of these contested compositions. There was a sudden transition in the Dean's countenance, from that of much complacency in the supposition, to that of what the Doctor supposed, very sensitive alarm about the consequences. I cannot at this moment say when Charles Lloyd died, but I believe in 1773, or 1774." [Jan. 22, 1773.] If Charles Lloyd were the author, the Grenvilles must be the depositaries of the secret. I could say something upon that subject, if I did not feel that I am treading on ground, where I am not permitted to throw any light into the depth of the obscuring shade.

"I heartily wish you success in the attempt, which you have so auspiciously begun; but beyond good wishes, I cannot be an auxiliary in the investigation.

"I am, my dear Sir, very truly yours,  
R. FELLOWES."

XXIV.

"My dear Sir.

March, 7, 1827.

I think you do quite right to clear the ground from the pretensions of other candidates for the authorship of Junius's *Letters*, before you endeavour to establish those of Charles Lloyd. I think that you have completely and satisfactorily demolished the claims of Sir Philip Francis. I saw Sir Philip Francis's library not long after his death. I looked

very anxiously for a copy of Junius's *Letters*, and at last found one of the most recent editions of that work with a few annotations in pencil, but of a common-place kind, and not very likely to have been written by the auto-Junius. Whatever may be the verity of Charles Lloyd's pretensions, you will not find many willing to allow them, unless you can produce specimens of equal ability in thought and diction in some of his undoubted compositions. You might, I should think, be able to procure some of Lloyd's *Letters*, which must be still in existence. Perhaps you are not aware that he was Secretary to Sir John Cust,\* when Speaker of the House of Commons. This circumstance will add something to the credibility of the hypothesis you have adopted; for it greatly enlarged Lloyd's sphere of observation on the public men of the day, and multiplied his opportunities of becoming acquainted with their characters. I hope you will prove the true Œdipus, and solve the riddle, that has puzzled so many men of brains and no brains, so many wits and wittings for more than half a century.

"I am not acquainted with the author of the *Letter to the Duke of Grafton*; but I conjecture from the acrimony of the abuse and some peculiarities in the style, that it was written by Mr. Miles, a political pamphleteer of once considerable notoriety.

"I am, my dear Sir, very truly yours,  
R. FELLOWES."

XXV.

"Dear Sir,

May 6, 1827.

I have been indisposed myself, and have had a great deal of sickness in my family, since I had the

\* Of Sir John Cust the reader may find some notices in the *Correspondence of the Late John Wilkes with his Friends*, by Mr. Almon, 3, 210. 245 — 62.

pleasure of receiving your favour of the 25th of March. I think you will find your hypothesis that Lloyd was *Junius*, encumbered with many embarrassing considerations, if not some insurmountable obstacles. Almon might be a very incompetent judge of Lloyd's literary abilities; but, as he knew him personally, and was acquainted with several of his friends and companions, he could not well err in the account, which he has given of the state of his health. Now, if we may credit Almon, Lloyd's health was in a declining state at the first appearance of the *Letters* under the signature of *Junius*. But did not the *Letters* of Junius, during the considerable interval, in which they followed each other in rapid succession, require the constant exercise of a degree of intellectual vigor and activity, which is seldom found in conjunction with a decay of the corporeal functions, and a depression of the vital powers? Though Junius wrote under a concealed name, yet he must have felt in perpetual peril of detection. And no timid man would readily have exposed himself to so much scrutinizing malignity, or have endangered his personal security by provoking such bitter hate, and incurring such implacable hostility. If Lloyd was Junius, Junius was indeed a prodigy; for he was not only brave and enterprising, but laborious and indefatigable under the langors of disease, and the approach of death.

“ If the Grenvilles are really in possession of the secret, they had very strong reasons for not divulging it during the last reign; or at least as long as the King possessed his consciousness, and retained his recollection. But these reasons no longer exist. What was once a question of internecine combat, is now one of pure curiosity.

“ George Grenville himself could not have been the author of the *Letters*. The sentiment and the

diction were above his reach. He had little illumination of mind, and no command of style. But he had one or two very able men about him besides Lloyd. He might have furnished the writer with some of his materials, or have infused a portion of his own rancour against adversaries and rivals, — against the King on the throne, and the Duke of Grafton in the cabinet.

“ Colonel Titus’s noble pamphlet, worthy the best days of republican Rome, was reprinted, if I remember right, some years ago by Ridgway. Some portions of it, certainly, were never exceeded in energy. The love of liberty was never more vividly delineated, nor the hatred of tyranny more forcibly expressed.

“ But I must conclude with saying that  
I am, dear Sir,  
very faithfully yours,  
R. FELLOWES.”

XXVI.

July 9, 1827.

“ Dear Sir,

I have delayed longer than I ought, and much longer than I intended, to notice the books, which you were so obliging as to send, and to answer your two favours of the 25th of May and the 17th of June. But during my stay in the country, I have been a good deal occupied with other matters, and besides, the consideration of my health induces me to spend as much time as I can in the open air.

“ I have glanced over all the pamphlets, and have read the two, that were written by Lloyd. They appear to me to furnish very cogent proof that he was not the author of the *Letters* under the name of *Junius*.

“ In Lloyd’s *Anatomy of a late Negotiation*, printed in 1763., there are no indications of a superior mind, either in the thoughts or diction. It is the

mere common-place of an ordinary intellect. The pamphlet entitled *An Examination*, etc., which was written three years after the former, does not exhibit any proofs of a mind in *progress*, gradually enlarging its powers, multiplying its stock of ideas, — invigorating its sentiments, and improving its style. If Lloyd had been a young man at the time these two pamphlets were written, the perusal could never have induced a critic to presage that he would ever attain to any of that force and brilliancy of style, that is so visible in the compositions of Junius. The pamphlets are flat and jejune, sterile in sentiment, and feeble in diction. I cannot discern the workings of a strong, or the richness of a full mind. There is no luxuriance, that might be pruned into beauty, — no expansion, that might be compressed into force.

“ You must, moreover, reflect that at the period, when those pamphlets were written, Lloyd was no longer a young man, and he was, besides, ‘ in an infirm state of health,’ as he himself tells us p. 5., and which, according to the testimony of Almon, continued till his death.

“ There does not, therefore, appear to me a particle of proof, or even the most minute probability, in favour of the claim of Lloyd to the authorship of the *Letters* under the signature of *Junius*.

I had once hoped that a better case might be made out for T. Whately, another of George Grenville’s literary auxiliaries. Whately was a man of superior abilities, was a better scholar, a more elegant as well as energetic writer, a more profound politician, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, than Lloyd. But Whately died in June 1772.

“ In the beginning of the year 1769., George Grenville published a speech, which he had delivered in the House of Commons on a motion for the ex-



pulsion of Mr. Wilkes. I have read the speech, and think that in several passages there is a nearer approximation to the style of Junius than in the two pamphlets, which were confessedly the work of Lloyd. Among the pamphlets you sent me, is one entitled *A Letter to G. G.* on this very speech. In this *Letter* p. 1. (*Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts* 3,40.) the following passage occurs, to which I invite your attention:—

‘ The world is greatly indebted to your indul-  
 ‘ gence for the publication of your speech on the  
 ‘ motion for expelling Mr. Wilkes, Friday, Febr.  
 ‘ 3, 1769., and the assiduous labour of the last  
 ‘ eight months to correct and polish the only Cice-  
 ‘ ronian oration you have ventured to the press.  
 ‘ You have in particular helped the invention of  
 ‘ pensioner Johnson for many pages in a future Ma-  
 ‘ gazine, or Volume of the Parliamentary Debates,  
 ‘ and saved his bookseller two or three guineas.  
 ‘ The subject, I must own, merited all your care  
 ‘ and attention. There is no harangue you ever  
 ‘ made in Parliament of so important a nature, ex-  
 ‘ cept in the single case of general warrants, on  
 ‘ which you again enlarge much on the present oc-  
 ‘ casion. The affair of Mr. Wilkes indeed interests  
 ‘ every Member of the lower House, and every  
 ‘ elector in the kingdom, but a general warrant may  
 ‘ carry horror and cruelty to every family and every  
 ‘ individual in the island; for it can be considered  
 ‘ in no other light than as a declaration of war  
 ‘ against the people at large. Your harangues on  
 ‘ that subject in February 1764. might not perhaps  
 ‘ be so popular, but they would be still more curi-  
 ‘ ous and interesting even than the present speech  
 ‘ — only I fear they would take more years than the  
 ‘ other has months to render them in any way pala-  
 ‘ table to the public. I was in the gallery, sir, du-

‘ ring the whole debate on the 3d of last February,  
 ‘ and I recollect your arguments, which were sensi-  
 ‘ ble and cogent, although I do not remember all  
 ‘ the *meliti verborum globuli* of the speech published  
 ‘ last Monday. The warmth of the colouring, the  
 ‘ glowing touches, and soft graces, have grown  
 ‘ since under your *forming hands*, or those more  
 ‘ elegant of a new friend, on whom nature has la-  
 ‘ vished all the powers of the *sublime* and *beautiful*,  
 ‘ or perhaps they may be the first fruits of the *Gren-*  
 ‘ *villian family-compact*.\* The present production  
 ‘ has indeed no small degree of literary merit, and  
 ‘ if I did not hear you, I read you through with sa-  
 ‘ tisfaction and ease.’

“ This must be a reference to Burke. Did Burke at this time form one of the literary junto, that constantly assembled at the house of George Grenville? Did the junto subsist after the death of the principal in the November of the following year?

“ Believe me, dear Sir,  
 Always yours faithfully,  
 R. FELLOWES.”

There does not appear to be any evidence to prove that Burke either frequented the house of George Grenville, or was one of his political friends. The writer of this pamphlet may have founded his notion that it *was* the fact on the bare supposition that it *might* have been the fact, because this was a convenient mode of accounting for the merit of the printed speech. But the reader must not fail to observe that the writer of the pamphlet does not himself speak with any positiveness; he says that the great improvements of the speech as printed compared with it as delivered, were introduced either by Mr. Grenville or by Mr. Burke. It is also re-

\* The italics are left as they are found in the pamphlet.

markable that he calls Burke "a new friend," from which we gather that, previously to the publication of the speech, he did not consider Burke as the friend of Mr. G., and we discern yet more clearly that this notion of friendship between these statesmen was a mere supposition at the moment.

But let us examine the matter still more closely.

XXVII. Mr. Roche p. 243. quotes, from the writer of the *Preliminary Essay* in Woodfall's edition of Junius, certain matter objecting to the claims of Burke on the ground that Burke's politics were those of Lord Rockingham, and Junius's those of George Grenville, and he, after some comments, then proceeds: — "The present, I believe, is the first time, in which it has been gravely maintained that Junius, (in spite of his own declaration to the contrary, affirming that he was of no party,) was the advocate and partizan of Mr. Grenville. That he had a high respect for his abilities, character, and integrity, is clear from various parts of his writings; but it is equally manifest that Junius was in direct hostility to some of the measures of Mr. Grenville's administration. For instance, did Junius approve of the proceedings against Mr. Wilkes, which commenced while Mr. Grenville was Minister, and by his advice? Did he approve of the seizure of his papers, or of his arrest by a general warrant? Or did Junius approve of another doctrine, not only maintained, but carried into execution during that administration, that the crown, during a recess, had the power of suspending the operation of an act of the legislature? It would be needless to multiply instances of this kind, to shew how much he differed in many things from Mr. Grenville. If, on the contrary, we compare the doctrines of Junius with those of the Rockingham party, as detailed in the writings of their ablest organ, Mr. Burke, we shall

find that they differ positively on one point only, and upon another, rather in appearance than in reality. The first of these relates to the duration of Parliaments; the other to the extent of our rights and authority to legislate for the British colonies in America. But does it so clearly follow, because Burke was the partizan of Lord Rockingham, and Junius the friend of Mr. Grenville, that both writers must be different persons, and that Mr. Burke could not also be a friend to Mr. Grenville? That Mr. Burke, though they frequently differed in opinion, entertained great respect for that gentleman, is well known. If we had no other reason to satisfy us of this, (it would be easy to state many proofs of it,) it is sufficiently clear from his character of Mr. Grenville, in his speech on American taxation, which seems to have escaped our author's memory. In the account given there of Mr. Grenville, though he points to some of his defects, it is evident that Mr. Burke was much more disposed to praise, than to blame him, and that panegyrics accordingly, predominate in the piece. 'Here,' (says he,) 'began to dawn the first glimmerings of this new colony-system. It appeared more distinctly afterwards, when it was devolved upon a person, to whom, on other accounts, this country owes very great obligations. I do believe that he had a very serious desire to benefit the public. But, with no small study of the detail, he did not seem to have his view, at least equally, carried to the total circuit of our affairs. He generally considered his objects in lights that were rather too detached.' This want of more extensive views in Mr. Grenville he attributes to his being bred a lawyer, previous to which he remarks: — 'Sir, if such a man fell into errors, it must be from defects not intrinsical; they must be rather sought in the particular habits

‘ of his life, which, though they do not alter the  
‘ ground-work of character, tinge it with their own  
‘ hue.’ Junius has nowhere manifested a more  
friendly disposition towards Mr. Grenville, or spoken  
more highly of his talents and integrity, than  
Mr. Burke has done in the following passage:—  
‘ No man can believe that at this time of day I mean  
‘ to lean on the venerable memory of a great man,  
‘ whose loss we deplore in common. Our little party-  
‘ differences have long ago been composed; and I  
‘ have acted more with him, and certainly with more  
‘ pleasure with him, than ever I acted against him.\*  
‘ Undoubtedly Mr. Grenville was a first-rate figure  
‘ in this country. With a masculine understanding,  
‘ and a stout and resolute heart, he had an applica-  
‘ tion undissipated and unwearied.’ He took pub-  
‘ lic business, not as a duty which he was to fulfil,  
‘ but as a pleasure which he was to enjoy; and he  
‘ seemed to have no delight out of this house except  
‘ in such things, as some way related to the busi-  
‘ ness, which was to be done within it. If he was  
‘ ambitious, I will say this for him, his ambition  
‘ was of a noble and generous strain. It was to  
‘ raise himself, not by the low, pimping politics of  
‘ a Court, but to win his way to power through the  
‘ laborious gradations of public service, and to se-  
‘ cure to himself a well-earned rank in Parliament,  
‘ by a thorough knowledge of its constitution, and  
‘ a perfect practice in all its business.’ If, there-  
fore we admit that Junius was ever so friendly to  
Mr. Grenville, it will be difficult to prove that he  
had a better opinion of him in any respect, than  
Mr. Burke had; so that, if we are to make an infer-  
ence at all, upon the subject, from this source, it

\* “ Such are the words of the man, who, it is contended, could not be Junius, because Junius was a friend to Mr. Grenville.”

will be in favour of the opinion that Junius was written by Mr. Burke."

XXVIII. The precise periods, during which George Grenville was in office, it may be convenient for the reader to know, and they are stated by Mr. Taylor p. 102.:— "Was, then, Sir Philip Francis known to Mr. Grenville? I shall not attempt to prove a negative, but merely observe that from the *Memoirs* there is no reason to infer that he was personally known to him; nor have I met with any circumstances, that in the least tend to make such knowledge probable. When Sir Philip received 'his little place' in the Secretary of State's Office, Mr. George Grenville was not in power. In the year 1756., when Lord Chatham became Secretary of State, Mr. Grenville accepted the post of Secretary of the Navy. On Lord Chatham's resignation in 1761., Mr. Grenville did not accompany him, but attached himself to Lord Bute and Lord Holland; and on May 29, 1762. he succeeded Lord Bute as Secretary of State, which place he resigned on Oct. 12th in the same year, on account of an important difference in opinion with Lord Bute respecting an equivalent for the Havannah. In consequence of this dispute, Mr. Grenville retired from the cabinet, and became first Lord of the Admiralty. On Lord Bute's resignation in April 1763. he was appointed Prime Minister, having undertaken the two great employments of First Lord of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the Exchequer. He lost these in the changes, which took place in 1765.: nor did he afterwards accept of any post, though he always promised his support, out of place, to an Administration formed on a comprehensive system."

XXIX.

" My dear Sir,

Aug. 16, 1827.

I return the four volumes of tracts you so

obligingly sent for my perusal. I am now more than ever perplexed about the authorship of Junius. I cannot even hazard a guess upon the subject. I am indeed perplexed in what seems an inextricable labyrinth. I am convinced that neither Lloyd nor Whately were the authors of these far-famed compositions. If the *Letters* were concocted in the cabinet of the Grenvilles, they might have been, in a greater or less degree, auxiliaries; but two or three subordinate understandings cannot make one master-mind. In intellectual operations, numbers do not constitute strength. There may be numerous forces in the field; but it is one presiding mind, that marshals the host, and gains the victory. Junius might have subalterns to assist; but he was alone and unrivalled in the execution.\* He is, however, still like the man in the *Iron-Mask*, a problem that has employed the wits of more than half a century in the solution. If Lloyd alone, or Lloyd and Whately were in any

\* "I will trespass, however, with another circumstance relative to one of the members of our club. On returning from thence, the Rev. Mr. Rosenhagen overtook me, and accompanied me as far as Dean-Street, Soho. He would force the subject of Junius's *Letters* upon me, said he knew I was intimate with both the Woodfalls, and mentioned many circumstances concerning the *Letters*. He did not appear to me to possess superior talents himself, but he was a busy, meddling man, what the French term *un intrigant*; and I have no doubt he was a negociator. The particulars did not occur to me till reminded by a paragraph, afterwards, in one of Lord Chesterfield's *Letters*, in which his Lordship says: 'Mr. Rosenhagen has been again with me this morning; but I will dip my pen no more in gall.' Rosenhagen was a Fellow of St. John's College, and afterwards resided at Paris, at a great expence, but very few knew how, or from whence those funds were supplied. Several passages in Junius's *Letters* have been compared with some in Bolingbroke's Works, particularly in his *Patriot King*; but many living authors might have been likewise readily resorted to. It was then asserted that, as the style of these celebrated *Letters* was uniform, one person only could be concerned in writing them. To which a wit at that time replied, 'Not one, but *Legion*, for there are many.' Many, I am sure, largely contributed to load the gun, though one only might draw the trigger." *Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs by J. Cradock, Esq.* Lond. 1826. p. 35.

degree accessories to the work, it must be remembered that they both died too early to make it prudent or safe for them to disclose what they knew. If the Grenvilles were in the secret, they had very momentous reasons to prevent them from divulging it during the last reign. Even at present they may feel a repugnance in having it known, that they in the person of their ancestor, if I may so speak, were accomplices in laying bare to the vulgar scorn the hypocritical interior of sceptered Majesty, and in teaching the multitude to think and to speak contemptuously of Kings.

I am, dear Sir,

very truly yours,

R. FELLOWES."

XXX. "In the opinion of the Reminiscent," says Mr. Butler, 2, 122. "the claims of Burke, Lord George Sackville, Dyer, and Glover, may now be put beside the question; and the only subjects to be discussed are, 1. Who now has the custody of Junius's original *Letters*? 2. What was the connection of Sir Philip Francis with Junius? 3. Who was the Swinney mentioned in one of Junius's *Letters* to Woodfall? 4. Has Lloyd any and what claim to the *Letters*? The Reminiscent has heard that Swinney was afterwards a bookseller at Birmingham."

"All we know with certainty of Junius," says Mr. Butler, 1, 102. "is to be collected from one of his private *Letters* to Woodfall, 1, 174.: — 'That Swinney is a wretched, dangerous fool; he had the impudence to go to Lord George Sackville, whom he had never before spoken to, and to ask him whether or no he was the author of Junius.' These few words disclose several facts; 1. that Junius knew Swinney; 2. knew his character; 3. knew that Swinney had called on Lord George Sackville; 4. knew that Swinney had never called on him be-



fore; 5. and knew of the interview very soon after it took place. From this it may be argued that Junius was intimate with Lord George Sackville: it has even been inferred that he was Lord George himself." The first fact is assumed, rather than proved, from the words of Junius; for Junius might not know Swinney, and might have received early information of the circumstance, accidentally communicated, or intentionally conveyed by some friend of Swinney, to whom Swinney had related it. The particular individual alluded to by Junius, I suspect to have been the author mentioned in Dr. Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*:—

"Swinney Sidney, D.D. F.R. and A.SS. *The Battle of Minden, a Poem, in three Books*, Lond. 4to. 10s. *A Sermon*, Lond. 1767. 4to. 1s."

At any rate the author of a Poem on the *Battle of Minden* has more apparent connection with Lord George Sackville, than a bookseller; there must have been to an author a greater facility of access than to a bookseller.

XXXI. During my long residence at Hatton I often conversed with Dr. Parr about Junius; but the conversation was very desultory, frequently interrupted, and seldom brought sufficiently to a point. He invariably held forth Charles Lloyd as the author of the *Letters*—in this opinion he was guided more by private circumstances, than by public reasons—he appeared not to have taken any large view of the question, or to have examined with any great attention what was either written or said about the matter—he had not continually revolved his own reasons in his capacious mind, as was usual with him in respect to controverted points, and yet he had a variety of little facts and circumstances, which he was at all times ready to produce, and by which he had satisfied his own mind, and

thus peremptorily precluded the exercise of that great understanding and those powers of discrimination, which he so triumphantly employed on many other occasions—he had read Mr. Taylor's book, Mr. Brougham's critique on it, and the observations in Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences*; but I doubt whether he had seen any of the numerous pamphlets on the question. He had not met with any of Lloyd's compositions, and therefore he drew no arguments favourable to his hypothesis from a comparison of style. If he had read any of his compositions, he would have found good reason to change his opinion, and he could not have viewed them in a light different from that, in which the eloquent author of the five *Letters*, just submitted to the public eye, has viewed them. Nevertheless, the opinions of such a man as Dr. Parr are entitled to respect, and repay the attention, which we bestow on them, by either unfolding the whole truth, or exhibiting a portion of truth, or pointing the way to truth.

2. He remarked that Junius speaks very guardedly of George Grenville, because he wished to disguise the fact that his sources of information were, 1. Lord Chatham, (whom he mentions as seldom, and with the same caution,) 2. Lord Temple, 3. George Grenville himself. He directed my attention to a *Letter* about Junius in the *Morning Chronicle*, Dec. 26, 1812. where the following words occur:—"It is not a little remarkable that both Junius and Lord Chatham should have expressed the same unpopular opinion respecting the legality of press-warrants;—a deviation from their general system almost unaccountable in two men professing so strong an attachment to the liberty of the subject, and who so commonly appealed to popular feelings." Now this measure, he observed, was discussed during George Grenville's administration.

The remark that Junius mentions Lord Chatham as seldom and with as much caution as he does George Grenville, is contrary to the fact— he has nowhere attacked Mr. Grenville, but for a long time he dealt out unmeasured abuse on Lord Chatham and then became his apparent panegyrist; but I have clearly shewn that his aversion from and his attachment to that great man, was entirely political, and that Mr. Taylor has also unintentionally misrepresented the truth on this subject.

3. Dr. Parr was personally acquainted with Charles Lloyd. He described him to be a most unhappy, fretful man, accustomed to look on the dark side of every thing. This account was probably correct, but does not agree with the testimony of Mr. Moysey, though the latter speaks only of Lloyd as a youth, when his disposition might have been very different.

4. Philip Lloyd, the brother of Charles Lloyd, was Dean of Norwich. Dr. Parr highly respected him, but did not love him. At the Dean's house he once met Charles Lloyd, the Bishop of Norwich, and many others. He resolved not to lose the opportunity of putting his suspicions to the test. He gave a well-guarded hint of them, in a way quite unintelligible to the rest of the company. [See p. 267.] The first emotion in the mind of Charles Lloyd was, according to Dr. Parr, delight at being thought equal to the composition of the *Letters*; the delight beamed through his eyes; it was a sudden and momentary flash, and was succeeded by an emotion of alarm, very visible in his countenance. The Doctor, however, with great dexterity calmed the perturbation by intimating that he would not disclose the great secret. This argument, brought forward by a man of so much discernment and judgment, and so well acquainted with human nature, I must admit

to be an argument entitled to the greatest weight. I cannot but admit that it does very unsuspectingly prove the connection of Lloyd with the authorship of Junius, as *lion's provider*, or as amanuensis, but it proves nothing more; because, if Lloyd had stood in either relation to Junius, he would very naturally have felt the alarm, which was described by Dr. Parr, and that alarm would be great or little proportionately to the constitution of Lloyd's mind.

5. Dr. Parr considered George III., who believed the fact of Lloyd's authorship, to have prevented the Dean's elevation to the Episcopal bench.

6. Dr. Parr did not profess to have made the supposed discovery himself; Dr. Farmer, the Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and the author of the celebrated *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*, first named Lloyd to Dr. Parr. Farmer is a witness of the very highest order in any question of literary curiosity, from his sagacity, discernment, judgment, accuracy, diligence, zeal, and research. Now Farmer had traced the hand-writing to Lloyd. And it is a most remarkable circumstance that, while Farmer, the antiquarian, had by one process traced the hand-writing to Lloyd, the philosophical Dr. Nathaniel Forster, of Colchester, had by a very different course, and without any previous communication with Dr. Farmer, arrived at the very same fact; and this witness is also one pre-eminently entitled as we have seen, to credit, not only from the qualities of his mind, but from the singular opportunities, which his official situation, already described, gave to him for pushing his inquiries into the authorship of the *Letters*. When we consider, too, that the Irish gentleman, Mr. Peter Walsh, had by a third process arrived at the same fact, and was himself a witness fully entitled to credit, and that Dr. Parr had subjected his suspicions to a fair test, we are justified in regarding the fact as indisputable

that Lloyd was connected, and deeply connected with the authorship or rather publication of the *Letters* — he was a party in some way or other — most probably the principal, perhaps not the sole, amanuensis, but certainly a collector of intelligence, or a furnisher of materials. The evidence for this supposition, in my opinion, far exceeds, in importance and certainty, the evidence brought forward by Mr. Taylor on the behalf of Sir Philip Francis.

7. Dr. Parr said that such had been his opinion for a long series of years — at this moment I cannot ascertain the period of Dean Lloyd's decease. Every thing, which Dr. Parr had seen on the subject from that time, had only tended to convince him the more that his opinion was correct.

8. The Rev. Dr. Goddard, the present Archdeacon of Lincoln, was stated by Dr. Parr to be a natural son of Charles Lloyd, and was the pupil of Dr. Parr. This circumstance, of course, furnished Dr. Parr with some means of strengthening his suspicions about the father's authorship of the *Letters*, because it brought him, more or less, into contact with the father. Dr. Parr stated that Dr. Goddard was offered the situation first held by Mr. Canning, which ill-health obliged him to decline — on that account he travelled over the greater part of the Continent — and was at the time, when I was conversing with Dr. Parr, (in Dec. 1813.) in holy orders, and said to be engaged in a discussion with his Rector about the glebe. Dr. Parr had recently said to him in a *Letter*, which was, I believe, dictated to me: — “ How do *you* feel at all these enquiries after Junius, in consequence of Woodfall's new edition?” In Dr. Goddard's reply no notice was taken of the interrogatory, and Dr. Parr thought this a very suspicious circumstance. Dr. Parr was accustomed playfully to call Dr. Goddard *Juniades*, i. e. ‘ the son of Junius.’

9. Reference has already been made to the *Bibliotheca Parriana* for a mention of Lloyd's name in connection with Junius, and I will conclude with adding one or two more references, which occur there:—

“Bampton-Lectures, by Dr. Charles Goddard, 1824. 8vo. *Formerly my pupil at Norwich.* S. PARR.’ P. 19. “Goddard’s (Charles) Account of the Principles, Origin, Proceedings, and Results of an Institution for Teaching Adults to read, 1816. 8vo.” P. 51. “National Schools, a Sermon, by Archdeacon C. Goddard, 1817. *Ilament his dogmatism.* S. PARR.” P. 597. The name *Juniades* is somewhere in the *Bibliotheca Parriana* applied to Dr. Goddard; but I am unable to give the exact reference. “Memoirs of a Celebrated Literary and Political Character, (Mr. Glover, Author of *Leonidas*,) 1813. 8vo. *This book abounds with interesting anecdotes. The editor supposes the author to have been the same with JUNIUS, but in this I believe he was mistaken.* S. PARR.” P. 406.

XXXII. The following is the commencement of a *Letter to G. G.* (George Grenville,)  *Lond.* 1767. 8vo. printed for J. Williams:—

“Sir,

You will be surprised perhaps at the receipt of a *Letter*, after so long an alienation of connections. You must place it to the idleness of the country, and to the wantonness of holiday time, as I certainly have given up the rights of old acquaintance, and am not interested to question you for your late publications. Indeed every man is *now* at liberty to print what he thinks proper. You may come forth, (if you like it,) in a tye and in quarto, while your secretaries appear with bags and in octavo. And you may put what price you please upon your several exhibitions; three and sixpence, three shillings, two shillings, or even one shilling. No body is

obliged to pay, that does not choose it. The whole is very fair.

“ If you find any entertainment in note-taking, commenting, and writing for the public, when you cannot talk to them, I do not begrudge your employment, and I see no harm in it. For, although one be frequently obliged to bear with a speech of three hours, on a thimble-ful of matter, yet nobody is under the necessity of undergoing the perusal of the same thing in print.

“ It has been, however, my misfortune to be at the villa of a friend, during this short recess, where nothing but newspapers, pamphlets, or cards can be had for the amusement of a bad day and long evenings. By which means I have read three or four late pamphlets, that I should otherwise never have looked into, and now, (as I understand they all came from you or your penmen,) I shall by way of revenge, (to use a card-playing expression,) as well as to fill up the remainder of my time, send you some animadversions in a loose, epistolary way, with little method, and with all the freedom of political colloquy. My style, perhaps, you will not relish; but I do not think you ought to wonder at it, for few men can endure repeated perseverance in exploded errors and much dull abuse, without rising up indignant at last, and being petulant in return. And yet I thought I had reined myself in as strongly as I could, knowing how provokingly long, and unsatisfactory you would be, that is, how very like the late unfortunate harvest, plentiful in straw, but light in the ear. Nay, I knew you well enough to guess where the envy and fretfulness of your temper would lead you. Nevertheless, I could not have conceived you would have touched some of the matters you have. Surely the appetite of the public or your own interest, could never be sufficiently

considered at the time, with the assistances you are said to command; some better topics might have been found out. Your sinecure Newfoundland secretary might bring the political tittle-tattle or gleanings of coffee-houses to your ear, whilst your treasury-secretary was hunting out apposite passages in history, or classical ornaments in ancient authors. At night, the occurrences of both might be submitted to your revision, and thence you might afterwards indite somewhat that was palatable and fit for your private secretary to fair-copy for the town.

“ But here I should inform you, that many people shrewdly suspect the brain of one of your help-mates, (the *German Considerer*,) to be somewhat affected, and therefore you should examine a little into the matter, before you rely very much upon his pen. Perhaps he is only overloaded with vanity, (as might very well happen to a Blackwell-hall factor,) from accidental repute as a writer. But it is certain, that the little busy animal is of late years become wonderfully pert and impertinent. Now, (what is very odd,) between you and me, many people conjecture, with respect to his memorable production, that he was no more the genuine father, than old *Colley Cibber* is said to have been of the *Easy Husband*, and for the same reason; namely, the utter unlikeness of all the rest of his known and avowed progeny. In truth, I have heard that in his political trade he set out as a dependent on the retainers to a famous old lawyer, who, (you may remember,) was long the head-piece of a rotten junto, that constantly endeavoured in private to depreciate the eminent services of the great minister they were publicly acting with, and therefore clandestinely retailed to proper emissaries whatever might contribute to so honest, laudable, and national a



purpose. Your run-about scribe was much at their heels, and although he now figures with a sword and bag, was then but the humblest of politicians, and dressed in the plainest of habits, as became a poor simple layman, who had but just quitted the pulpit and tub. His pen being vacant, and itching for employ, he put together as it was guessed he would, whatever was purposely dropped at proper times, and with convenient discretion by these retainers to the old lawyer and junto. This he did, (to give him his due,) very well upon the whole, with here and there *une maudite phrase pourtant et des redites ennuyeuses*. But it so happened, that a change in the ministry fell out, before the impression of his well intended piece could be finished; so that when it came out, it served quite another set of men, that in its embryo were not in view, who instantly sought out the editor, and with transport caressed and rewarded him. The good luck of this scribbling ear-wig was really uncommon; for, (if I mistake not,) the crafty original designer and fomentor of the factious work would never have avowed the knowing aught of the matter, and have only fed the officious writer with kind gracious looks now and then, and some casual passing civilities as he fell in his way. However, the visible favours and open protection of the new ministers, with an admission to their persons and tables, being too strong for the head of your friend, quite overpowered his small senses, and, (what is most strange to relate,) converted at once a speaking obscure conventicler into a fine gentleman and tory, in which sphere he has flourished ever since, noisy, petulant and public, and officiously exhibiting in the lobbies of either house, at court, in coffee-houses and all other places of common resort, the strongest living example to be met with of *the great importance of a man*

*to himself.* Therefore, before you entrust him again implicitly with state-papers, have a consultation upon the state of his brain. You may hold it upon *the next 30th of January*, as that is a day, I am told, concerning which he has some particular conceit."

The "private secretary" here alluded to is *Charles Lloyd*.\*

XXXIII. *Bull-head-Passage, Wood-street, Cheapside, Dec. 6, 1827.*

"My dear Sir,

"Touching the family of the Lloyds, I find there were three brothers; all clever men. Bobby

\* In p. 90. there is an allusion to Burke, which it may be right to set before the reader:—

"It is the common notion that our extraordinary minister, whilst in office, has been always inaccessible to mere visitors, of whatever quality, and could never be talked with about places, nor seen on any private affairs; but that he was open at all times to any body of any condition, who had public business to transact or to speak about, and that he was upon these occasions the easiest and most agreeable man in the world to confer with. Now I cannot, for my own part, blame a real statesman for such reserve, or if you will, distance, with respect to the mere men of fashion and birth, who neither think nor care about the state, nor have any thing but their own particular points to solicit. This being the case, I was surprised the other day to hear a very ingenious gentleman of a neighbouring island talk of the minister as utterly inaccessible, excepting by chosen spirits, and that these could only approach him with their supplications, covering their faces, like the angels of *Milton*, who hide themselves with their wings before the deity. I enquired therefore seriously into the fact, and learned there was no foundation for it; and that probably it was no more more than A SUBLIME IDEA OF A BEAUTIFUL IMAGINATION. But I am rather, I confess, apt to suspect myself that it may really have been the singular effect of that particular awe and reverence, which a bashful man always feels within himself, when he appears before the great, and may in this instance perhaps be only the genuine offspring of that native shamefacedness so very remarkable in this diffident young politician, heightened withal by the natural and innate modesty of the country, from whence he comes. However, the sources of human error are so various, that I don't care to be positive in matters of this difficulty, and therefore I merely submit my opinion to your greater experience."

Lloyd, the intimate friend of Churchill, the poet, — a loose, careless character, who imbibed his friend's dissipated habits, and died in indigence," [Dec. 15, 1764.] "Philip was more fortunate, and became an ornament to the Church. In Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes* 8, 465. I find the following account of him: — 'The Rev. P. Lloyd of Christ-Church, Oxford; M. A. 1752. B. and D.D. 1763., succeeded Dr. Townshend as Dean of Norwich 1765. Vicar of Puddleston, County of Dorset, succeeded Mr. Lindsay in 1765., presented by Francis, Earl of Huntingdon. He was formerly Prebendary of Westminster, which he resigned on obtaining the Deanery of Norwich. He died at the Deanery-house May 31, 1790.'" He says, 9, 707.: — 'The late Dean Lloyd filled his situation in the church with great dignity and attention to its interests. He was a man of very polite manners, extraordinary composure of mind and resignation to the divine will. In his last moments he sent for one of the members of the Chapter, and said: *Sir, on Wednesday next there will be a Chapter held, when I wish such and such things done. It is not likely that I shall be there, as by that time I expect to be numbered with the dead.* Which afterwards proved to be the case. In his last agonies he requested Mrs. Lloyd and his niece to quit the room, that they might not be distressed by his convulsions.'

"Mrs. Lloyd was niece to the famous and noted *Philip Thicknesse*, as he styled himself in his pamphlets, the unfortunate father of Lord Audley.

"Of Charles Lloyd it is very difficult to gain much information. I have seen Mr. Burton" [of Brook-Street, Grosvenor-Square,] "though, poor man, he was unable to see me. He was, (on the receipt of your introductory *Note*,) extremely polite, and wish-

ed it were in his power to render me more information. He says that he was totally unacquainted with him — never saw him but once — recollects his being private Secretary to George Grenville — always heard him spoken of as a clever man — that the nickname of *Dolly* was given to him, when at Westminster-School, on account of his quiet habits — that he afterwards associated much with men of letters, particularly with Colman, the farcical writer, in whose family he thinks some of his correspondence may be found — that he never heard of or saw any pamphlet or composition from his pen. This is all the information I can obtain for you. If a few of his private *Letters* could be found, they would tend greatly to throw light on his talents. Are any of the Colmans in existence?

“ In haste believe me yours very truly,  
G. COVENTRY.”

“ To E. H. Barker, Esq.”

My intelligent and kind friend, L. Baugh Allen, Esq., “ apprehends there is some mistake as to Charles Lloyd. He never heard that he was a brother of Robert, and thinks he should have done so, if he was, because Robert was the son of old Lloyd, who for so many years was under-Master of Westminster, and whose memory is even now warmly cherished by a great number of men, who had been under him.”

*Extract from a Letter dated Six Clerks' Office,  
London, Dec. 13, 1827.*

In Chalmers's *Biographical Dictionary* there is a notice of Robert Lloyd, who was educated at Trinity-College, Cambridge, the friend of Churchill, Colman, and Wilkes, p. 343—7. The last-mentioned personage thus characterised him: — “ Mild and affable in private life, of gentle manners, and very

engaging in conversation. He was an excellent scholar, and an easy, natural poet. His peculiar excellence was the dressing up an old thought in a new, neat, and trim manner. He was contented to scamper round the foot of Parnassus on his little Welsh pony, which seems never to have tired. He left the fury of the winged steed and the daring heights of the sacred mountain to the sublime genius of his friend, Churchill." Mr. Chalmers refers, for notices of Robert Lloyd, to *Johnson and Chalmers's English Poets*, 1810. *Bishop Newton's Life* p. 16. 17. etc. The article in the *Biogr. Dict.* thus speaks of Robert's father:—"Lloyd (Robert,) a modern poet, was born in Westminster in 1733. His father, Dr. Pierson Lloyd, was second Master of Westminster-School, afterwards Chancellor of York, and Portionist of Waddesdon in Bucks. His learning, judgment, and moderation endeared him to all, who partook of his instructions, during a course of almost 50 years, spent in the service of the public at Westminster-School. He had a pension from his Majesty of £500, conferred upon him in his old-age, which was ordered to be paid without deduction, and which he enjoyed until his death Jan. 5. 1781." As Charles Lloyd was educated at Westminster, and was, (according to the testimony of Mr. Burton, the oldest Westminster-man now living,) intimate with Colman, the intimate friend of Robert Lloyd, to me it seems highly probable that Robert and Charles were brothers, as Mr. Coventry mentions them to have been. If a man were disposed to be *fanciful*, he might contend that, if they were brothers, it furnishes a reason why Wilkes, who was the friend of Robert Lloyd, was honoured with the correspondence of Junius, on the supposition that Charles Lloyd was either Junius or closely connected with Junius.

On the whole, I think that the reader may be disposed to agree with me that there is in the known compositions of Charles Lloyd abundant and satisfactory evidence to prove that he was not the author of Junius's *Letters*, but that we may, with the greatest probability, believe from the united testimony of four witnesses of the very highest order in respect to probity, diligence, accuracy, research, and intellect, 1. the Rev. Dr. Richard Farmer, 2. the Rev. Dr. Nathaniel Forster, 3. the Rev. Dr. Samuel Parr, and 4. the late Peter Walsh, Esq. of Belline, (who each pursuing a different course had arrived at the same point, viz. that Charles Lloyd was the writer,) we may, I say, reasonably conclude that Charles Lloyd was concerned in the authorship of the *Letters* either as the amanuensis, or as a collector of intelligence, or as "the conveyancer" of the *Letters* themselves. In which of these capacities he acted, and whether he did not act in all of them, time, the revealer of secrets, may yet disclose to us. There can be little doubt that the principal part of the evidence, on which these gentlemen relied for establishing the fact of Lloyd's authorship, if the whole of that evidence were before us, would be perfectly compatible with the idea of his having been an auxiliary scribe or a subordinate agent.

XXXIV. "The information I sent you about the Lloyds, was obtained from Mr. Burton; that is, as far as their relationship is concerned. He may be wrong; but I will endeavour to ascertain this fact in another channel. I referred to the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1781., where I find the death of Dr. Pierson Lloyd; but no account of his family. If Charles and Philip Lloyd were not his sons, whose sons were they? Dr. Lloyd had an annuity from the King of £500 *per ann.*, so that he was

quite respectable enough. This annuity might have been obtained through the Grenvilles.

“There is no further account of Dean Lloyd in Nichols’s *Literary Anecdotes* excepting his Latin epitaph at Norwich, which I apprehend you are not in want of.

“I think I formerly mentioned I could gain no information whatever about Charles Lloyd’s writings — I perceive you have noticed them in your book. The style of writing would be *some* criterion; but I have never met with any to judge of his ability.

“The proof-sheets of your work have reached me through Mr. Valpy. I have looked them through, and now send you my remarks.

“Mr. Charles Butler informed me that Swinney, who called on Lord George Sackville, and taxed him with being Junius, was Chaplain in one of the regiments at the time Lord George was commander-in-chief in Germany. This information is very curious, inasmuch as Lord George, admitting him to have been Junius at the time of Swinney’s call, would naturally feel a bitter invective against him for his interference. Swinney never would have called, had he doubted Lord George’s abilities.

“P. 17. You seem to think the panegyric upon Lord Chatham counteracts the violent aspersions Junius heaped upon that nobleman. I cannot agree to this, inasmuch as it is my firm belief that all that Junius wrote in his favor, was ironical — he made a tool of him, as best suited his views — I believe I am not singular in this opinion.” [Mr. Butler says in his *Reminiscences* 1, 81. that Wilkes and himself ‘thought, Junius’s high-wrought panegyric of Lord Chatham was ironical.’ Perhaps there may be some irony in it; but take out the irony, and praise still remains. My statement and opinion

are, (and Dr. Mason Good in Woodfall's edition thinks the same,) 1. that Junius, at the commencement of his career, when he was writing under various signatures, was on several occasions most vehement against Lord Chatham, not hesitating to treat him as a public criminal, a madman, a dotard, a man marked out for human abhorrence by the vengeance of heaven; the bitterness implies the strongest political, and even personal aversion to that great man: 2. That he afterwards under the signature of *Junius* panegyrised him on several occasions: 3. That the cause of the hostility is to be referred to political antipathy, and the cause of the commendation to political sympathy, the nearer approximation between their political sentiments and conduct. 4. I am very willing to admit that Junius is more reserved in the praise than he was in the censure of Lord Chatham — that the praise may be mixed with some delicate irony — and that the praise is of such a nature as to manifest rather approbation of his Lordship's conduct at the time, than admiration of his character — as commending the politician rather than the man. 5. Sir James Mackintosh, as we have seen p. 247., connects the early political hostility of Junius towards Lord Chatham with the separation between his Lordship and George Grenville, and the later political attachment of Junius towards the same nobleman he refers to the reconciliation between those personages. 6. Mr. Taylor, seeking to establish a community of feeling between Junius and Sir Philip Francis on the subject of Lord Chatham, and thence to infer an identity of person between them, says that Sir Philip, like Junius, speaks with qualified praise of his Lordship. But this is a manifest, however unintentional, misrepresentation of the truth; for Sir Philip has nowhere abused Lord Chatham — no-



where spoken dis-respectfully of him — nowhere mentioned his name without honour, and often ‘with admiration and reverence’ — in one place only has he qualified his praise, and by the discrimination, which he exhibits, has stamped additional value on the panegyric, which of itself surpasses in meaning the famous, but ‘high-wrought’ panegyric of Junius. ¶ 7. The difference between Junius and Sir Philip is this, that the former was actuated solely by political aversion and political attachment, while the latter had the strongest personal attachment towards his early patron and constant friend, never had the smallest political aversion, and merely acknowledged in his Lordship ‘faults,’ which might have had no reference whatever to political principles and political conduct, but merely to personal qualities, which made his Lordship an impracticable man in business, when he had to act with others.]

“ P. 227. If Lloyd wrote against the Rockingham-Administration, it militates against his claims, as Junius speaks of Lord Rockingham as a man of inflexible integrity.

“ If what Almon says of Lloyd be true, there is an end to the controversy, as he appears to have been abroad in a bad state of health during the publication of the *Letters*. In all probability, when his master died in 1770., he went abroad to endeavour to repair a shattered constitution. If access could be had to Colman’s papers, doubtless some of his correspondence would appear, which would be very satisfactory to trace from whence his *Letters* were dated.

“ P. 228. How could Lloyd write in favour of government in the case of Wilkes, and take Wilkes’s part in the character of Junius? I cannot reconcile it.” [Lloyd might have been no more a

friend of Wilkes than George Grenville was. The proceedings against Wilkes were commenced under Mr. Grenville's *reign*, and yet in 1770., the latter made a speech in favour of Wilkes. The demagogue, however, as well as the demagogue's friends, regarded George Grenville rather as an enemy than as a friend, as is apparent from several pamphlets published at the time.]

“ P. 260. If when Johnson published his pamphlets on the Falkland-Islands, Lloyd was setting out for Aix-la-Chapelle, how could he act in the capacity of Junius, who must of necessity have been in London or its vicinity? As the Rev. T. Kidd appears to have known Lloyd's movements, it would not be amiss to trace whether he has any of his correspondence, or how he came to know that Lloyd was going to Aix-la-Chapelle?” [Mr. Kidd has no personal acquaintance with Lloyd, but states himself to have derived his information from a gentleman, who was in the same office with Lloyd.]

“ P. 190. The statement about Garrick is quite correct. I spoke to Mr. Woodfall about the other *Letter* you mention — he had never seen or heard of it, so that such a document, if it ever existed, must have been handed to Garrick through another channel.

“ I have just seen Mr. Upcott, to whom I pointed out that part of your pamphlet relative to Garrick.

He says, my remarks are perfectly correct, those of Mr. Dawson Turner erroneous. He obligingly referred again to the original, which we examined, and we remain of the same opinion. There is not the shadow of a doubt but that it is a copy of the original in Mr. Woodfall's possession. You may recollect that in one of Junius's private *Letters* to Mr. Woodfall, it was suggested that the word *practices* should be inserted in lieu of *impertinent inquiries*.

ries, and so to be forwarded. The word *practices* is consequently inserted in the *Letter* now in Mr. Upcott's possession. It was sent by the *Penny-post*, 'paid'—sealed with the reverse of a guinea, and addressed to 'Mr. David Garrick, Southampton-Street, Strand—upon which Garrick has written, *I received the enclosed Nov. 18, 1771. at night.* There is no trace of the one you speak of among Garrick's papers, which have all been carefully examined.

"I took up a copy of *Lowth's Grammar* formerly belonging to Wilkes—it contains many of Wilkes's notes—among them is a quotation from Junius, whom he styles 'a polished, refined writer.' Such evidence as this goes to prove that Wilkes, (who was once suspected,) was not the author, as no man would quote from his own writings. Had this book belonged to Lloyd, and contained Lloyd's notes instead of Wilkes's, I should say the evidence was strong against Lloyd's claims. At the sale of Wilkes's books there was a *Junius* with Wilkes's notes—brought £5. 17s. 6d. Did you ever hear who purchased it?"

*Extract of a Letter of Mr. George Coventry,  
dated Wood-Street, London, Dec. 20, 1827.*

I have examined the Sale-Catalogue of Mr. Wilkes's books, and do not find any mention of the *Junius*.

My friend, Mr. Coventry's criterion against the authorship of Wilkes, that the author of the *Letters*, if he were writing notes on *Lowth's Grammar*, would not quote from his own writings, is very false. Will Mr. Taylor admit the criterion as decisive against the claims of Sir Philip Francis? See p. 267. of this work, where Dr. Fellowes informs us that he saw in Sir Philip's library marginal notes written

by Sir Philip in his copy of Junius very unlikely to have proceeded from the author of Junius. See also p. 46 — 48., where the reader will find that Sir Philip writing anonymously refers to himself by name, and to the *Letter Missive to Lord Holland*, which was not anonymous. But a memorable instance of self-quotation occurs in the *Bibliotheca Parriana* p. 460., and the reader will observe that Dr. Parr reasons in a way directly opposed to the doctrines of Mr. Coventry: —

“Wallace’s (the excellent Mr.) *Various Prospects of Mankind, Nature, and Providence*, 1761. 8. ‘In Payne’s *Catalogue* 1770. this is given to Price. ‘Query, the same man who wrote *on Morals*?’ To this query by a former possessor of the work, (apparently not Dr. Lort, whose autograph is, however, on the same page,) Dr. Parr makes the following reply. The Dr. Price, who wrote *on Morals*, also published some *Dissertations*, of which one is *on Providence*. But this work, in Godwin’s book on *Political Justice*, is expressly and justly ascribed to Mr. Wallace, and the internal arguments are numerous and decisive. There is no resemblance of Dr. Price’s style or manner of reasoning. There is more vivacity, more taste, more sensibility, than there is in the writings of Dr. Price. There are many instances of Scotticism. There is a long and pointed reference in the note of p. 7. to the admirable work of Mr. Wallace on the *Populousness of Ancient Nations*. I was particularly struck with the vindication of Providence, the scheme of liberty, and the scheme of necessity. S. P.”

In the *Bibliotheca Britannica* of Dr. Watt the book is not ascribed to Dr. Robert Wallace: all which he says, is this: —

“Wallace, Robert, D.D., one of the Ministers of Edinburgh. *A Dissertation on the Numbers of*

*Mankind in Ancient and Modern Times; with an Appendix, containing additional Observations on the same Subject, and some Remarks on Mr. Hume's Political Discourse of the Populousness of Ancient Nations.* Edinb. 1753. 8vo, (*Anon.*) 2d. ed. Edinb. 1809. 8vo. 9s. *Characteristics of the Present State of Great Britain,* Lond. 1758. 8vo."

1. There can be no doubt of the correctness of Dr. Parr's judgment in ascribing to Wallace, with Godwin, the work in question. Supposing the fact of the authorship to be now ascertained on positive evidence, Dr. Parr's reasons would have been well founded: yet how few would have admitted their force! How few, then, are qualified to judge in the case of Junius, where similar arguments are entitled to equal weight! 2. While Mr. Coventry considers self-quotation in one work to militate against the supposition of disputed authorship as to an anonymous work, Dr. Parr employs it as an argument to prove identity. How, then, can we reason with any hope of success about questions of authorship, unless we are first agreed as to the principles, on which the reasoning ought to be conducted? 3. Some authors may have a delicacy, real or false, in referring to or quoting from their own works, while other writers, — the foolish from the impulse of vanity, the wise from superiority to vulgar notions, the independent from contempt of popular opinion, the impartial from a sense of justice to themselves, — may have no such scruples. 4. Mr. Coventry takes up a position on dangerous ground, when he says that no man will quote his own works, because a single instance is sufficient to dislodge him. 5. We may with more safety reason with Dr. Parr, because what one author has done in certain circumstances, another is likely to do in similar circumstances; and throughout my investiga-

tions I have “kept probability in view,” “the most fixed principles of human nature, as well as the examples of all history,” and pursuing that circumspect course, I may well hope to carry with me the conviction of the reader, amidst all the uncertainties of the case itself, and the Egyptian darkness in which it has been involved by false ratiocination.

XXXV. “I now enclose you *Garrick’s Letter to Woodfall*, in reply to Junius: you are at liberty to make what use of it you please. It is certainly not a little extraordinary, and confirmed by Garrick also, that Junius knew of his communication to Ramus, *the very next day*. Now all that I contend for on the part of Lloyd is this, that, if he was at Aix-la-Chapelle, (see Mr. Kidd’s *Letter* in p. 260. of your book,) or on the continent, as mentioned by Almon, (see p. 227. of your book,) he could *in no way* be connected with Junius, either as *amanuensis* or *lion’s provider*. This was what I wished to impress in my last. I was aware that *you* had relinquished his claim as author; but many, no doubt, in consequence of what Dr. Parr has said, would not do so easily, until they had been convinced by circumstantial evidence, which I hoped you would introduce into your examination. The other *Letter* certainly reads like *Junius*. Perhaps something may transpire to authenticate it. How does the date agree? I forgot to refer, when you sent up the sheets for perusal. Is it not singular that Garrick notices no other communication?”

“I have found out the *Critical Review* now discontinued. There are several critiques in various dates, relative to Junius — one respecting Sir Philip Francis, which they think, although ingenious, too far-fetched to carry any conviction with it. In another place Blakeway’s pamphlets are discussed, whom they recommend to make no further es-

says, having been attended with so little success. The principal critique is upon Mr. Woodfall's new edition in 1812., wherein they say that Lord Geo. Sackville and Lloyd have the strongest claims — the latter particularly, whom they recommend to public attention, to those who have time and inclination to follow up the subject."

*Extract from a Letter of George Coventry, Esq. dated Bull-Head Passage, Wood Street, Cheapside, Dec. 29, 1827.*

With respect to the absence of Charles Lloyd on the continent, my friend, Mr. Coventry, is, in the absence of positive facts and undisputed dates, disposed to draw too *large* an inference — for my own part, I cannot *on this ground alone* decide against Lloyd's claims to the authorship, and to any participation in the work — the information of Almon is given too vaguely, to be entitled to full credit, and that furnished by my friend, Mr. Kidd, on whose accuracy I could rely, is too imperfect for me to reason on it safely. Though I have already stated my belief and conviction that Lloyd was, though not the *author*, a party concerned either as amanuensis, or bearer of intelligence to Junius, or as 'the conveyancer of the *Letters*,' yet I am not prepared to contend that he was the *sole* person employed in these *three* capacities, and therefore his temporary absence on the continent during the *reign* of Junius, if the fact were established beyond doubt, would not affect the truth or the probability of my supposition; but his entire residence in France during the whole period would, certainly, if it could be proved, be decisive on the subject.

XXXVI. (COPY.) November 20, 1771.

" Sir,

I am obliged to address this *Letter* to you

and to appeal to your probity — in that, and my own, lies my defence against a most unprovoked and illiberal attack made upon me by your celebrated correspondent *Junius*. — Had you not convinced me, that the *Letter* I received last Monday-night, was really written by that gentleman, I could not have imagined that such talents could have descended to such scurrility. — However mighty the power may be, with which he is pleased to threaten me, I trust with truth on my side and your assistance to be able to parry the vigour of his arm, and oblige him to drop his point, not for want of force to overcome so feeble an adversary as I am, but from the shame and consciousness of a very bad cause, In *one* particular I will be acknowledged his superior; for however easy and justifiable such a return may be, I will make use of no foul language — My vindication wants neither violence or abuse to support it: it would be as unmanly to give injurious names to one, who *will* not, as to him, who cannot resent it. Now to the fact, which, till you had explained to me, had made no impression upon my mind. I am told in most outrageous terms, and near a month after the supposed crime was committed, (for *Junius* was exactly informed of my practices the day after,) that if the vagabond does not keep to his pantomimes, every hour of his life shall be cursed for his interfering with *Junius*. Is not this rather too inquisitorial for the great champion of our liberties? Now let us examine into the dreadful cause of this denunciation. Mr. Woodfall, the first informer, informs me in a *Letter* in no wise relative to the subject, *without any previous impertinent inquiries on my part*, or the least desire of secrecy on his, that *Junius would write no more*. Two or three days after the receipt of yours, being obliged to write a *Letter* upon the business of the theatre to one at Rich-



mond,\* and after making my excuses for not being able to obey his Majesty's commands, I mentioned to him that *Junius* would write no more — but the triumph, that succeeded this intelligence, never reached me, till I received *Junius's Letter*; and so far was I from thinking there was a crime in communicating what was sent me without reserve, that I will freely confess that I wrote no *Letter* to any of my friends without the mention of so remarkable an event. I will venture to go further and affirm that it would have been insensible and unnatural not to have done it. I beg you will assure *Junius* that I have as proper an abhorrence of an informer as he can have — that I have been honoured with the confidence of men of all parties, and I defy my greatest enemy to produce a single instance of any one repenting of such confidence.

I have always declared that, were I by any accident to discover *Junius*, no consideration should prevail upon me to reveal a secret productive of so much mischief, nor can this most undeserved treatment of me make me alter my sentiments.

One thing more I must observe, that *Junius* has given credit to an informer in prejudice of him, who was never in the least suspected of being a spy before. Had any of our Judges condemned the lowest culprit upon such evidence without hearing the person accused and other witnesses, the nation would have rung with injustice!

I shall say no more; but, I beg you to tell all you know of this matter, and be assured, that I am with great regard for *Junius's* talents, but without the least for his threatenings,

Your well-wisher and humble Servant,

D. GARRICK."

Enclosed in an envelope, directed to *Mr. Woodfall, Paternoster-Row.*

(Delivered by hand.)

\* "This alludes to his friend Ramus." — G. COVENTRY.

This *Letter* is in the course of publication, with other Garrick-papers, by Mr. Colburn.

XXXVII. "In respect to *Junius*, I can most positively declare that Parr was decidedly of opinion that Charles Lloyd was the Author. A particular friend of mine, the late Mr. Walsh of Belline, (who had an enlarged and investigating mind,) conceived he had discovered the author of *Junius*, and also who the famous *Iron-Mask* was; but I never could prevail on him to draw up any Memoir on these two interesting subjects; but a short time before his death he gave me many of his papers on these points, and promised to leave me the remainder. However, from causes too long to explain by letter, I did not get the *latter*, and I fear they were destroyed. From what I got, I drew up and published a short account, and a copy of which I shall send you, as also some correspondence with Mr. Walsh. On one of my visits at Hatton, I drove with Dr. Parr in his carriage to Birmingham, and on our way he said — 'Come, I will tell you a great secret, but you must promise not to disclose it; I will tell you the author of *Junius*.' 'Hold, my dear Doctor,' answered I, 'I will tell you.' 'You tell me?' said he, a little offended. 'Yes; Charles Lloyd.' I assure you he fell back in the carriage with astonishment — 'My God! how came you by this secret?' I told him I got it from Mr. Walsh, and who in many conversations *convinced* me of the accuracy of his opinion. Parr ever after called him his intelligent friend, and charged me to write and request him to keep the secret. Though he was old enough to be my father, I was intimate with Dr. Percy, Bishop of Dromore, and have often been in private company with him at the house of my uncle, the late Mr. Caldwell, who was a man of letters. Four others of this description, whom, though so much

older than myself, it was my good fortune to have been acquainted with, viz. Lords Claremont and Besborough, Mr. Malone, and Mr. Mangin, of the Secretary of State's office, Dublin, a man of great anecdote and knowledge, I think were all likely to have known, or to have thrown light on the subject of *Junius*. But in those times I was young and giddy, and thought of nothing but military pursuits. I have, however, a sort of recollection like a dream, that I have heard Percy and Lord Besborough name Lloyd: of this, however, I cannot be absolutely positive. Parr told me that C. Fox thought Lloyd the author. If what I state can be of any use to you in support of this, and of which I have not the slightest doubt, use it as you please. I understood from Parr that Lloyd left a son, and who, I believe, was a pupil of the Doctor's. This son was intended for the diplomatic line, and was in training for it, as the jockies say. But the late King found out the secret, and as in this case it was probable that the sins of the father would be visited on the son, the young man then changed his name, went to Cambridge, and into the church; and Parr, I know, was most anxious to keep the question secret till the young man was provided for."

*Extract from a Letter of General Cockburne, dated Shanganagh, Sept. 10, 1826.*

XXXVIII. "P. 283. You state that Dr. Farmer traced the hand-writing to Lloyd, also Dr. Forster, and Mr. Walsh. Three such respectable authorities have made me the more anxious to obtain his signature, but hitherto without effect. On Monday I went to the *Prerogative Office*; found that he died intestate — that letters of administration were taken out by Philip Lloyd, his brother, and Mrs. Catharine Lloyd, mother to the deceased — so that in this instance I was foiled. If you know any one

in Norwich, (where Philip died and was buried,) in all probability access may be gained to the family-papers. I understand they were in the habit of preserving papers. Nichols says, the Dean possessed some documents relating to the Pretender.

“ The *Letter* to Ramus is not among Garrick’s papers. I apprehend the communication was very short — ‘ Junius will write no more.’ This we may infer from the light manner, in which he treats the affair in his reply to Junius’s attack.”

*Extract from a letter of George Coventry, Esq. dated Bull-head Passage, Wood-Street, Cheapside, Jan, 10, 1828.*

Dr. Pierson Lloyd died in 1781., and Charles Lloyd in 1773.; and if the latter was the son of the former, it appears singular that the mother of Charles, Mrs. Catharine Lloyd, should have joined her son Philip, the Dean of Norwich, in taking out letters of administration for the effects of Charles, when the father was living, and apparently in the enjoyment of good health.

Dr. Pierson Lloyd published a single Sermon in 1753., 8vo., according to Dr. Watt’s *Bibliotheca Britannica*. In Cooke’s *Preacher’s Assistant*, Oxford, 1783., V. 2. p. 214. we read these words:—

“ LLOYD P., M. A. Cur. of Roxwell, Essex.

“ LLOYD PIERSON, D. D. late Archdeacon of the Church of York.

“ Sixteen Sermons, in 8vo. 1765. On several Occasions. *Wadh. Ox. Trin. C.*”

The *Sixteen Sermons* were preached at Westminster-Abbey. Philip, the Dean of Norwich, seems not to have been polluted with the sin of publishing; for nothing of this sort is attributed to his pen.

“ *Junius*.— In our first Review\* will be

\* The passage referred to is the following quotation from the *Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs of J. Cradock, Esq.*:—

found certain allusions to the authorship of *Junius's Letters*; upon which, by the bye, a new light has lately broken. It is stated that the original of the famous *Letter to the King* has been recently discovered at Stowe, (the Duke of Buckingham's,) with the signature of the writer; and it is added that none of the theories yet maintained have hit the real person. Our opinion leans to Lord G. Sackville; but, strong as the circumstantial evidence is *for* him, we are assured there is an allusion to him in one of *Junius's Letters*, ('that he liked to be in the rear,') which destroys the whole fabric, as it is undoubtedly the last thing, which he would have allowed to be written. Burke we never believed in; Sir P. Francis we have always disbelieved in;† and Dr. Wilmot, though supported by the Princess of Cumberland, &c. &c. &c. has never been our *Junius*. It has always been thought evident that the writer was connected with the Grenville-family, and, therefore, it is likely enough that an *escritoire* at Stowe should produce this revelation; but it is said that Lord Grenville has requested it to be kept sacred during his life. Lloyd, the Secretary of the Right Hon G. Grenville, (if we recollect rightly,) has been frequently mentioned (by Parr, Horne Tooke,

“ *Mr. Rosenhagen*. — I was particularly intimate with Mr. Henry Sampson Woodfall. Though Mr. Woodfall always declared he never knew any particular author of *Junius*, I think, from circumstances, that Rosenhagen was an occasional negociator; he was known to live afterwards in Paris, at great expense, without any visible means. I once mentioned the subject to Professor Mainwaring, who said he recollected Rosenhagen, a Fellow of St. John's, and his name there called to mind a wretched pun made upon it by one of the *Johnian society*, who was going down stairs, when Rosenhagen was scraping on his fiddle with his door open: *O Mr. Rosenhagen*, exclaimed he, *if you will persist in scraping upon your fiddle, for heaven's sake, ROSIN-AGAIN your fiddle-stick.*”

† “ In spite of a very able article in the last *Edinburgh Saturday's Post*, which strenuously contends for Sir Philip's claim.”

&c.) as *the Junius*; but we are assured that Junius's last *Letter to Woodfall* was dated only two days before Lloyd's death, under circumstances which make it impossible that he could have been the correspondent. We have only further to observe, that what adds to the probability of the new rumour is, that Junius in another *Letter* about the period in question threatens to consummate his work by one grand stroke, — such as it would have been to publish his *Letter to the King*, subscribed by his real name."

*The Literary Gazette, Jan. 12, 1828.*

1. I do not recollect to have heard that Horne Tooke was a believer in the authorship of Charles Lloyd; from Mr. Blakeway's two pamphlets it appears that he encouraged the notion that the *Letters* were written by HIMSELF! There is a mention of Horne Tooke's opinions in Mr. Roche's *Inquiry*; but at the present time I have not access to the book.\* 2. On the inconclusive nature of the argument, which has been urged against Lloyd's claims, because Junius's final *Letter to Woodfall* was dated Jan. 19, 1773. and Lloyd died on the 22d. I have already spoken. 3. The recent discovery

\* "His style, (Horne Tooke's,) is strongly impressed with the character of his mind — neat, clear, precise, and forcible, free from affectation, void of ornament. We do not think he is ever vulgar; but he is full of that genuine Anglicism, of which the course of his studies rendered him at once an admirer and a master — that native idiom, which the brilliant success of some of those, who have written English as a foreign language, has, within the last fifty years brought into disuse, and almost into oblivion. The most finished specimen of his composition is probably to be found in the two or three *Letters* written in answer to the attacks of Junius, and he had the honour, which in those days was deemed no inconsiderable one, of being the only knight, that returned with his lance unbroken from a combat with that unknown, but terrible champion. If he wants the requisite and the brilliant invective of his adversary, that dexterous malignity, which comes in with such effect to blacken a character by insi-

at Stowe is thus noticed in another periodical publication:—

“ Five *Letters* are deposited in the archives of the Grenville family at Stowe, which establish, beyond the possibility of doubt, the real author of *Junius*. This eminent individual was politically connected with Mr. George Grenville, the grandfather of the present Duke of Buckingham, from whom these autograph-proofs have descended to the present possessor. The venerable statesman, nearly allied to the Duke

novation, after invective has exhausted its powers, and above all, that well-sustained tone of austere dignity, which gives to *Junius* the air and authority of a great personage in disguise, he is superior to him in facility, vivacity, and that assurance of plainness and sincerity, which is of such importance in controversial writings. The great fault of *Junius* is a sort of stiffness and appearance of labour—his compositions smell too much of the lamp—he wanted nothing to be a perfect master of his art but the power of concealing it. Mr. Tooke's *Letters* have the flow, unity, and simplicity, which belong to writings struck off at a heat, and which depend for their effect rather upon the general powers of the writer, than upon great nicety and labour in the particular instance. In justice to *Junius*, as a writer, we must add that he was labouring under the disadvantages of a weak case. It is evident that he was early and deeply sensible of his own mistake, and he was therefore glad to put an end to the contest as soon as possible, even at the price of leaving his adversary in possession of the field; a humiliation, to which he would not have submitted, but from the consciousness of his having originally selected an unfavourable ground.”

*The Quarterly Review* 14, 319. Art. *Reid's Memoirs of Horne Tooke*.

I will conclude the note with another extract from the same periodical:—“ ‘Glover was supposed by Dr. Warton,’ says Mr. Chalmers, ‘to have left some curious *Memoirs of his Life*; but as so many years have elapsed without their appearance, this was either a mistake, or they have been deemed unfit for publication.’ A portion of this history has lately been made public, and it is as interesting as any thing can be, which relates to the politics of such unimportant times.

“It has led to a supposition that the author of *Junius* and of these *Memoirs*, was one and the same person, and an *Inquiry* has been published, which must be allowed to have shewn satisfactorily that the various requisites, which must have existed in *Junius*, are to be found in Glover—it is thus proved that Glover *might have*

of Buckingham, has requested the discovery should not be published during his lifetime. It is, however, confidently asserted that in all the controversies relating to these celebrated *Letters*, the author of them has not been named. (*Morning Chronicle.*)”  
*The Times* Jan. 1, 1828.

4. The earliest notice of this discovery appeared in a Magazine:—

“*August 27.* The murder’s out—*Junius is at last discovered!* and, strange to say, never once

*been* the author, but no proof has as yet been adduced that he *was*—we should rejoice if this *Inquiry* should bring forth more of his remains, and lead to a collected edition of the Works of an author, who, though too highly extolled in his own day, must ever hold a respectable rank among the English Poets. The Editor of the *Memoirs* would do more honour to the memory of this distinguished man by executing this task, than if he should succeed in identifying him with the most eminent libeller of his day—for the literary character of *Junius* will not maintain its rank. It is as little difficult in these times to write a malicious style, as it is to produce smooth verses; and he, who like *Junius* is deterred by no sense of veracity or of shame from bringing forward bold accusations, which he knows to be unfounded, misrepresenting and distorting facts, and seasoning calumny and detraction with insult, may easily obtain the reputation of writing with vivacity and strength—but the trick has grown common—some of the most eminent professors of the art have been stripped and whipped as they deserved; and they have discovered somewhat too late, while writhing under the wholesome discipline, that the precepts of the moral law are not to be violated with impunity.”

*The Quarterly Review*, 22, 499. Art. *Chalmers’ English Poets.*

The writer of this article ought to have perceived that “the literary character of *Junius* will maintain its rank;” for, when any writings, more especially those, which related to the fleeting politics of the day, are found to have survived those politics, and continue to engage the attention of readers of every class in the succeeding age, the fair and necessary inference is that such writings are not destined to drop from the remembrance of men, and to roll down the stream of time into the gulf of oblivion. *Junius* may have been malignant; but he is still read by the good—he may have been a calumniator of private character; but he is still studied by the wise—he may have been a libeller of public men; but he is still capable of instructing youthful statesmen, of admonishing unenthroned princes, and of disheartening “purple-tyrants.”



scented. Months ago I mentioned, that at a party-conciliation dinner given by Mr. Whitbread in 1805., at which Mr. Fox, Mr. Canning, Lord Grenville, and my father were present, Lord Grenville emphatically declared, ‘*I know the real Junius*—but the secret will not transpire in my lifetime.’ In answer to a question of Mr. Canning, his Lordship replied, ‘He is not any of the persons suspected—his name has never been coupled in any way with Junius’s.’ Sir Philip Francis, one of the party, was not then mentioned.

“I have myself been a bit of a *Junius*-hunter, and have for some time taken a place among the foremost of the *Franciscans*. No merely circumstantial evidence could shake my faith in Francis’s identity. It appears, however, that I lack His Holiness, the Pope’s prerogative of infallibility, and that I was mistaken in affiliating the *Junius-Letters* to Sir Philip Francis. So at least my fat friend, Lord Nugent tells me. Nugent is burstingly big with the secret, and I am burstingly big to get possession of it. My longing, I am sorry to say, is not likely to be very soon gratified. Wish I heard nothing about the matter, and that the ‘precious documents,’ as Chandos calls them, had reposed some time longer in peaceful dust. The simple history of the discovery is, that some six weeks ago, as Lord Nugent and his Grace of Buckingham were private-paper hunting in the Stowe-Library, they lit upon a parcel studiously concealed in a, to them, unknown recess. The parcel contained three *Letters*: one from *Junius* under his fictitious signature; another to George Grenville asking for legal advice as to the risk of publishing the *Letter to the King* WITH THE REAL NAME; and a third, enclosing *Junius’s Letter* to Lord Mansfield, with the author’s initials. References are made in the last to a *Letter* from

George Grenville to the author. The Duke went off post-haste to Dropmore with the parcel. Lord Grenville at once recognized it, and declared his intention of providing for the publicity of the documents after his death—but not till then. At his request, the Duke and Lord Nugent have pledged themselves to silence, till that event shall have taken place: and thus I, and all others interested in the matter, are forced to stifle our curiosity as well as we can. Curiosity is a questionable phrase here—in smacks of Eve and Eve's daughters. I care not who wrote the *Letters*; but I wish to know, as a curious chapter in the history of the human mind, the motives, which impelled the great libeller in the first instance to write those matchless productions at such an expense of time and trouble; and which urged him to conceal himself, when the storm had passed over, and when the fame of those *Letters* was far more than a counterbalance to the risk of the discovery. After all, I fear I shall not have a hundred years to wait for the gathering of the noble statesman to the last mansion of his fathers."

*The Inspector*; (a Magazine published monthly by Effingham Wilson,) for Oct. 1827. No. 18. p. 585.

This information, so positively given, and professedly derived from the authority of Lord Nugent is by no means correct, as the reader will see by referring to a statement, which the kindness of a friend will enable me to employ in the Preface to this volume.

But, what shews the propriety of receiving such statements with great caution, is this, that I was informed by a friend, who received his intelligence from a gentleman of literary character, then recently arrived in London from Stowe, that the discovery just made there, confirmed the claims of Charles Lloyd beyond all doubt!

A contemporary writer, addressing Junius, says, but apparently not in allusion to Lloyd:—

“*You are well-known to be the subaltern of a discarded minister, who was deservedly respected in his natural sphere, but grew less by elevation, ‘like a little statue placed upon a mighty pedestal.’ And though I revere the heart of that noble Lord, yet I pity the unfortunate defects of his head, which forced him to rely upon the counsels of ambitious dependants, whose views were so eager and aspiring, that they alarmed all the old faithful servants of their country and King, and induced his Majesty to remove the cause of their jealousy and discontent, by making choice of another set of ministers, who had capacity and firmness to execute the business of our nation, uninfluenced by dependants and parasites.*”

PHILALETHES, in *the Public Advertiser*,\*  
Oct. 9. 1771.

“I have dropped a hint with regard to the patron of *Junius*. The fair way to examine this hint is to read the whole series of *Letters* attributed to *Junius*, applying them to the supposed patron or party, and so correcting and establishing the idea. However, to give the reader some excuse for my arrogance in suggesting a notion, which differs from the

\* Mr. Taylor has p. 237. instanced the phrase *false fact* as peculiar to *Junius* and Sir Philip Francis: this argument of identity, slender enough in itself, falls to the ground, when any example is produced from any third writer. One of the contemporary antagonists of *Junius* says:—

“*As great a liar as Junius* is become an universal proverb as far as your writings have been dispersed; other characters are sometimes called in aid to illustrate other sorts of villainy; but in this you are indisputably pre-eminent; you have an exclusive right to this species of notoriety; and as long as the memory of *Junius* exists, so long will exist the simile of *As great a liar as Junius*. It was one of the characteristics of Charters, *that he could cheat without the mask of honesty; that he could lye without the mask of veracity,* may be as shining an ornament to the epitaph of *Junius*. But when I cautioned you against FALSE FACTS, I meant not that you

most prevalent one," [in favour of Burke, the Jesuit of St. Omer's,] "let me observe that Junius never speaks of Mr. Grenville with disrespect; that, when he speaks of *times* and *measures*, in which *Mr. Grenville* bore a principal share, and which he attacks with great freedom, he avoids even the name of *Mr. Grenville*; for he describes his *Grace* as called in 'to support an administration, which *Lord Bute* had pretended to leave in full possession of 'authority; but which, (as he would have us believe,) 'became servile to my *Lord Bute* from the moment 'of his *Grace's* accession to the system, and by 'means of stipulations between the Duke and the 'favourite.' Here he transfers all the *odium* of that servility from his friend, *Mr. Grenville*, to the *Duke of Bedford*; though in truth it belongs equally to both. What is the ground of his inveteracy to the *Duke of Bedford*? He shall tell you in his own words:— 'Apparently *united with Mr. Grenville*, 'you waited until *Lord Rockingham's* feeble administration should dissolve in its own weakness. 'The moment their dismissal was suspected etc., 'you thought it no disgrace to solicit once more the 'friendship of *Lord Bute*,' etc. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* *The Duke of Bedford* forsook *Mr. Grenville*, and

should rely alone on the virulence of declamation—much less that you should refer to your exploded accusations only to remind the public of the infinity of your falsehoods; and least of all that you should receive that unfortunate *cream-coloured* phrase, reviving with it the Shakespearian retort,

*The Devil damn thee black, thou cream-faced loon,  
Where goest thou that goose-look?*

Yet all this, and nothing else, is contained in your last *Letter*. Sure 'tis a mere exercise of scurrility. Where's your spirit? where's your invention? All lost in scurrility and *cream-colour*. Awake, Junius! let not your talents be confined to the most despicable species of writing:

*Nec circa vilem patulumque rotaberis orbem."*

THE SUPERIOR OF THE JESUITS, in the *Public Advertiser*, Dec. 3, 1771.

therefore Junius persecutes him with such rancour. But his panegyric upon the Stamp-Act in his very first *Letter*, and his anxious vindication of *Mr. Grenville* (in *Letter XVI*, addressed to *Mr. Justice Blackstone*,) from the most vulnerable and most indefensible part of his political life, announce to us that gentleman's attached and partial friend. Out of many other passages, that point out the suspected person," [*William Gerard Hamilton, Esq.*] "I must remind the reader of two or three instances, which evince that *Junius*, at two critical periods, disclaims Lord Rockingham and Lord Chatham: — ' When ' *the Duke of Cumberland's* first negociation failed, ' and when the favourite was pushed to the last extremity, you saved him by joining in an administration, in which *Lord Chatham* had refused to engage. *Lord Chatham* formed his last administration upon principles, which you certainly concurred in, or you could never have been placed at the head of the Treasury. By deserting those principles, (in which he found you were secretly supported in the closet,) you soon forced him to withdraw his name from an administration, which had been formed upon the credit of it.' What caution is here used to avoid a compliment to *Lord Chatham*, or to these unstated principles in the midst of invective upon the *D. of G.* for deserting them! The principles, for aught that appears, might have been the same, which at *Lord Rockingham's* coming in had saved the favourite. I presume the conclusion is not a rash one from these premises, (to omit for the present several others,) that the patron of *Junius* is the person characterised in my last, (*Lord Temple.*) "

SCÆVOLA, in the *Public Advertiser*, Nov. 18, 1771.

# APPENDIX,

CONTAINING,

## I.

*A Collection of the Most Remarkable Images, Illustrations, Sentiments, and Expressions,*

CONTAINED IN THE

**Letters of Junius.**

## II.

THE OPINIONS OF JOHN WILLIAM BERGER; OF JOHN NICHOLAS FUNCCIUS; OF HENRY VALOIS; OF PETER BURMANN; OF JOHN AUGUST ERNESTI; OF JOHN GOTTLIEB HEINECCIUS; OF JOHN MATTHEW GESNER; OF J. N. NICLAS; AND OF Jo. L. MOSHEIM;

ON THE

*Laconic, Attic, Rhodian, and Asiatic  
Style of Eloquence.*

## III.

EXTRACT FROM SIR PHILIP FRANCIS'S LETTER MIS-  
SIVE TO LORD HOLLAND, Lond. 1816. 8vo. p. 62.

## IV.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. GREEN'S DIARY OF A LOVER  
OF LITERATURE, RESPECTING BURKE.



## APPENDIX.

---

To the kindness of a very intelligent friend I am indebted for the following paper : the extracts are made only from *Letters*, which have the signature of *Junius*.

“ I have at last completed the task I so long engaged in, of collecting the chief images and illustrations in the *Letters* of Junius. Their number, you will see, is pretty considerable, and their character highly diversified — from the *military art* there are 7; from the *medical science* 12; from the *terms of commerce* 6; from the *Scriptures* and *religion* 18; from *objects in nature* 22; from *classical subjects* 13; from the *fine arts* 5; from *mechanics* 4; besides 13 of a *miscellaneous* kind. I have transcribed, moreover, some remarkable *passages* and *phrases*, all the striking references, which I have found to *Scotland* and *Ireland*, and the marked sentiments on *government* and *governors*. In *Scotticisms* and *Irishisms* I am not competent to decide.”

Nov. 26, 1826.

“*A Collection of the most remarkable Images, Illustrations, Sentiments, and Expressions, contained in the LETTERS OF JUNIUS.*

1. “As if an appeal to the public were no more than a military *coup de main*, where a brave man has no rules to follow but the dictates of his *courage*.” (1, 70.)

2. “A submissive administration was at last gradually collected from the deserters of all parties, interests, and connections, and nothing remained but to find a *leader* for these gallant, well-disciplined troops.” (1, 167.)



3. "His palace is besieged — the lines of circumvallation are drawing around him, and unless he finds a resource in his own activity, or in the attachment of the real friends of his family, the best of princes must submit to the confinement of a state-prisoner until your Grace's death or some less fortunate event shall raise the siege." (1, 245.)

4. "I may quit the service, but it would be absurd to suspect me of *desertion*." (2, 205.)

5. "The favor of this country constitutes the *shield*, which defends him against a thousand daggers — *desertion* would disarm him." (2, 347.)

6. "The wary Wedderburne, and the pompous Suffolk never threw away the scabbard, nor ever went upon a *forlorn hope*." (2, 358.)

7. "When the contest turns upon the interpretation of the laws, you cannot, without a formal surrender of all your reputation, yield *the post of honour* even to Lord Chatham." (2, 443.)

8. "When all your instruments of amputation are prepared — when the unhappy patient lies bound at your feet, without the possibility of resistance, by what infallible rule will you direct the operation? When you propose to cut away the rotten parts, can you tell us what parts are perfectly sound? Are there any limits in fact or in theory to inform you at what point you must stop — at what point the mortification ends?" (1, 289. Correspondence with Wilkes.)

9. "The *wound* is curable, and the *scar* shall be no disgrace to you." (1, 314.)

10. "It is not the *disorder*, but the *physician*." (1, 51.)

11. "We are governed by counsels, from which a reasonable man can expect *no remedy* but *poison*, *no relief* but *death*." (1, 61.)

12. "His views and situation required a creature

void of all these properties, and he was forced to go through every division, resolution, composition, and refinement of political chemistry, before he happily arrived at the *caput mortuum* of vitriol in your Grace." (1, 167.)

13. "To me they originally owe nothing but a healthy, sanguine constitution." (Dedication.)

14. "The noble spirit of the metropolis is the *life-blood* of the state collected at *the heart*; from that point it *circulated* with health and vigour through every *artery* of the constitution." (2, 115.)

15. "When the *poison* of their doctrines has *tainted* the natural benevolence of his disposition; when their insidious counsels have *corrupted* the *stamina* of his government, what *antidote* can restore him to his political *health* and honour, but the firm sincerity of his English subjects?" (2, 125.)

16. "No man regards an *eruption* on the surface, when the *noble parts* are invaded, and he feels a *mortification* approaching to his *heart*." (2, 153.)

17. "With regard to the press for seamen, it does not follow that the *symptoms* may not be softened, although the *distemper* cannot be *cured*." (2, 345.)

18. "He advertizes for *patients*, collects all the *diseases* of the heart, and turns a royal palace into an *hospital for incurables*." (2, 439.)

19. "I shall only say, give me a healthy vigorous *constitution*, and I shall hardly consult my looking-glass to discover a blemish upon my *skin*." (1, 311.)

20. "Our enemies treat us as the cunning *trader* does the unskilful Indian — they magnify their generosity, when they give us *baubles* of little proportionate value for *gold* and *ivory*." (2, 359.)

21. "This worthy nobleman has long *dealt* in virtue; there has been a large *consumption* of it in

his own family, and in the way of *traffick* I dare say, he has *bought* and *sold* more than half the representative integrity of the nation." (1, 145.)

22. " Like *bad money*, it may be *current* for a time, but it will soon be *cried down*." (2, 121.)

23. " Gave you a generous *credit* for the future blessings of your reign and *paid* you *in advance* the dearest *tribute* of their affections." (2, 67.)

24. " If the King had not graciously affixed his *stamp* and given it *currency* among his subjects." (2, 243.)

25. Having sold the nation to you in the *gross*, they will undoubtedly protect you in the *detail*, (2, 54.)

26. " By laying in a moderate *stock* of reputation, setting up the royal patronage to *auction*." (2, 53. 54.)

27. " They are the *trustees*, not the *owners* of the estate — the *fee-simple* is in us — they cannot *alienate*, they cannot *waste*." (Dedication 1, 5.)

28. " Whichever way he flies, the *hue and cry* of the country pursues him." (1, 246.)

29. " He is the *tenant* of the day, and has no *interest* in the *inheritance*." (2, 133.)

30. " Like broken *tenants*, who have had warning to *quit the premises*, they curse their *landlord*, destroy the *fixtures*, throw every thing into confusion and care not what mischief they do to the *estate*. (2, 104.)

31. " Are these glorious privileges the *birth-right* of the people, or are we only *tenants* at the will of the ministry?" (2, 44.)

32. " If his royal inclination should unfortunately be discovered, it drops *like an acid* and turns the election." (2, 257.)

33. " Recorded honours shall gather round his monument and *thicken* over him — it is a *solid fabric*, and will *support the laurels*, that *adorn it*." (2, 311.)

34. "I can *brush away the swarming insects*, whenever I think proper." (1, 295.)

35. "*The coldest bodies warm with opposition — the hardest sparkle in collision.*" (2, 71.)

36. "The gentle *breath* of peace would leave him on the *surface* neglected and unremoved — it is only the *tempest*, that lifts him from his place." (2, 85.)

37. "He never weeps but like an *April-shower*, with a lambent ray of sunshine upon his countenance." (2, 401.)

38. "I turn with pleasure from that barren waste, in which no salutary *plant takes root*, no *verdure quickens*, to a character *fertile*, as I willingly believe, in every good and great qualification." (2, 441.)

39. "In the *shipwreck* of the state, trifles *float* and are preserved, while every thing solid and valuable *sinks to the bottom* and is lost for ever." (2, 360.)

40. "The *feather*, that adorns the royal-bird, supports his *flight* — strip him of his *plumage*, and you fix him to the earth." (2, 194.)

41. "I am not sanguine enough to expect a more *plentiful harvest* of parliamentary virtue in one year than another." (2, 210.)

42. "Charles Fox is yet in *blossom*."

43. "The properties of a patriot are perishable in the individual, but there is a quick succession of subjects and the *breed* is worth preserving. (2, 357.)

44. "In collision with their virtue perhaps he may *take fire*." (2, 347.)

45. "The *mine* was sunk — the *combustibles* provided, and Welbore Ellis, the *Guy-Faux* of the fable, waited only for the signal of command." (2, 129.)

46. "Their lives were like a *rapid torrent*, brilliant in prospect, though useless and dangerous in its course — in the dull, unanimated existence of other

princes we see nothing but a sickly, *stagnant water*, which taints the *atmosphere* without fertilizing the *soil*." (2, 152.)

47. A character of this sort is the *soil* fittest to *produce* that obstinate bigotry in politics and religion, which begins with a meritorious sacrifice of the understanding, and finally conducts the monarch and the martyr to the block." (2, 152.)

48. "The *rays* of *royal* indignation *collected* upon him served only to *illuminate*, and could not *consume*." (2, 71.)

49. "Here stands a precedent — a land-mark to direct us through a *troubled sea* of controversy." (2, 72.)

50. "Clearing the *fountain* is the best and shortest way to purify the *stream*." (1, 293.)

51. "Every common *dauber* writes RASCAL and VILLAIN under his *pictures*, because the pictures themselves have neither character nor *resemblance* — but the works of a *master* require no index — his *features* and *colouring* are taken from nature." (1, 125.)

52. "Struck with the principal *figure*, we do not sufficiently mark in what manner the *canvass* is filled up." (2, 35.)

53. "To a mind like yours there was no other road to fame but by the destruction of a *noble fabric*, which you thought had been too long the admiration of mankind." (1, 169.)

54. "The bravest and freest nations have sometimes submitted to a temporary surrender of their liberties, in order to establish them for ever — at a crisis of public calamity or danger, the prudence of the state placed a confidence in the virtue of some distinguished citizen, and gave him power sufficient to preserve or to oppress his country. Such was the *Roman Dictator*, and while his office was con-

fined to a short period, and only applied as a remedy to the disasters of an unsuccessful war, it was usually attended with the most important advantages, and left no dangerous precedent behind." (2, 451.)

55. "As if he pulled down an ancient *Temple of Venus*, and could bury all decency and shame under the *ruins*." (1, 154.)

56. "But mine is an inferior ministerial office in the *Temple of Justice* — I have bound the *victim*, and dragged him to the *altar*." (2, 443.)

57. "It will be a *scene in Ædipus* without the *distress*." (1, 155.)

58. "They pile up reluctant quarto upon solid folio, as if their labours, because they are *gigantic*, could contend with truth and heaven." (1, 214.)

59. "As well might *Verres* have returned to *Sicily*." (1, 247.)

60. "The *odia in longum jaciens, quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret*, I thought had only belonged to the worst character of antiquity — the *text* is in *Tacitus* — you know best where to look for the *commentary*." (2, 8.)

61. "Let it be impressed upon your minds, let it be instilled into your children, that the liberty of the press is the *palladium* of all the civil, political, and religious rights of an Englishman." (Dedication 1, 344.)

62. "Are these terms, which men, who are in earnest, make use of, when the *salus reipublicæ* is at stake?" (1, 284.)

63. "Was he *winged like a messenger*, or stationary like a sentinel?"

————— 'like Maia's son he stood,  
'And shook his plumes';

*videlicet* at the door of Lady — n's cabinet. His zeal in the execution of this honourable office promoted him to another door, where he also stands *sentry*;

——— ‘*virgâque levem coercet  
Aureâ turbam.*’

(3, 443. signed *Veteran.*)

64. “I see no reason why a wise man may not unite the public virtues of *Cato* with the indulgence of *Epicurus*.” (1, 314.)

65. And do you now, after a retreat not very like that of *Scipio*, presume to intrude yourself unthought of, uncalled for, upon the patience of the public? (1, 78.)

66. “The *prætorian bands*, enervated and debauched as they were, had still strength enough to awe the *Roman* populace, but when the distant *legions* took the alarm, they marched to *Rome*, and gave away the *empire*.” (2, 81.)

67. “Not even the *sacred shield* of cowardice should protect him.” (2, 90.)

68. “I appeal to Miss Wilkes, whose judgment I hear highly commended, would she think herself much indebted to her favourite admirer, if he forced a most disagreeable *partner* upon her for a long winter’s night, because he could not *dance* with her himself?” (1, 271.)

69. “He has treated our opinion a little too cavalierly — a young man is apt to rely too confidently upon himself to be as attentive to his *mistress*, as a polite and passionate *lover* ought to be.” (2, 349.)

70. “I too am no enemy to good-fellowship, and have often cursed that *canting parson* for wishing to deny you your *claret*.” (1, 313.)

71. “Recovered from the errors of his youth, from the distraction of play and the *bewitching* smiles of *Burgundy*, behold him exercising the whole strength of his clear unclouded faculties in the service of the *crown*.” (1, 58.)

72. “Accept of this address as a *prologue* to more

important *scenes*, in which you may be called upon to *act and suffer*." (2, 159.)

73. "Life is no more than a *dramatic scene*, in which the *hero* should preserve his consistency to the last." (1, 246.)

74. "Is he only the *punch of puppet-show* to speak as he is prompted, by the chief *juggler* behind the curtain?" (2, 181.)

75. "These are *mysteries*, of which we must not pretend to judge by experience; and truly, I fear, we shall perish in the *desert*, before we arrive at the *land of promise*." (1, 162.)

76. "We owe it to the bounty of Providence that the completest *depravity* of the heart is sometimes strangely united with a confusion of mind, which counteracts the most favourite principles and makes the same man *treacherous* without art, and a *hypocrite* without deceiving." (1, 164.)

77. "*He calls for papers and witnesses* with a sort of triumphant security, as if nothing could be true, but what could be *proved in a court of justice* — yet a *religious* man might have remembered upon what foundation some *truths* most interesting to mankind have been received and established. If it were not for the internal *evidence*, which the purest of *religions* carries with it, what would have become of his once well-quoted *Decalogue* and of the meekness of his *Christianity*?" (2, 25.)

78. "An honest man, like the true *religion*, appeals to the understanding, or modestly confides in the internal *evidence* of his conscience — the *impostor* employs *force* instead of *argument*, imposes *silence* where he cannot *convince*, and propagates his character by the *sword*." (2, 182.)

79. "There are *proselytes* from *atheism*, but none from *superstition*." (2, 207.)

80. "The resentment of a *priest* is implacable —



no sufferings can soften,—no penitence can appease him.” (2, 313.)

81. “Avail yourself of all the *unforgiving piety* of the court you live in, and *bless God that you are not as other men are — extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican* — in a heart void of feeling, the *laws of honour* and good faith may be violated with *impunity*, and there you may safely indulge your genius — but the *laws* shall not be violated, even by your holy zeal to oppress a sinner.” (1, 121.)

82. “Stand forth, my Lord; for *thou art the man.*” (1, 167.)

83. “Divided as they are into a thousand forms of *policy and religion*, there is one point, in which they all agree — they equally detest the pageantry of a *King*, and the supercilious hypocrisy of a *Bishop*. (2, 77.)

84. “Yet, while the whole kingdom was agitated with anxious expectation upon one great point, you meanly evaded the question, and instead of the explicit firmness and decision of a *King*, gave us nothing but the misery of a ruined grazier, and the *whining piety of a Methodist.*” (2, 93.)

85. “But in truth I have left no room for accommodation with the *piety of St. James’s* — my offences are not to be redeemed by *recantation or repentance.*” (2, 206.)

86. “Permit me to recommend him, (Horne Tooke,) to your Grace’s protection — you will find him copiously gifted with those qualities of the heart, which usually direct you in the choice of your friendships — he too was Mr. Wilkes’s friend, and as incapable as you are of the liberal resentment of a gentleman — No, my Lord, it was the solitary, vindictive malice of a *Monk*, brooding over the infirmities of his friend until he thought they *quicken*ed into public life; and feasting with a rancorous rapture

upon the sordid catalogue of his distresses. Now let him go back to his *cloister* — *the church* is a proper retreat for him — in his principles he is already a *Bishop*." (2, 256.)

87. "In some men, there is a malignant passion to destroy the works of genius, literature and freedom — the *Vandal* and the *Monk* find equal gratification in it." (2, 325.)

88. "A Prince, (whose *piety* and self-denial one would think might secure him from such a multitude of worldly necessities,) with an annual revenue of near a million sterling, wants money." (2, 326.)

89. "His Majesty's predecessors, (excepting that worthy family, from which you, my Lord, are unquestionably descended,) had some generous qualities in their composition; with vices, I confess, or frailties in abundance. They were Kings, or gentlemen, not *hypocrites*, or *Priests*; they were at the head of the *church*, but did not know the value of their office; they said their *prayers* without ceremony, and had too little *priestcraft* in their understandings to reconcile the sanctimonious *forms of religion*, with the utter destruction of the *morality* of their people." (2, 324.)

90. "Our *religious*, benevolent, generous Sovereign has no objection to selling his own timber, to his own admiralty, to repair his own ships, nor to putting the money into his own pocket. People of a *religious* turn naturally adhere to the principles of the *church* — whatever they acquire, falls into *mortmain*." (2, 326 — 327.)

91. "From whatever origin your influence in this country arises, it is a phænomenon in the history of human virtue and understanding. Good men can hardly believe the fact — wise men are unable to account for it — *religious* men find exercise for their *faith* and make it the last effort of their

*piety* not to repine against Providence." (2, 337.)

92. "The fundamental principles of *Christianity* may still be preserved, though every zealous *sectary* adheres to his own *exclusive doctrine* and *pious ecclesiastics* make it a part of their *religion to persecute one another*," (2, 346.)

93. "In a great business there is nothing so fatal as *cunning management*." (1, 273.)

94. "*Anger* has some claim to *indulgence* and railing is usually a relief to the mind." (1, 193.)

95. "To alienate even our own rights, would be a crime as much *more enormous* than *suicide* as a life of civil security and freedom is superior to a base existence." (1, 224.)

96. "There may be a vanity perhaps in a singular way of thinking; but when a man professes a want of those feelings, which do honour to the multitude, he hazards something infinitely more important than the character of his understanding." (2, 18.)

97. "Sir William Draper should have entered boldly into the detail of indigence relieved, of arts encouraged, of science patronized, men of learning protected, and works of genius rewarded." (2, 19.)

98. "I think that of all the vices *avarice* is most apt to taint and corrupt the heart." (2, 22.)

99. "*Women*, and men like *women*, are timid, irresolute, and vindictive; their passions counteract each other, and make the same creature at one moment hateful, and at another contemptible." (2, 166.)

100. "*Honour* and *honesty* must not be renounced, although a thousand *modes of right and wrong* were to occupy the degrees of morality between *Zeno* and *Epicurus*." (2, 346.)

101. "I was not born to be a *commentator* even of my own *works*." (Preface 1, 349.)

102. "A man, who honestly engages in a public cause, must prepare himself for events, which will

at once demand his utmost patience, and rouse his warmest indignation." (1, 276.)

103. "But my own zeal, I perceive, betrays me; I will endeavour to keep a better guard upon my temper, and apply to your judgment in the most cautious and measured language." (1, 276.)

104. "Far be it from me to insinuate the most distant reflection upon the *army*: on the contrary, I honour and esteem the *profession*." (2, 41.)

105. "There is hardly a period, at which the most irregular character may not be redeemed; the mistakes of one sex, find a retreat in devotion, those of the other in patriotism." (2, 70.)

106. "The first foundation of *friendship* is not the power of conferring benefits, but the equality, with which they are received and may be returned — the fortune, which made you a King, forbid you to have a friend." (2, 88.)

107. "Though I use the terms of art, do not injure me so much as to suspect I am a *lawyer* — I had as lief be a Scotchman; it is the encouragement given to disputes about titles, which has supported that *iniquitous profession* at the expense of the community." (1, 312.)

108. "I am no *lawyer by profession*, nor do I pretend to be more deeply read, than every English gentleman should be in the *laws* of his country. If, therefore, the principles I maintain, are truly constitutional, I shall not think myself answered, though I should be convicted of a mistake in *terms*, or of misapplying the language of the *law*." (1, 10.)

109. "As to *lawyers*, their *profession* is supported by the indiscriminate defence of right and wrong,\*

\* [“Before, however, he proceeded to say one word upon this case, he would take leave to make one observation upon the course of argument adopted by Mr. Sugden, in which he wished it to be considered that a man, who had never committed an offence like

and I confess I have not that opinion of their knowledge or integrity, to think it necessary that they should decide for me upon a plain constitutional question." (1, 158.)

110. "You are a *lawyer*, sir, and know better than I do upon what particular occasions a talent for misrepresentation may be fairly exerted." (1, 195.)

111. "The cunning Scotchman, (Lord Mansfield,) never speaks truth without a fraudulent design." (2, 554.)

112. "I will not contend with you in point of *composition*. You are a *scholar*, Sir William, and if I am truly informed, you write *Latin* with almost as much purity as English — suffer me, then, for I am a *plain unlettered man* to continue that stile of interrogation, which suits my capacity." (1, 100.)

113. "You will then have reason to be thankful, if you are permitted to retire to that seat of learning, which in contemplation of the system of your life, the comparative purity of your manners with those of their *High Steward*, and a thousand other recommending circumstances, has chosen you to encourage the growing virtue of their youth, and to preside over their education \* — Whenever the spirit of distributing Prebends and Bishopricks shall have departed from you, you will find that learned seminary perfectly recovered from the delirium of an

that of Mr. Egar, was in no better situation as to character or belief than the man, who had unfortunately yielded to temptation. This observation of his learned friend confirmed him in the opinion, which he had always entertained of the justness and propriety of what the author of the *Letters of Junius* had said with regard to the effect, which the habit of indiscriminately defending right and wrong had upon gentlemen engaged in the profession, to which he had the honour to belong."

Mr. Heald's Speech in the Chancery-case of *Maloney and Maloney*, *Times* Dec. 10, 1827.]

\* The Duke of Grafton was Chancellor, and Lord Sandwich High-Steward of the University of Cambridge.

*installation*, and what in truth it ought to be, a peaceful scene of slumber and thoughtless meditation, the venerable *tutors of the University* will no longer distress your modesty by proposing you for a pattern to their *pupils* — the learned dulness of declamation will be silent—and even the venal *muse*, though happiest in fiction, will forget your virtues.” (1, 172.)

114. “ This may be *logic at Cambridge*, or at the treasury, but among men of sense and honour it is folly, or villany in the extreme.” (2, 315.)

115, “ Our gracious Sovereign has had wonderful success in creating new attachments to his person and family. He owes it, I presume, to the regular system he has pursued in the *mystery of conversion*. He began with an experiment upon the Scotch, and concludes with *converting Mr. Horne*. What a pity it is that the *Jews* should be condemned by Providence to wait for a *Messiah* of their own !” (2, 317.)

116. “ I speak to men, and to their experience, and will not descend to answer the little sneering sophistries of a *collegian*.” (2, 305.)

117. “ If I am candid enough to admit that this is the very logic taught at *St. Omer's*, you will readily allow that it is the constant practice in the *Court of King's Bench*.” (2, 368,)

118. “ If *Malagrida* had any interest with the present ministry, I should have no doubt that this was one of his subtle contrivances. An ostensible engagement, with a mental reservation, is the first principle of the *morale relachée*, professed and inculcated by the *Society of Jesus*.” (3, 70. sign. C.)

119. “ The author, indeed, calls God to witness for him, with all the sincerity, and in the very terms of an *Irish evidence*, to the best of his knowledge and belief.” (1, 118.)

120. “ They, (*the Irish*,) despise the miserable

Governor you have sent them, because he is the creature of Lord Bute — nor is it from any natural confusion in their ideas, that they are so ready to confound the original of a King with the disgraceful representation of him." (2, 76.)

121. "But the complexion of the time will suffer no man to be *Vice-Treasurer of Ireland*, with impunity." (2, 129.)

122. "At that very moment the *Irish* negotiation was probably begun — come forward, thou worthy representative of Lord Bute, and tell this insulted country, who advised the King to appoint Mr. Luttrell Adjutant General to the army in *Ireland*?" (2, 156.)

123. "The people of *Ireland* have been uniformly plundered and oppressed." (2, 75.)

124. "I do not wonder at the unremitting rancour, with which the Duke of Bedford and his adherents invariably speak of a nation, which we well know has been too much injured to be easily forgiven. But why must Junius be an *Irishman*? *The absurdity of his writings betrays him* — waiving all consideration of the insult offered by *Modestus*, to the declared judgment of the people, (they may well bear this among the rest,) let us follow the several instances, and try whether the charge be fairly supported." (2, 29.)

125. "You would fain be thought to take no share in government, while, in reality, you are the *main-spring of the machine*." (2, 179.)

126. "We incline the *balance* as effectually by lessening the *weight* in one *scale*, as by increasing it in the other." (2, 265.)

127. "The *scales* are equally poised — it is not the printer's fault, if the greater *weight inclines the balance*." (1, 93.)

128. "Is this the wisdom of a great minister, or

is it the ominous vibration of a *pendulum?*" (2, 149.)

129. "Permit me to begin with paying a just tribute to *Scotch* sincerity, wherever I find it. I own I am not apt to confide in the professions of gentlemen of that country, and when they *smile*, I feel an involuntary emotion to guard myself against mischief." (2, 160.)

130. "I speak tenderly of this gentleman; for when treachery is in question, I think we should make allowances for a *Scotchman*." (2, 206.)

131. "Here, too, we trace the *little* prudential policy of a *Scotchman*." (2, 179.)

132. "Lord Littleton's integrity and judgment are unquestionable; yet he is known to admire that cunning *Scotchman*, and verily believes him an honest man." (2, 305.)

133. "National reflections, I confess, are not to be justified in theory, nor upon any general principles—to know how well they are deserved, and how justly they have been applied, we must have the evidence of facts before us—we must be conversant with the *Scots* in private life, and observe their principles of acting to us and to each other—the characteristic prudence, the selfish nationality, the indefatigable smile, the persevering assiduity, the everlasting profession of a discreet and moderate resentment—if the instance were not too important for an experiment, it might not be amiss to confide a little to their integrity—without any abstract reasoning upon causes and effects, we shall soon be convinced by *experience* that the *Scots*, transplanted from their own country, are always a distinct and separate body from the people, who receive them—in other settlements they only love themselves, in England they cordially love themselves, and as cordially hate their neighbours." (Preface 1, 380.)



134. "The favour of *Princes* is a perishable commodity." (1, 145.)

135. "*Oliver Cromwell* had the merit of conducting *Charles I.* to the scaffold." (1, 156.)

136. "I speak from common report and opinion only, when I attribute to Mr. Sawbridge a speculative opinion in favour of a *republic* in the personal conduct and manners of the man. I cannot be mistaken — he has shewn himself possessed of that *republican* firmness, which the times require, and by which an English gentleman may be as usefully, and as honourably distinguished, as any citizen of ancient *Rome*, of *Athens*, or *Lacedæmon*." (2, 349.)

137. "Yet, though I hope *the English constitution* will for ever preserve its original *monarchical* form, I would have the manners of the people purely and strictly *republican*." (2, 348.)

138. "I should be glad to mortify those contemptible creatures, who call themselves *noblemen*, whose worthless importance depends entirely upon their influence over boroughs, which cannot be safely diminished but by increasing the power of the counties at large." (1, 290.)

139. "The arbitrary power of fine and imprisonment assumed by these men would be a disgrace to any form of legal *government* not purely *aristocratical*." (1, 308.)

140. "Nothing can be more true than what you say about *great men* — they are indeed a worthless, pitiful race." (1, 320.)

141. "Lay aside the wretched formalities of a *King*, and speak to your *subjects* with the spirit of a *man*, and in the language of a *gentleman*." (2, 87.)

142. "How long, and to what extent a *King of England* may be protected by the forms, when he violates the spirit of the *constitution*, deserves to be considered." (1, 42.)

143. "To provide at the public expense for every creature, that bears the name of *Manners*." (1, 58.)

144. "Among *these men* I cannot but distinguish the meanest of the human species, the *whole race of Conways*."

145. "Even the *callous pride* of Lord Egremont was alarmed." (1, 241.)

146. "A *Stuart* and a *Murray* should sympathize with each other." (2, 356.)

147. "Where will the gracious *Monarch* look for assistance, when the wretched Grafton could forget his obligations to his master, and desert him for a hollow alliance with such a man as the Duke of Bedford?" (1, 245.)

148. "To possess himself of another man's *right*, and to *maintain* it in defiance of public shame as well as justice, bespoke a degree of zeal or of depravity, which all the favour of a *pious Prince* could hardly requite." (1, 155.)

149. "He has discovered a new line in the human character — he has degraded even the name of *Luttrell*, and gratified his father's most sanguine expectations." (1, 156.)

150. "If their present professions were sincere, I think they could not but be highly offended at seeing a question concerning parliamentary privilege unnecessarily started at a season so unfavourable to the House of Commons, and by so very mean and insignificant a person as the minor *Onslow*." (2, 207.)

151. "With a *rate* of abilities, which Lord *Weymouth* very justly looks down upon with contempt." (2, 322.)

152. "I speak to the people *as one of the people*." (2, 346.)

153. "As it is, whenever he changes his servants, he is sure to have the people in that instance *of his side*." (3, 116.)

154. "I am persuaded he would have the reasonable part of the Americans of *his side*." (3, 160.)

155. "Here, my Lord, you have fortune of *your side*." (2, 169.)

156. "Answer for me *so far forth*." (1, 316.)

157. *So far forth* as it operates, it constitutes a House of Commons, which does not represent the people." (1, 135.)

158. "I would tell him, it contained the plan, upon which Mr. Crosby and you were desirous to act, provided he would engage to concur in it *bonâ fide, so far forth* as he was concerned." (1, 273.)

159. "The cases to prove that the assumed privileges of either House of Parliament are not *examinable* elsewhere, than in their own houses." (3, 362.)

160. "I am sorry to tell you, Sir William, that in this article your first *fact is false*." (1, 75.)

161. "*Any colour of decency*." "*Colour of truth*." "*Ray of wisdom*." "*Ray of understanding*." "*In the name of God and the laws*." "*In the name of common sense*." "*A fund of good sense*." "*A vain punctilio*." "*Trampling upon the laws*." "*Sulk into the closet*." "*He has tampered with a pitiful portion*," &c. "*Little infected with the prudence of your country*." "*As a salvo for his own reputation*." "*A hopeful subject of merriment*." "*Mr. Wilkes's patriotism thrives by persecution*." "*Copiously gifted*." "*Rancorous rapture*." "*A curious felicity*." "*Blinded by your resentment*." "*The low rate, at which you seem to measure my understanding*." "*Disgrace the lips of an idiot*." "*Colourable charge*." "*Solid satisfaction*." "*Solid ignorance*." "*This consummately bad man*." "*A single spark of personal resolution*." "*'Twere in a fit of foaming frantic passion*." "*Compulsive assent*." "*Plain understanding*." "*Plain man*." "*Indefeasible infamy*." (vols. 1, & 2.)

162. "Is the union of *Blifil* and *Black George* no longer a romance?" (2, 335.)

163. "The Ministry have realized the compendious ideas of *Caligula* — they know that the liberty, the laws, and the property of an Englishman have, in truth, but *one neck*, and that to violate the freedom of an election strikes deeply at them all." (2, 154.)

164. "No man is better acquainted with the bounty of government than you are —

*ton impudence*

*Temeraire viellard, aura sa recompense.*"

(1, 123.)

165. "I cannot express my opinion of the present ministry more exactly than in the words of *Sir R. Steele*, 'That we are governed by a set of drivellers, whose folly takes away all dignity from distress, and makes even calamity ridiculous.'" (1, 231.)

166. "Speak out, *Grildrig*." (2, 239.)

167. "Yet he must have *bread*, my Lord, or rather he must have *wine* — If you deny him the *cup*, there will be no keeping him within the *pale* of ministry." (2, 249.)

168. "He seems to manufacture his verses for the sole use of the hero, who is supposed to be the subject of them, and that his meaning may not be *exported in foreign bottoms*, sets all translation at defiance." (2, 252.)

169. "The false insidious partizan, who creates or foments the disorder, sees the fruit of his dishonest industry ripen beyond his hopes, and rejoices in the promise of a banquet only delicious to such an appetite as his own." (2, 345.)

170. "Our dogs and horses are only English upon English ground, but patriotism, it seems, may be improved by *transplanting*." (2, 357.)

171. "The very *sunshine* you live in, is a prelude to your dissolution — When you are *ripe*, you shall be *plucked*." (2, 406.)

172. "Like other *rakes*, he may perhaps live to see his error, but not until he has *ruined his estate*." (1, 163.)

173. "When a *victim* is marked out by the ministry, this judge will offer himself to *perform the sacrifice*." (1, 60.)

174. "An *academical* education has given you an unlimited command over the most beautiful figures of speech — Masks, hatchets, racks, and vipers dance through your letters in all the mazes of metaphorical confusion — these are the gloomy companions of a disturbed imagination — the melancholy madness of poetry without the inspiration." (1, 439.)

175. "The *vices* operate like *age* — bring on *dis-ease before its time*, and in the *prime of youth* leave the character *broken and exhausted*." (2, 92.)

176. "We were taught to expect that you would not leave the ruin of this country to be completed by other hands, but were determined either to gain a decisive victory over the constitution, or to perish bravely at least behind *the last dyke* of the prerogative." (2, 92.)

177. "On this side there is indeed a precedent so strongly in point, that all the *enchanted castles* of ministerial magic fall before it." (1, 221.)

178. "Let it be my office to collect the *scattered sweets*, till their united virtue tortures the sense." (2, 160.)

179. "Private credit is *wealth* — public honour is *security*." (2, 194.)

180. "The *miser* himself seldom lives to enjoy the fruit of his extortion, but his heir succeeds to him of course, and takes possession without censure — no man expects him to make restitution, and no

matter for his title, he lives quietly on the estate.” (2, 234.)

181. “The first act of his own administration, was to impose that tax upon America, which has since *thrown* the whole continent *into a flame*.” (3, 185.)

[In Mr. Brougham’s recent *Speech on the State of the Law*, (*Times* Febr. 8, 1828.) there is very honourable mention of Lord Mansfield with a reference to the opinion of Junius, which it will be right to quote in this place:—

“Lord Mansfield, whose luminous mind was never undervalued except by those, who were either jealous of his fame, or ignorant of his value in the science of jurisprudence, — whom no one ever attacked for a deficiency in his knowledge of the laws, (with the exception of ONE GREAT WRITER, whose style gave currency for a time to the assertion, though accompanied by an obvious want of legal knowledge in himself,) that great man had noticed many of the discrepancies of the law with the eye of a philosopher, who was not to be changed by the habits of the practitioner.”]

*The Opinions of John William Berger; of John Nicholas Funccius; of Henry Valois; of Peter Burmann; of John August Ernesti; of John Gottlieb Heineccius; of John Matthew Gesner; of J. N. Niclas; and of Jo. L. Mosheim, on the Læconic, Attic, Rhodian, and Asiatic Style of Eloquence.*

## I.

“ Hæc Xenophonti tribuit Aristides, hæc dat historiæ, atque adeo commendat, Lucianus, aut, quisquis sub hoc latitat nomine, qui, cum nihil divinum humanumque relinquat intactum, et Syrum alias, alias Achivum, se ferat, videtur ita licentiæ scribendi consuluisse, ut, una cum patria, ipsum verum celaret nomen. Ille vero omnem, intemptiva arte compositum, historiæ ornatum fastidit, æque ac muliebrem illum crocotæ purpuræque habitum, quo amictus in Lydia Hercules servit Omphalæ, amat, contra, ac laudat, in historico lumina neque alte petita, et quæ minimum studii præ se ferre videantur. Sic, cum perite is monet, illa parari condimenta, quibus reddatur similis oratio, tum vero tanto plus capitur voluptatis, quanto magis cuncta creduntur, non molesta præparatione quæsita, sed oblata ultro, sed sponte nata. Quod cum fit, ars ipsum naturæ simulacrum sucipit, eoque involuta integumento, quo minus injicit suspicionis, hoc tectius fallit, non hebetes tantum, quibus cuncta, non valde ac præter modum splendida, videantur inornata, sed interdum etiam sagaciores, cum figura, commotionis et altitudinis lumine veloque, absconditur, ut

præcipit Longinus. Est autem hoc pro certo habendum, ita ut, nisi *venustos* Cæsaris commentarios simul nominasset Cicero, hunc, opinaremur fere, Cæsare, minus attente lecto, ipsa Juliæ artis dissimulatione, multo solertissima, fuisse deceptum. Sed, ut omni sese, vel negligentia vel invidia, culpa liberavit vir, non magis in republica, quam in literarum studiis, optimus ac prudentissimus, sic potest, e contrario, tum curæ quid, tum sagacitatis, desiderari in Rapino, qui neque integrum Tullii iudicium, quod hic fecit de Cæsare, omni ex parte consideravit, neque summum Cæsaris, in arte celanda, artificium, quantum satis est, perspexit. Hoc si diligentius explorasset, non siccum aridumque scribendi genus in Julio notasset, qui tanto plus succi habet ac sanguinis, quanto minus habet tumoris, hoc plus affert prudentiæ, quo plus Atticæ habet siccitatis. Ea vero, qua utebantur Attici et celebrabantur, oratio sicci ac sobrii testis erat iudicii, ASIATICAM loquacitatem, ut luxuriantem, ebriam, insanam despiciebat, nihil redundans, insulsum, impolitum, recipiebat, sed moderata, acuta, limata consecrabatur, insulsiatatem et insolentiam, tanquam insaniam quandam, fugiebat, sanitatem autem et integritatem, quasi religionem et verecundiam oratoris, probabat. Non humilis et abjecta, exilis tamen magis quam tumida, pressior magis quam amplior, non affluens nec tamen sterilis, acutior, illustris tamen, magis propria quam florida, simplex, nec tamen honesti cultus negligens, fuci pigmentorumque fugitans, sed nativi coloris retinens, gravioris etiam ornatus oratorii interdum observans denique quæ brevitate quam verborum abundantia, delectu quam multitudine, integritate quam ostentatione, placere malebat. Hoc dicendi genus ingeniorum æmulationem inter ipsos aluit Latinos, e quibus ne Ciceroni quidem sui defuerunt obtrectatores, quibus parum Atticus videretur ille, cum a Fabio tamen,



tum ab ipso Tullio, responsis, quæ veros ostendant Atticos, excepti. Non aliud, quam tersum illud, ac prudens, Atticæ frugalitatis exemplum, historicis magis commendant sapientes, ac, veterum iudicio convenienter, pronunciat Paullus Benius, historicam loquendi formam, si mundities ab hac retineatur, facile majoribus carere ornamentis, oratione contentam simplici, pura, naturali, quæ Atticam siccitatem referre possit. Sit Cæsar, dum sit Attice, siccus, hoc est, ita limatus sit et emunctus, ut nec inepte, nec odiose, nec putide dicat, insolentiam, tanquam scopulum, sicut ipse consuluit aliis, fugiat, nihil habeat, cui iudicium desit ac modus. Interim, nec Robortellus ubertatem in Cæsare desideravit, et Bisciola docere paravit, Cæsaris *Commentarios*, vel ipsius Tullii iudicio, *ut maxime oratorios atque uberes*, probari. Sebastianus autem Maccius ita iudicavit de Cæsare, ut eum *orationi et animo et spiritum, et ornatum, cum majestate conjunctum*, attulisse, pronunciaret." Jo. Guil. Berger, *de Naturali Pulchritudine Orationis*, Lipsiæ 1720. 4to. p. 152.

"Dicat pro nobis ille, cujus suppedere Germanos haud debet, Petrus Lambecius, qui, cum laudat Tranquillum, de Augusto loquentem, admiratione prudentissimi, in dicendo, speciminis captus excitatusque, hic *totus*, inquit, *locus aureus est, dignissimusque, qui millies legatur, et relegatur, immo vero, qui non ab adolescentibus tantum, sed etiam magistris ipsis, ad verbum ediscatur, ut aliquando tandem cognoscant, quis fuerit genius priscae illius et genuinae, germanæ, Latinitatis sæculi Augusti, quo, ut Suetonius testatur, et ipsa auctorum ejus ævi scripta confirmant, nihil æque damnabatur, quam ASIATICORUM ORATORUM, inanibus sententiis, epithetis, figuris, aliisque intempestivis ineptiis, ornata verborum profusio. Inerat enim, ut Gellius de epi-*

*stolis Augusti loquitur, stilo et eloquentiæ ejus sæculi elegantia orationis neque morosa, neque anxia, sed facilis et simplex, omnis autem prava affectatio, tanquam scopulus, evitabatur. Hæc ille, in ea quidem oratione, qua sese ad enarrationem Titi Livii parat, utique non indigna, quæ referantur hic, nec segniter expendantur.* Berger *l. c.* p. 370.

---

## II.

“ Atqui genus triplex dicendi olim etiam de oratione Græcorum rhetores expertissimi definierunt, ac stilum posuere ASIATICUM, RHODIUM, et ATTICUM. Fabius *Inst. Or.* 12, 10.: — ‘ Mihi autem orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium naturæ videntur, quod ATTICI limati quidem et emuncti nihil inane aut redundans ferebant. ASIANA gens, tumidior alioquin et jactantior, vaniore etiam dicendi gloria inflata est. Tertium mox, qui hæc dividebant, adjecerunt genus RHODIUM, quod velut medium esse, atque ex utroque mixtum volunt,’ etc. Genus itaque dicendi ASIATICUM fuit amplum, copiosum, atque tumidum, longas præ se ferens periodos. Hinc ASIATICI oratores non contemnendi quidem, nec celeritate nec copia; sed parum pressi et nimis redundantes. (Cic. *de Clar. Oratt.* 13.) RHODIUM inter ASIATICUM et ATTICUM tenet medium: quamobrem oratores eo genere incluti M. T. Ciceroni (*l. c.*) dicuntur ASIATICIS saniores et ATTICORUM similiores. ATTICUM fuit paulo pressius et conspicua brevitate absolutum: formæ istius species vel dialectus est LACONISMUS omnium brevissimus, omni ornatu atque etiam figura omni copiaque destitutus. De studiis illorum Cicero

(l. c.) scribit: — ‘ Et Græciæ quidem oratorum  
 ‘ partus atque fontes vides, ad nostrorum annalium  
 ‘ rationem, veteres; ad ipsorum sane, recentes.  
 ‘ Nam antequam delectata est Atheniensium civitas  
 ‘ hac laude dicendi, multa jam memorabilia et in  
 ‘ domesticis, et in bellicis rebus effecerat. Hoc au-  
 ‘ tem studium non erat commune Græciæ, sed pro-  
 ‘ prium Athenarum *etc.* Lacedæmonium vero usque  
 ‘ ad hoc tempus audivi fuisse neminem. Menelaum  
 ‘ ipsum, dulcem illum quidem tradit Homerus, sed  
 ‘ pauca dicentem. Brevitas autem laus est interdum  
 ‘ in aliqua parte dicendi, in universa eloquentia  
 ‘ laudem non habet.’ (Cf. *Erasm. de Cop. Verb. et*  
*Rer.* 1, 5. 6.) Est ergo nobis dicendi genus *sublime*  
 ASIATICUM, *medium* RHODIUM, *tenuè* ATTICUM.  
 LACONICUM, quod nonnulli tribus memoratis specie-  
 bus subjungunt, ab nobis consideratur velut stili  
 tenuis vitium, quod vulgo *jejunum* vocatur. De  
 singulis quædam nunc sigillatim monere, putamus  
 operæ pretium fore. *Stilus sublimis*, qui et circum-  
 ductus, et magnificus, et grandis vocatur, altum sa-  
 pit, atque res non vulgares quadam verborum ma-  
 jestate, eorundemque convenienti structura profert  
 quam elegantissime: ac plurimum longioribus peri-  
 odis, vel periodicis locutionibus, colis item atque  
 commatibus varie et quadam orationis vi commixtis  
 gaudet: ut ornatus et gratiæ causa dicendi amplis-  
 simus aperiatur campus. In hoc genere summus  
 artifex et orator incomparabilis Cicero fuit: cujus  
 inter alia scripta orationes præsertim vivum stili  
 sublimioris exemplum fingunt.\* Licet alii velint  
 istius genus dicendi Ciceronianum, quod sublime et  
 copiosum diximus, RHODIUM ac inter ASIATICUM

\* “ Quod oratores post restauratam Latinitatem, maximi qui-  
 que et inter hos Muretus, Perpinianus, Thilo, Palearius, Buchne-  
 rus, Cellarius, Grævius, Octavius Ferrarius, et Facciolatus quam  
 felicissime imitati fuerunt.”

ATTICUMQUE medium esse. Ita Cellarius (*Diss. Acad.* 475.) ‘ASIATICAM abundantiam nonnulli ei ‘objiciunt, sed frustra, quia non tam ASIATICUS est ‘dicendi genere, quam RHODIUS, quod genus me- ‘dium est inter ATTICUM et ASIATICUM.’ Quomocunque res sese habeat, maximam præ se fert orationis elegantiam et majestatem: quod ex ipsa hujus stili, utut varie a variis eloquentiæ magistris accepta, denominatione patet.” J. N. Funccii *Tractatus de Virili Ætate Latinæ Linguae Pars Altera*, Marb. Catt. 1730. 4to. p. 314.

---

### III.

“Isocratis mentio admonet me ut de Marco Tullio dicam, quem criticæ peritissimum fuisse tot rhetorici ejus libri declarant, in quibus de oratoribus tam Græcis quam Latinis, tam priscis quam recentioribus, egregie judicat. Vel unus ejus liber, qui *Brutus* inscribitur, abunde testatur id quod dixi. Sed et in libro secundo *de Oratore*, de historicis Græcis ac Latinis judicantem Antonium inducit, et quid in Græcorum libris de arte dicendi desideraretur docentem. Atque ut breviter absolvam, nego quemquam in eloquentia posse excellere, qui criticæ peritiam non sit adeptus. Græci quidem Oratores id præcipue studuerunt, ut ATTICE DICERENT. Quis est autem, qui ATTICE possit DICERE, nisi ATTICAM loquendi rationem perdiderit. Atqui de ATTICIS dictionibus disserere proprie criticorum est, ut patet ex Dionysii Halicarnassei *Lexico* et Pollucis *Vocabulario*: atque ob id præcipue criticam artem addiscebant, qui ad eloquentiam aspirabant, ut de Herode Attico superius dixi. De ATTICO genere dicendi disputat

Cicero in *Oratore* c. 16., cui opponitur ASIATICUM, quod laxius erat ac redundantius. Strabo 'Ασ'ατ'ικὸν στῆλον Græce vocat." H. Valesii *Libri duo de Critica* 1, 12. p. 160. "De differentia inter ATTICUM et ASIATICUM dicendi genus egregie agit Quintil. Inst. 12, 10. ubi hæc inter alia: — *Et antiqua quidem illa divisio inter ASIANOS atque ATTICOS fuit, cum hi pressi et integri, contra inflati illi et inanes haberentur, et in his nihil superflueret, illis iudicium maxime et modus deesset.* Et paullo post: ATTICI limati quidem et emuncti nihil inane aut redundans ferebant. ASIANA gens tumidior alioqui atque jactantior: vaniore etiam dicendi gloria inflata est. Julius Severianus loco ab aliis etiam prolato in Præf. ante *Syntom. Artis Rhet.* 303. ed. Fr. Pithœi: ATTICORUMNE nobis sequenda sit actio,\* (dictio, rectius Voss.) qui breves adstrictique et acres sunt, etc.; an imitanda nobis sit ASIANORUM licentia, qui vagi ac fusi rapere potius affectibus quam disputationibus persuadere didicerunt. Sit tamen Romanus orator ASIATICO pressior, ATTICO copiosior. ATTICUM igitur dicendi genus adstrictum, et pressum erat, et nihil ineptum ac superfluum habebat, cum contra ASIATICUM esset tumidum, inflatum, ac redundans, quod Ciceroni ipsi objecerunt ejus obtrectatores. Auctor de *Causis Corruptæ Eloq.* c. 18. Satis constat nec Ciceroni quidem obtrectatores defuisse, quibus inflatus et tumens nec satis pressus, supra modum exsultans et superfluens, et parum ATTICUS videretur. Sic recte emendatum a VV. DD., Ursino ac Lipsio; nam quod antea legebatur, *parum antiquus*, sensu destituebatur. ASIATICUM dicendi genus cum IONICO idem esse, quia Iones copiosos et μακρολόγους fuisse testantur veteres, putat Is. Voss. ad Catull.

\* The true reading is *factio*, in my opinion: see the words of Mosheim, which will be soon cited.

p. 137. Respicit huc Petronius cum *ventosam et enormem loquacitatem ex Asia Athenas commigrasse, et juvenum animos veluti pestilenti quodam sidere adflasse*, dicit in *Satyr.* c. 2., ubi vide notas. Styli autem ASIATICI primum auctorem fuisse Hegesiam Magnesium ex Strabone notavit venerandus patruus meus ad Quintil. *d. c. init.*, qui Hegesias idem est quem inter alios memorat Dionys. *H. de Str. Or.* 4. p. 40. ed. Lond. ASIATICORUM vero oratorum dicendi genus ut inane ac tumidum damnavit etiam Augustus, ubi Antonii dictionem increpat ap. Sueton. 86. *An potius ASIATICORUM oratorum inanibus sentiis, verborum volubilitas in nostrum sermonem transferenda.* De ASIATICIS oratoribus, quos *inanes et inflatos* Quintil. vocat, intelligendum sit illud notissimum, sed variis conjecturis vexatum, Virgiliti *Epigramma in Tullium Cimbrum Rhetorem*, quod in Pithœi et Scaligeri *Catalectis* legitur:

CORINTHIORUM amator iste verborum,  
Iste, iste rhetor etc.

tum illud, quod ibidem sequitur:

*Ite hinc inanes rhetorum manipli,  
Inflato rore non Achaico turba:*

de quo ad ipsa *Catalecta* videbimus. Ceterum ASIATICOS oratores tumidos et inflatos fuisse etiam patet ex Livio 45,23. *Non negaverim et totam Asiæ regionem inaniora parere ingenia, et nostrum tumidiorem sermonem esse.* Quia autem ATTICUM dicendi genus pressum, subtile, simplex, nec supra modum abundans erat, hinc ATTICE DICERE de illis, qui optimo dicendi genere utebantur: de quo vide egregie Manut. ad Cic. *Fam.* 4, 4. p. 188. Sed plura de discrimine dictionis ATTICÆ et ASIATICÆ, maxime ex Cicerone, dabit Vossius *Inst. Orat.* 6, 6." P. Burmann in H. Valesii *Emendatt.* l. c.\*

\* The reader may smile at the following story:—

"Præceptor ille Russellus vocabatur, homo minime malus,

## IV.

“ Sed præter hanc triplicem distributionem generis dicendi, et aliæ sunt usitatæ in rhetorum scholis, de quibus aliquid dicendum videtur: non quo necessarium sit, sed ne quid prætermisisse videamur. Est igitur orationis quædam distributio a nationibus ducta, cum aliud genus LACONICUM, aliud ATTICUM, aliud RHODIUM, aliud denique ASIATICUM dicunt. Alia est a disciplinis arcessita, quæ dicendi ac scribendi rationem in *philosophicam, historicam* etc. partitur: alia denique a forma externa, quæ in *dialogicam, epistolicam* etc. dividit. Est denique distributio ab affectionibus, partibus, virtutibus, vitiisque superiorum trium generum nata: cujusmodi sunt Hermogenianæ formæ.

“ Jam quod ad primam divisionem attinet, in ea male ponitur pars ea, quæ LACONICA dicitur. Satis constat, Lacones eloquentiæ nihil tribuisse, nec Laconum orationem scriptam unquam exstitisse, nedum peculiaris character orationis Laconicæ in rhetorum scholis ferretur. Quintilianus quidem auctor est, 12, 10. olim duo tantum characteres dicendi celebratos fuisse in Græcia, alterum ATTICUM, alterum ASIATICUM: sed postquam Æschines exsul Rhodi instituerit eloquentiæ scholam, et quasi colo-

sed admodum imperitus, et artis, quam profitebatur, plane rudis ac ignarus: qui in prosa eloquentia verba grandia et bene sonantia, orationem in re vel levissima numerosam, plenam pompæ et majestatis, descriptionesque ne in carmine quidem tolerabiles affectabat: qualis est hæc primæ lucis descriptio, quam Valesius a ludo recens nobis sæpe recitantis more graviter pronuntiabat: *Dilucescebat; et emissa jam uberioris affuturæ lucis quasi præcone Aurora, flave-centem auro cæsariem pullulantibus in altum radiis sol matutinus depectebat!* Actum erat de Valesio, si talem præceptorum esset imitatus; sed exemplis magistri malis atque vitiosis iudicium discipuli prævaluit: qui cuncta ludi Verodumensis auditoria intra quinquennium feliciter emensus est.” *Vita H. Valesii*, prefixed to the work mentioned in the text.

niam, exstitisse genus ex utroque mixtum, quod RHODIUM diceretur: unde etiam Cicero RHODIOS oratores commemorat in *Bruto* c. 13,

“ ATTICUM igitur genus sic describunt, ut non discrepet ab subtili ac tenui: quippe ei elegantiam in verbis, acumen in sententiis tribuunt; ejusque principes faciunt Thucydidem et Lysiam: quæ opinio etiam Ciceronis tempore valuit: contra quam late disputat in *Bruto* c. 82. s. et *de Optimo Genere Orat.* c. 5—9. ATTICOS quidem vel maxime fuisse Platonem, Xenophontem, Isocratem, ac Demosthenem, nemo ambigat, eosque principes eloquentia. In his autem non perpetuam esse illam subtilitatem, ante diximus. Itaque auctore Cicerone, ATTICUM potius dicemus eum, qui istis tribus, de quibus ante dictum est, generibus recte ac loco uti possit: a quo absit nimia redundantia in genere copioso, et contra in genere tenui et moderato habeat illam ATTICIS, maxime Platoni et Xenophonti, propriam venustatem, a qua hic quidem etiam apis Attica, et oratio ejus melle Attico plena dicta est, cerniturque maxime in usu Socraticæ ironiæ, continuatis metaphoris nitidis, allusionibus lepidis, jocis festivis, et sententiis facietis et acutis.

“ Ab eo differt ASIATICUM non sic, ut bonis ATTICI generis careat, sed ut iis nimis abundet, sitque præsertim uberrimum copia, non modo in verbis, sed etiam vel maxime in exornatione et amplificatione. Oritur enim ab ingenii ubertate, et rerum memoria comprehensarum copia, atque adeo a bono quasi succo et sanguine, sed nimis copioso. Itaque est etiam in laude. Cicero quidem ipse eo genere usus est, ante quam se Moloni dedidisset, ejusque specimen est oratio *pro Roscio Amerino*: sed ab illo monitus cœpit illam redundantiam vitare. Atque etiam Hortensii, qui secundus a Cicerone numeratus est, orationem ex eo genere fuisse, auctor est Cicero *Brut.* 95.



“ His duobus interjectum aiunt fuisse RHODIUM, paullo copiosius ATTICO, pressius ASIATICO: ex eoque genere Ciceronem esse volunt. Quod largiendum utique erit, si Lysias ATTICI generis exemplum est perfectum et unicum. Sed ita etiam Demosthenes RHODIUS orator erit: quod ineptum esse omnes vident. Si tamen tale genus ponendum, non discrepabit ab ATTICO mediocri et sublimi genere.”

*Initia Rhetorica, auctore Jo. Aug. Ernesti, p. 200. (appended to his Initia Doctrinae Solidioris, Lipsiæ 1796.)*

---

## V.

“ Primo igitur, quod ad brevitatem vel ubertatem sermonis attinet, stilus in LACONICUM,\* ATTICUM, RHODIUM, et ASIATICUM dispesci solet.† Stilus

\* “ [LACONES alieni fuerunt a literarum studio generatim, eloquentiæ autem adeo, ut Cic. *Brut.* 13. *oratorem dicat Lacedæmonium usque ad hoc tempus audiui fuisse neminem; Sextus vero Emp. Rhet.* 2. p. 293. cives tradat punitos esse, qui dicendi arti foris operam dedissent. Igitur Laconica brevitatis in orationes generibus vix locum meretur. N.] ”

† “ Omnes hæ gentes Græce loquebantur, sed ita, ut mirifice inter se discreparent. LACONIBUS, genti ambitiosæ ac suspicaci, (litterarum ac doctrinæ omnis experti, prudenti tamen, cautæ et parcæ, *J. M. G.*) brevis atque abrupta placebat oratio: ATTICIS, (philosophantibus τῆς παιδείας καὶ τῆς πείρας συντρέφους, *J. M. G.*) brevis quidem et simplex, sed acuta. ASIATICIS, (luxuriantibus in omni re, *J. M. G.*) ventosum diffusissimumque dicendi genus. RHODII denique, (inter utrosque interjecti situ et moribus, *J. M. G.*) ATTICIS paulo uberiores, at multo adstrictiores ASIATICIS erant, adeoque prudenter orationis habitum efformarunt, inter ATTICAM macilentiam et ASIATICAM pinguedinem medium. Vide Quintil. 12, 10. N. Crag. *de Rep. Lac.* 3, 6, 5. (De Jctis ita magnus vir, Bynckershoeckius *Obs.* 8, 15. ‘Stilus Jctorum ATTICUS perit cum libertate Rom. Successit RHODIUS, quo pler-

LACONICUS justo brevior, ac veluti abruptus est, in eoque consistit, quod plura intelligi quam legi jubeat.\* Hinc, nisi inter amicos, vix laudem ali-

‘ que Jcti utuntur: postea ASIATICUS, quo utitur Constantinus ‘ M.’ Hoc forte optimum exemplum, quo triplex illa stili differentia illustrari potest. Ceterum ad primam classem pertinent P. et Q. Mucii, pater et filius, quorum loca ex *Digestis* collegit Fr. Balduinus in *Jurisprudencia Muciana*. Aliorum hujus ætatis Ciceronianæ circiter rarissima sunt fragmenta. Ex altera classe sunt Papinianus, Ulpianus, Africanus etc. G.) [Cl. Ernesti de hac divisione judicium extat in ejus *Init. Rhet.* s. 409., quod videatur. N.]”

\* “ Demetr. Phal. *de Elog.* 102. p. 66. *Καὶ οἱ Λάκωνες πολλὰ ἐν ἀλληγορίαις ἔλεγον ἐκφοβοῦντες*, LACONES multa allegorice dicebant metum incussuri. Eadem vero ratio, quæ eos allegoriis occultare jussit sensa animi, etiam breve illud atque abruptum dicendi genus suavit. Hinc idem Demetr. Phal. (8. 102.) auctor est, eos aliquando ad verbosam Philippi Macedonis Epistolam ita rescripsisse, *Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ*, *Dionysius Corinthi*. Plura hic intelligenda erant Philippo, quam legebat. Dicere volebant LACONES, non esse quod se jactaret, *Spartæque minaretur Philippus, fulgur e pelvi dari*. Non diuturna esse solere tyrannorum imperia. *Dionysium quoque, Siculis olim metuendum, nunc Corinthi vivere, in tanta rerum omnium penuria, ut ludimagistri munere fungatur. Forsan in fatis esse, ut eadem fortuna Philippum moneat, nisi cautior sit adversus bona sua, et opprimendæ Græcæ consilia adjiciat. Videret ergo, ne ejus vitam imitaretur, cujus exitum perhorresceret*. Vide quantum idearum tria ista verba, *Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ*, contineant! Non minus breves sunt Epistolæ LACONICÆ, quas collegit Schol. Dionis Chrys. *Orat.* 64. veluti, *Τὸ Πέρσαι δουλεύοντι: Ἐαλόκωντι τὰ Ἀθῆναι: Ξενοφῶν ἐφυγαδεύθη*: et similes, (LACONICARUM Epistolarum Farrago edita est a Gilb. Cognato Nozerino 1554. 12. et Colon. 1606. 12. *Thesaurum Epistolarum Laconicarum* Jo. Buchlerus a Goldbach dedit. Adeatur etiam Olearii præfatio ad Philostr. *Epist.* p. 379. (et Valckenærii *Digressio* II. ad Theocr. p. 257., ubi Epistolas LACONICAS a Plutarcho custoditas exhibet. N.) Brevisssima forte et *Λακωνικωτάτη* illa est ad Philippum regem, in qua, ei negantes, quæ voluerat, scripserunt litteram O pro οὔ. Vide Auson. *Ep.* 25, 36. et *Technop.* l. c.

*Una fuit tantum, qua respondere Lacones, Littera, et irato regi placuere negantes:*

item Tzetzæ 9, 258. et Langbæn. ad Longin. 38. n. 26. *J. M. G.*) Unde Strabo I. observat inter *ὑπερβολὰς ἐπὶ ὑπερβολαῖς* esse et illam, *Ἐλαττώ δ' ἔχειν γῆν τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐπιστολῆς Λακωνικῆς*,

quam meretur.\* Magis commendandum ATTICUM dicendi genus, in quo multæ ideæ paucis acutisque verbis proferuntur.† Talis est stilus Thucydidis, Xenophontis, Aristophanis. Ast, quum Lysias et Isæus exile quoddam atque exsuccum dicendi ge-

*agram habere minorem Epistola Laconica. Sed de βραχυλογία Λακωνική plura scripsit Jo. Meursius Misc. Lac. 3, 3. (ubi LACONISMUM declaravit ex apophthegmatis LACONICIS Plutarchi. Est etiam Kappii DE LACONISMO Disp. Lips. 1736, J. M. G.)"* See Toup on Pseudo-Longinus p. 322. Porson's *App. ad Toupii Emendd. in Suid.* 4, 455.

\* "Hinc LACONICE nonnunquam cum Attico agit Cicero; cum amicis Plinius et Lipsius. Sed quum LACONES semper habit sint ἄμωσοι, nec ulla umquam eloquentiæ laude floruerint, (v. Cic. *Brut.* 13. Aelian *V. H.* 12, 50.) absurdum esset, abrupto illo dicendi genere laudem consectari velle."

† "Virtutes ergo ATTICI stili sunt I. *brevitas*, (non simpliciter tamen; sed in quantum argumento ea convenit. Vide omnino Cic. *Brut.* 82., ubi dedita opera errorem eorum refutat, qui brevitate censerent stilum Atticum, quam Lysias. *J. M. G.*) II. *omnis tumoris atque adfectionis fuga*; III. *acumen*, IV. *elegantia*. Hinc præclare monet Cic. *de Opt. Gen. Or.* 3. non sufficere, ut in verbis nihil sit inquinatum, abjectum, ineptum, durum, aut longe petitum; nec satis esse, si nihil in sententiis absurdum, aut alienum, aut subinsulsum sit: sed exigi etiam vires, lacertos, sanguinem, i. e. acumen et elegantem gravitatem, (aut potius digna rebus verba copiosa, ubi opus est, etc. *J. M. G.*) Sic Attica sunt illa Plin. *Ep.* 1, 3. *Tu modo enitere, ut tibi ipse sis tanti, quanti videberis aliis, si tibi fueris.* Brevia enim hæc sunt, recta, acuta, elegantia. Attica etiam illa *Ep.* 1, 9. *O rectam sincerumque vitam! O dulce otium honestumque, ac pæne omni negotio pulchrius! O litus, verum secretumque μυστήριον! quam multa invenitis? quam multa dictatis? Proinde tu quoque strepitum istum, inanemque discursum, et multum ineptos labores, ut primum fuerit occasio, relinque, teque studiis vel otio trade. Satius est enim, ut Attilius noster eruditissime simul et facetissime dixit, otiosum esse, quam nihil agere.* Sic pleraque apud Plin. sunt brevia, ab omni tumore aliena, acuta, ac polita, id est Ἀττικώτατα. Tali etiam dicendi genere in *Epist. ad Att.* non infeliciter utitur Cicero, in *Historia* Sallustius, Thucydidis imitator; nonnunquam etiam Seneca, quamvis is ob nimiam sententiarum frequentiam paullo tumidior videatur."

nus invenerint,\* factum est ut plures eorum imitentur exilitatem, et sibi ipsis Athenis magis viderentur ATTICI, si siccam atque ab omni ornatu alienam dicendi formam sequerentur, quos graviter reprehendit Cicero *Orat.* 7. sq.

“ATTICO dicendi generi e diametro opponitur ASIATICUM, quod omnium est uberrimum.† Pau-

\* “Sunt quidem Lysias ejusque discipulus Isæus venusti scriptores, subtiles, puri, sed tennes admodum et inornati, (sine amplificatione. *J. M. G.*) Unde Quintil. præclarus ingeniorum censor, 10, 1. *Lysias subtilis atque elegans, et quo nihil, si oratori satis sit docere, perfectius; nihil enim in eo est inane, nihil arcessitum, puro tamen fonti, quam magno flumini propior.* Duas itaque priores, ut et postremam stili Attici virtutem in hisce oratoribus mirati sunt veteres: ast tertia illis plane defuit. Omnia enim simplicia sunt, exilia, sicca, ut vix quivis ex plebe aliter potuerit loqui. (Nempe sic scribebat caussas Lysias, quasi haberentur ab ipsis litigatoribus, quibus nimirum eas ediscendas daret. *J. M. G.*) Quum tamen multi maximam stili Attici virtutem, id est acumen, non animadverterent, factum est ut non paucis magis placerent Lysias et Isæus, quam ipse Demosthenes, aliique scriptores Ἀττικῶτατοι. Atque hi demum Atticum dicendi genus in siccitate atque exilitate sermonis quæsierunt.”

† “Initio Athenis tantum florebant eloquentiæ studia. Postea etiam in Asia coli cœperunt. Cic. *Brut.* 13. *Ut semel e Piræo eloquentia evecta est, omnes peragravit insulas, atque ita peregrinatu tota Asia est, ut se externis oblineret moribus, omnemque illam salubritatem ATTICÆ dictionis, quasi sanitatem, perderet, ac loqui pæne dediceret. Hinc ASIATICI oratores, non contemnendi quidem, nec celeritate nec copia, sed parum pressi, et nimis redundantes.* Add. c. 95. Postquam vero semel redundans illa orationis ubertas in deliciis esse cœperat: ipsas etiam Athenas inquinavit. Unde Petron. *Satyr.* 2. *Nuper ventosu isthæc et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit, animosque juvenum ad magna surgentes veluti pestilenti quodam sidere afflavit, simulque corruptæ eloquentiæ regula stetit, et obtinuit.* Denique et Romanos oratores ASIATICÆ copię studuisse novimus, maxime Ciceronem, qui sæpe vix dicendi finem reperit. Unde nec olim defuerunt, quibus iste orator inflatus et tumens, nec satis pressus, supra modum exultans et superfluens, et parum ATTICUS videretur, *Auct. de Caus. corr. Eloq.* 18. Hæc in Ciceronem adolescentem ex aliqua parte conveniant. Vide ipsum *Orat.* c. 30. Postea enim, apud Molonem Rhodium præcipue, hoc emendavit. Itaque ASIATICI stili specimina forte suppeditaverit *Oratio pro Roscio Amerino*; aliæ non temere. *J. M. G.*

cas enim ideas multis verbis exprimit ita, ut, si copiam atque ubertatem tollas, vix quidquam admiratione dignum relinqui videatur.\*

\* "Ait Cic. *pro Mil.* 4. *Est hæc non scripta, sed nata lex, quam non didicimus, accepimus, legimus, verum e natura ipsa arripimus, hausimus, expressimus; ad quam non docti, sed facti, non instituti, sed imbuti sumus, ut si vita nostra in aliquas insidias, si in vim, si in tela, aut latronum aut inimicorum, incidisset, omnia honesta ratio esset expediendæ salutis.* Quantum hic verborum! Et tamen paucissimæ hæc idæ tot verborum phaleris teguntur: *Jus naturale permittit moderamen inculpatæ tutelæ.* ASIATICUS ergo stilo hæc expressit Cicero. E recentioribus in orationibus suis plane ASIATICUS est M. A. Muretus, qui ipsum nonnunquam Ciceronem copia videtur superare."

"I ventured to call the Doctor's attention to my observation in the *Reminiscences*, in which I inferred that the people of Rome were, speaking generally, a rude and uncultivated race, from Cicero's having found such a laboured period, as the *Est enim hæc non scripta, sed nata lex*, necessary, to convince them that homicide in self-defence is justifiable — 'You are mistaken,' said the Doctor. 'If Cicero had attempted to prove the position gravely and systematically, there would have been ground for your observation. But his sentence was a *Delilah*. He intended by it to captivate the audience; to win them over to him, and his cause. The passage from admiring an orator, to thinking well of his cause, is very easy. Such artifices are common in Cicero; I can shew many in his *Orations*. By the tirade in question he did not seek to prove; he sought to charm.'" Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences* 2, 257.

"(Vocet aliquis, si ita volet, ASIATICA. Dummodo Demosthenem ATTICÆ eloquentiæ exemplar ita loquutum, idem agnoscat. Rideliculus fuisset Cicero, si illam philosophicam enunciationem, *Jus naturale permittit moderamen inculpatæ tutelæ*, in conventum judicum et populi attulisset. Utrum aliquid abundet, indicandum est ex conditione audientium. Si ita instituere velis oratorem, ut ad paucissimas ideas referat orationem, perierit e rebus eloquentia et humanitas; prælegatur in templis *Decalogus* et *Symbolum Apostolorum*; facessant *Chrysostomi*. Sed nimirum ad hoc valet illa quondam domina rerum eloquentia, ut ab omni parte, et omnibus quasi ansis suis, res offeratur auditoribus: ut omnes velut aditus ad illorum animos tententur, ut pugnetur contra negligentiam, et quibusvis machinis excitetur et conservetur attentio. Non qui hoc recte facit, eo minus ATTICUS est, si copiosus est. Sed hoc ATTICUM est, sive multis verbis dicas, sive paucis, nihil dicere, quod sanum non sit, quod non ad rem, ad causam, ad consilium dicentis, ad persuadendum, faciat. Potest permitti auctori nostro, ut ASIATICUM dicat genus dicendi copio-

“ Pressius ASIATICO, ATTICOQUE paullo plenius est genus dicendi RHODIUM, adeoque mediocritatem servat, et similitudinem quamdam inter verba atque ideas.\* Unde et maximam meretur laudem.† Ceterum non melius hos eloquutionis characteres distinguas, quam si unam eandemque propositionem diversis dicendi formis expressam, tibi ob oculos ponas.‡

sissimum. Modo meminerimus, veteres vitii nomen hoc voluisse et luxurie, a quo Ciceronem post reditum a peregrinatione, postquam honores gerere cœpit, liberant, qui judicare de oratione sine invidia possunt. *J. M. G.*”)

\* “ Talis plerumque est stilus Corn. Nepotis, C. Jul. Cæsaris, T. Livii, (inprimis vero, M. Tullii, *J. M. G.*) quorum lectio ideo maxime commendanda est adolescentibus. Quam justum orationis habitum conspicimus in illis Corn. Nep. *Attic.* 13. :—“ *Usus est familia, si utilitate judicandum est, optima; si forma, vix mediocri. Namque in ea erant pueri litteratissimi, anagnostæ optimi, et plurimi librarit, ut ne pedissequus quidem quisquam esset, qui non utrumque horum pulchre facere posset. Nihil hic abruptum, nihil redundans, nihil quod aut addi aut demi, salvo stili nitore possit. Et talem quidem esse oportet stilum RHODIUM.*”

† “ Laudat stilum RHODIUM Cic. *Brut.* 13. RHODII oratores ASIATICIS saniores, et similitiores ATTICIS, (i. e. judicio Tullii perfectissimis. *J. M. G.*) Et sane, quum LACONES justo sint breviores, ASIATICI nimis redundantes, facile adparet, ATTICUM RHODIUMQUE dicendi genus esse ceteris omnibus longe anteponendum. Origo scholæ rhetoricæ, quæ Rhodi diutissime floruit, ab Æschine est, qui exsul ibi docuit, et teste Plutarcho de *X Oratt.* σχολὴν ἐκτὶ προσκατέλιπε, τὸ Ῥοδιακὸν διδασκαλεῖον κληθῆν, *Reliquit ibi scholam, quæ Rhodiaca adpellata.* Adde Quintil. 12, 10. Hinc et principes Romani, quos dicendo valuisse novimus, Rhodum ad audiendos rhetores, imprimis Apollonium Molonem, confluebant, veluti C. Julius Cæsar, (Sueton. *Jul.* 4.) M. T. Cicero, (Plut. *Vit.* 862. f. Aurel. Victor. de *Vir. Illustr.* 4.) M. Junius Brutus, (id. *ibid.* 5.) Cassius, (Appian. de *B. C.* 3. cf. Jo. Meurs. de *Rhodo* 1, 2.)”

‡ “ Esto propositio: *Studia optimarum artium perpetuo nobis prosunt.* Hanc ATTICÆ ita exprimit Plin. *Ep.* 1, 3. *Reliqua rerum tuarum post te alium atque alium dominum sortientur: hoc nunquam tuum desinet esse, si semel ceperit.* Item ASIATICÆ eloquitur Cic. *pro Arch.* 7. *Nam ceteræ res neque temporum sunt, neque ætatum omnium, neque locorum: hæc studia adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac solatium præberit, delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernoctant nobiscum,*

“ Si quæres, quodnam horum dicendi generum maxime probandum sit, jam monere me memini, nec **LACONICUM**, nec **ASIATICUM** multum laudis habere. Danda tamen opera, ne quid invita Minerva tentemus. Alia ingenia ad Ciceronis ubertatem, alia ad Plinii pressiores stilum, alia ad Corn. Nepotis, aut Cæsaris medium characterem natura feruntur. Multum vero in cultiore Latinitate proficiet, quicumque naturam sequetur. Deinde in adolescentibus magis laudanda orationis redundantia, quam in viris, quos decet sensim amputare luxuriantem illam verborum silvam, et vel ad **ATTICAM**, vel **RHODIAM**, dicendi formam sensim adspirare.”

Jo. Gottl. Heineccii *Fundamenta Stili Cultioris. Omnibus J. M. Gesneri Animadv. Emendd. Additt. et Præfatione Locupletata. Accuravit, digessit, suas quoque Obs. hac Editione auctas adjecit Jo. N. Niclas. Lipsiæ 1790. 12mo. p. 182 — 191.*

---

## VI.

“ Ad imitationem accedo veterum, quam ita plurimi commendant, ut se liberos esse natos, prope-

*peregrinantur, rusticantur. Jam si ita diceres: Quum reliquarum rerum omnium non admodum sit diuturna possessio, sola optimarum artium studia omnium temporum ac locorum esse videntur: RHODIUS hic stilus esset futurus. (Ita LACONICE dictum erit: Fur est qui mandato in suam rem utitur: ATTICE vero, Non minus fur est, qui mandatum sibi negotium in rem suam vertit, quam qui pecuniam, quam alii ferre jussus fuerat, in suos loculos recondit. RHODIUS aliquis forte erat dicturus: Qui alienam rem invito domino contractavit, eum furem esse, totus jureconsultorum chorus affirmat: de eo vero quid dicamus, qui negotium alienum suæ permissum fidei ita tractat, ut ipse inde utilitatem capiat, damnum vero qui mandavit? Hunc talem furum consortio quis eremerit? Quod ASIATICE sic enunciat Cic. pro Rosc. Am. 38. Quid recipis mandatum, si aut neglecturus, aut ad tuum commodum conversurus es? Cur mihi te offers, ac meis commodis, officio simulato, officis et obstas? Recede de medio: per alium transigam. Suscipis onus officii, quod te putas sustinere posse: quod minime videtur grave iis, qui minime ipsi leves sunt. Ergo idcirco turpis hæc culpa est, quod duas res sanctissimas violat, amicitiam et fidem; nam neque mandat quisquam fere, nisi amico, neque credit, nisi ei, quem fidelem putat. Perditissimi est igitur hominis, simul et amicitiam dissolvere, et fallere eum, qui læsus non esset, nisi credidisset. J. M. G.’)*

modum obliviscantur. Ut varia hominum sunt ingenia, ita hic CICERONEM, alius LIVIUM, tertius SENECAM, quem imitetur et exprimat, sibi proponit, nec ab ejus numero et compositione latum unguem recedere, fas ducit. Hac demum ratione nos consequi florem dictionis existimant, si veteres non legamus, non laudemus, sed prorsus, invita licet et repugnante natura, referre studeamus. Nescio qui fiat, quod maxima pars hominum ita facta sit, ut in litteris servire malit, quam libertatem amplecti. Certe plurimos in aliorum verba et voces jurare, paucos ingenio et diligentia ad gloriam sibi viam munire videas. Dudum est, quod de isto imitandi pruritu veteres conquesti sunt; HORATII enim quis ignorat illud, *O imitatores servum pecus!* Verum longe magis aut conquesti essent, aut sane risissent, si avorum nostrorum ætate vixissent. Extulit in Italia cum ipsis fere litteris caput factio quædam, CICERONIANA dicta, BEMBO, SADOLETO, LONGOLIO ducibus, quæ fortunas Latii in eo positas existimabat, ut nihil sine CICERONE diceretur. Hinc longiores illæ verborum comprehensiones; hinc sententiarum frequentia; hinc vocum Tulliana plane conglutinatio; hinc denique, qui profecto non poterat abesse, languor orationis, quem in BEMBI aliorumque libris qui non videt, is sensu caret. Aderant viri præstantissimi, qui omnibus opibus hanc serviendi libidinem impugnabant, ERASMUS inprimis, suavissimo libello, quem *Ciceroniarum* inscripsit, GUIL. BUDÆUS (*Comment. Gr. L. p. 1290. s.*) H. STEPHANUS (in *Pseudo-Cicerone*,) FR. TAUBMANNUS (*Diss. de L. L. 38.*) pluresque alii, quos nunc enumerare haud opus est. Qui licet hac diligentia id efficerent, ut CICERONIANUS iste morbus paullulum remitteret, haud tamen, quo minus alii mox nascerentur, paullo illis insipientiores, impedire poterant. Planum erat PHIL. MELAN-



CHTONIS dicendi genus et naturali quadam simplicitate cunctis sese probabat. Nova itaque secta, PHILIPPICA scilicet, in Germania efflorescebat, quæ, ut apertam illam PHILIPPI dictionem consequeretur, enitebatur, (Taubm. *l. c.* 84.) Mira profecto res! virum optimum, qui nunquam eo progressus est arrogantis, ut se unum dicendi magistrum constitueret, invitum post fata scriptoribus in exemplum proponi. Verum ita ratio naturæ plurimorum comparata est, ut quas in magnis hominibus enitere vident, artis et ingenii dotes, nulla sui ratione habita, adquirere studeant, quo partem gloriæ ab illis collectæ in se quoque derivent. Majores LIPSIANA dictio tumultus deinceps movit. Is enim quum pressum, vividum, et a veterum rationibus paullo remotius dicendi genus, sive quod novitatis et laudis esset avidus, sive quod natura hominem eo impelleret, affectaret, multos sectatores in hoc genere habuit. Qui veterum illam copiam et ubertatem sibi conciliare non poterant, nec tamen ultimi Latine loquentium videri volebant, viam sibi natam esse summopere gaudebant, qua facilius ad eloquentiæ laudem pervenire possent. Hinc cerebrum sibi pene nonnullos perdidisse constat, et in his BERTILIIUM CANUTUM, ut Lipsianæ istius brevitatis compotes fierent. Adeo verum est, quod vulgo dicitur, easdem sæpenumero fabulas mutatis tantum personis agi. TULLII enim jam ætate idem, quod tum, contigit; qua quidem factio ATTICORUM, quæ vocabatur, quum copiosam illam CICERONIS et aliorum eloquentiam ingenio non posset consequi, exilitatem quamdam sermonis adsciscebat, quam ATTICAM dicebant, eosque, qui dictionis ubertate gaudebant, ASIANOS esse et tumidos, criminabatur. (Vide Cic. in *Bruto* 83. p. 182. Quintil. 12, 10. p. 746.) Sed quid est, quod in imitatorum factionibus enumerandis commoror? Longe plures certe commemorare possem ac ad

nostra etiam tempora propius descendere, quibus sibi ipsi multi nocent, dum aliorum orationi nimis favent. Citius enim terrarum orbem mortale genus, quam homines imitatorum secta deficiet. Verum satius erit, quid de hacce ratione habendum sit, paucis exponere." Jo. L. Mosheim, *Præf. ad Uberti Folieta de L. L. Usu et Præstantia Libros III.* Hamb. 723. 12mo. p. 24.

*Extract from Sir Philip Francis's Letter Missive to  
Lord Holland, Lond. 1816. 8vo. p. 62.*

“ In reading the Report of the select Committee, (of the House of Commons on the Elgin-marbles,) one of their first propositions, including an historical assertion, seems to me a paradox, the truth of which however I am not bound or disposed to deny, viz. ‘ that the date of these works must be referred to ‘ the original building of the *Parthenon*, and to the ‘ designs of *Phidias*, the *dawn* of every thing, ‘ which adorned and ennobled Greece.’ From this position, compared with what we know of the architecture and statuary of Athens, it follows that the *first* productions of those arts were at once perfect, without previous defect or gradual improvement. The dawning light is in the meridian. Birth and maturity have but one date. This discovery is new in the natural history of man. In all other attainments of human skill, the arrival at perfection is by progression. Were there no temples or statues in Athens or in Greece, before *Phidias*? By whom, and when was the temple of Jupiter built at Olympia; or the temple of Theseus at Athens? \* On questions of date it is in vain to

\* “ After a long search, I cannot discover with certainty, by whom, or when the temple of Theseus was built. On the whole, however, it seems probable that it was erected by *Cimon*, or in his time, or about forty years before *Pericles*. I leave it to the learned to consider, whether that date of such a temple, with such a statuary, can be consistent with the assertion of the Committee.”

look for accuracy in the Greek historians, nor is it always safe to rely on their veracity. On this point I speak with more moderation than I think. A peremptory language in matters of opinion, is always offensive and never in its place, but when it is called upon to command. In *me*, who court instruction, because I want it, a tone of authority would be worse than unbecoming. *Græcia mendax* was proverbial among the Romans. Plutarch and others speak of the *Hecatompædon* and the *Parthenon*, as of one and the same building. Now it appears to me that either this must be a mistake, or the text is not correct, or it is a mere epithet carelessly used. The *Hecatompædon* was a square temple of a hundred feet, and if it were fifty feet high, would make half a cube. Mr. Wilkins says that the area embraced by the *uppermost* step of the *Parthenon*, is little more than two hundred and twenty-seven feet in length and one hundred and one in breadth. The former then must have been a moderate building compared to the latter. But *Herodotus* affirms that *Xerxes* burnt the citadel, and with it the temple of the Goddess, of which last he repented; and that the utter destruction of the whole city was completed by Mardonius. Yet Mr. Stuart says: ‘The temple of Minerva in the Acropolis was called the *Parthenon* and *Hecatompædon*.’ To *me* it is plain, that they were different temples, on the same site, with very different dimensions. The former was built about fifty years after the *Hecatompædon* was destroyed. Be all this as it may, I shall leave it to the learned to discover the meaning of Plutarch’s words, and proceed to other questions in *my* mind of much greater interest and curiosity, concerning the two celebrated statues of Minerva and Jupiter, undoubtedly the works of Phidias, and placed by him in their respective temples at Athens

and Olympia.\* Here again we have a singular proof of the inaccuracy and carelessness of Grecian historians. Pausanias and all of them say that these two statues, one of which was fifty-four feet high, sitting, the other thirty-nine feet, standing, were positively made of ivory and gold. Of the latter Pausanias says: *Αὐτὸ δὲ ἔκ τε ἐλέφαντος τὸ ἀγαλμα καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποίηται*, (p. 41.) Some of these careless writers, quoted by Meursius, describe the Minerva as made all of *pure* gold; others, as all of ivory without a qualification, abatement, or explanation of any kind. Even Pliny, on this point, is full as inaccurate and obscure, as if he had never seen the two statues, or never considered or inquired what they were made of. He says (*liber 34, cap. 8,*) ‘Phidias, præter Jovem Olympium, quem nemo æmulatur, fecit et ex ebore *æque* Minervam Athenis, quæ est in Parthenone adstans;’ which words, as long as words express meaning, affirm that both the statues were made of ivory. Now *my* conviction is, that every one of these writers, in the literal and indisputable sense of their own language, asserts a gross, ridiculous falsehood. Such enormous statues neither were, nor could be made of gold or ivory, in their solidity, as they might have been of marble. A quantity of gold or ivory, or both, sufficient for the purpose, could not have been found in all Greece, much less in Attica; and, even if it had existed, Phidias and Pericles, and indeed the people of Athens and Elis must have been frantic to lavish and waste such precious materials on the in-

\* “Pausanias says that the temple of Jupiter at *Olympia* was built, but not when, by a native architect called *Libo*; that it was sixty eight feet high, ninety-five feet wide, and two hundred and thirty feet long. He says that the God, sitting on a throne, was *made* of gold and ivory. L. 5. p. 304-5-6. The temple must have been built long before the Peloponnesian war!”

side of such statues. The fact is, they were hollow, and covered in *some* parts with *laminæ*, or thin plates applied of ivory, in *others* of gold, which on occasion might be and actually were taken off. All the gold, furnished by Pericles to Phidias for the statue of Minerva, amounted only to forty-four talents of pure gold, equal to about £8,525. in our standard. The intrinsic value of the Attic talent is by no means ascertained by comparison with any modern coin, much less is it a clear case among the learned. This quantity might be sufficient to cover as much of the statue, as was not plated with ivory, but would go a very little way to fill it. The outside, so formed, was supported by an internal construction or machinery of brass and cedar-wood. As far as I have been able to trace this question, the first person, who discovered the fallacy imposed upon us by the Greek writers, and swallowed without hesitation or inquiry by the moderns, was *M. de Pauv*, a merciless inquisitor into literary frauds, and a fatal foe to learned impostors. The following extract from his *Recherches Philosophiques sur les Grecs* (Vol. ii. p. 112,) printed at Berlin in 1788, ought to excite the reader's curiosity. After proving to demonstration that the ivory and gold in question consisted of plates laid on, or *appliqués, par pièces rapportées*, &c. he says:—

“ Pour communiquer à toutes ces pièces rapportées le degré de consistance, dont elles avoient besoin, il faut que la *Minerve* de Phidias ait été intérieurement soutenue par un corps prodigieux de fer ou d'airain, revêtu dans sa principale longueur de lames de bois de cédre, qui formoient l'ame de ce colosse, dont toute la capacité étoit vuide; et *Lucian* avoue que ces ouvrages d'ostentation, si riches en apparence, et où l'on ne voyoit briller que l'or et l'ivoire, étoient intérieurement

‘garnis de toiles d’araignées, et servoient d’asyle  
 ‘aux insectes et aux animaux immondes, qui fré-  
 ‘quentoient les temples et les autels de la Grèce.’

Lucian’s words, to which *M. Pauw* refers, are:  
 ‘The richest of these statues were covered with  
 ‘ivory, and here and there, (ὀλίγον ὄσον,) glittered  
 ‘with gold. Withinside they were supported by  
 ‘frames of wood, (ὑπόξυλοι,) in which whole troops  
 ‘of mice took shelter, and formed their common  
 ‘wealth.’ (ἀγέλαι μύων.) \*

It seems to me remarkable that it is *not* stated by Pausanias or Pliny that the statue of Victory, of four cubits high, (therefore not a *Victoriola*,) stood, or was placed standing, on the extended right-hand of Minerva, which must include the arm, or there would be no extension. But Epictetus † does say so distinctly. Now, if the *Victory* were solid of any metal, it must weigh down the arm, or break it, unless the inside of the limb were of brass, and that too attached to a metallic frame supporting the statue.

Supposing this state of the case, as far as relates to the outward appearance and internal machinery of the statues, to be indisputable, a question remains, which he, who can answer it in plain intelligible language, and not in terms of art, must have much more skill and sagacity than I can pretend to. My own superannuated thoughts have been wasted on it in vain. The figures of the God and Goddess must have been composed and formed on a covered frame of some kind or other, and that frame supported throughout by internal bars of brass or wood. I ask what was the composition of that frame, and of the figures or shapes, which were supported by it; and how, or by what medium or con-

\* In the *Jupiter Tragædus*.

† L. ii. cap. 8.

tact they were supported by the inside-machinery. To me it appears that the forms, at least, of the statues must have been finished, before the *laminae* of gold and ivory could be applied to those forms, by way of ornament or dress. Here I shall conclude this part of my meditations, with one note of admiration more to the statues. Is it possible, or is it conceivable, that Pausanias, Plutarch, and Pliny, should not have known the internal construction of these colossal statues, or that they should have believed or imagined that they were literally made of solid gold and ivory! On the subject of these wonderful works of art, there remains still one consideration, worthy of your taste and genius, and then you shall be at liberty, *portá mittendus eburná*.

The enormous disproportion of the size of these statues to the temples, which held them, must have been obvious to every eye. Nay, I should think, it must have been the *first* impression made upon the spectator, the moment he entered the temple. Yet, if my utmost researches have not failed or misled me, it is certainly true that no ancient writer has taken notice, or, if at all, very slightly, of this manifest and striking disproportion, except Strabo, much less to account for it. The geographer says only that ‘The greatest of all was the *ivory* statue of Jupiter, (*ἐλεφάντινον ξόανον*,) made by *Phidias*, of such a magnitude that, although the temple was of the greatest size, the artist seemed to have missed the mark, or failed, of symmetry (*between the statue and the temple*.) He made the statue sitting, yet almost touching the roof with the summit of its head, giving an impression on the eye, that if the God were to rise and stand upright, he must unroof the temple.’ In this place it is natural to ask a question, which, as far as my little learning reaches, has never been answered, Why, of all the



single statues of the heathen celestial Gods, the Jupiter alone is represented *sitting*? Because *he* was their supreme divinity. The others, even the Minerva, or Goddess of Wisdom, were his ministers or agents, and, as his inferiors, *stood* in his presence, whenever they were personified. *He* alone is not in action. *His* power is in repose, serene and majestic, and executes his pleasure, not by motion or command, but by pure volition.

Is it to be believed that *Phidias* was not aware of a palpable violation of the laws of symmetry between his own work and the case, which contained it? or that, seeing the fact, he should not have intended it? Or that, with that intention, he should have had no rational purpose to be answered by it? *I'll not believe it.* The dimensions of so great an artist are not to be measured by the mere visual faculty of vulgar eyes. The altitude of such a being must be taken with a quadrant. First, undoubtedly he meant to magnify his statue at the expence of the temple; and, so meaning, the disproportion he resorted to, could not fail of its effect. So far a common caviller might accuse him of vanity. A critic of a higher order might content himself with subscribing to the accurate and enlightened conclusion of *Quintilian*, who illustrates the statue of Jupiter by its moral impression: ‘Cujus pulchritudo adjecisse aliquid etiam receptæ religioni videtur; adeo majestas operis deum æquavit.’

Was that all? Had he no theory, of a more elevated ascent, in contemplation? Yes; I swear by the Genius of *Phidias* himself, he had another purpose worthy of him, which he has left it to the statue to denounce. ‘THE DEITY I REPRESENT, FILLS HIS OWN TEMPLE, AND LEAVES NO ROOM FOR ANY OTHER GOD.’

*Extracts from Mr. Green's Diary of a Lover of  
Literature, respecting Burke.*

“Oct. 6. 1796. Pursued Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. The distinguishing excellence of Johnson's *manner*, both in speaking and writing, consists in the apt and lively illustrations by example, with which, in his vigorous sallies, he enforces his just and acute remarks on human life and manners, in all their modes and representations; the character and charm of his *style*, in a happy choice of dignified and appropriate expressions, and that masterly *involution* of phrase, by which he contrives to bolt the prominent idea strongly on the mind. Burke's felicity is in a different sphere: it lies in the diversified allusions to all arts and to all sciences, by which, as he pours along his redundant tide of eloquence and reason, he reflects a light and interest on every topic, which he treats; in a promptitude to catch the language and transfuse the feelings of passion; and in the unrestrained and ready use of a style, the most flexible, and the most accommodating to all topics, ‘from grave to gay, from lively to severe,’ that perhaps any writer, in any language, ever attained.— ‘*Ipsæ res verba rapiunt.*’ As opposed to each other, condensation might perhaps be regarded as the distinguishing characteristic of the former, and expansion of the latter.”

“It would be difficult to find in the English language, of equal variety and length, four such compositions, as Burke's *Speech to the Electors of*

*Bristol*; Johnson's *Preface to Shakspeare*; Parr's *Dedication to Hurd*; and Lowth's *Letter to Warburton*." P. 12.

"The topics pressed by the Tarquins on Porsena (Lib. 2. c. 9) to induce him to assist them in recovering their sovereignty, might neatly be applied to Mr. Burke. 'Monebant—ne orientem morem pellendi reges, inultum sineret. Satis libertatem ipsam habere dulcedinis. Nisi quantâ vi civitates eam expetant, tantâ regna reges defendant, æquari summa infimis; nihil excelsum, nihil quod supra cetera emineat, in civitatibus fore. Adesse finem regnis—rei inter deos hominesque pulcherrimæ.'" P. 14.

"Nov. 12, 1796. Read Burke's *Letters on a Regicide Peace*. I am so satisfied that Burke enters into the true genius and character of the principles, which have operated in the French Revolution, that I listen with reverence to whatever he advances on the subject. He has here pursued his original sentiments on these principles, with no abatement of his original vigour. In his cordial detestation of them, I heartily conspire; but by what measures does he propose to rescue us from their contagion? Were it possible to restore France and Europe to the state they were in before the Revolution, or rather to the semblance of that state,—(a thing probably impracticable, were it ever so earnestly sought; and which the corruption of courts will not allow us to suppose would for any length of time be sincerely, honestly, and steadily pursued,)—still the *mind* could never be restored; pernicious habits could not be effaced; prejudices, however useful, could not be revived; nor could the sacred cause of real liberty be purified from the stains and disgrace of prostitution. We are in the midst of horrible and antagonist disorders; nor till they reach some-

thing like a crisis, is it easy to say, what we ought to think, or how we ought to act. His strictures on the war, which certainly never originated in the views he recommended, and which, prosecuted as it is, can only tend to accelerate the evils, which he laboured to avert by it, or sink us still deeper in the bog of corruption, are animated with a just and lively indignation. He certainly places us, by these *Letters*, in a shocking dilemma: but I wish to believe that his rampant imagination has magnified the peril; and, at worst, have considerable reliance on that *nisus* towards a healthy state, which in the body politic, as well as natural, is often our safest and surest ground of hope, under the visitation of disorder. — The passage, in which he brings the situation of the emigrants home to our feelings, and recalls us to a sense of our danger by *their* example, is sketched with masterly judgment, and coloured with a glowing pencil." P. 15. "May 20, 1797. Finished, by a continued perusal, Burke's *Two Letters on a Regicide Peace*. They contain as much plenitude of thought, fertility of fancy, and vigour of argumentation, as any of his younger productions; nor do I perceive any symptoms of that decay of mind, which he so often asserts. How inestimable would be the remnant of such unrivalled powers!" P. 34. "Nov. 22, 1797. Read, by a rapid perusal, Burke's *Third Letter on a Regicide Peace*. I am overpowered with this stupendous effort of Burke's mind; whose genius never flamed so fiercely as in this expiring conflagration. He seems to gambol, at his ease, in a multitudinous ocean of matter, obedient to his will; and to sport with a pressure, under which Atlantean shoulders would have groaned. The passage, in which he exposes the impolicy of Lord Malmesbury's first humiliating mission, has irresistible force; and that,

in which he arrays what he should have supposed, would have been the Minister's conduct, on this scornful repulse of Britannia's humble suit, is most awfully and transcendently sublime. Really, compared with this astonishing effusion, all the most celebrated specimens of antient or modern eloquence, appear like child's play. — The *hiatus* in that part, in which he has drawn a cheering picture of our resources, is well supplied by the Editors: — I confess I cannot exactly trace it. It was a very delicate task." P. 52. "Dec. 25, 1798. Looked again over Burke's *First Letter on a Regicide Peace*: — a wonderful composition! He admits the perilous nature of our situation, but deprecates all overtures to peace; laments that the true state of the contest, in which we are engaged, has never been fairly exposed to us by its conductors; exhibits it himself, with matchless force; and animates us to persist in it, by the most powerful appeals to our reason and our passions. Eager, unremitting earnestness, breathes its persuasive spirit through the whole effusion." P. 119. "Jan. 20, 1797. The critique on Burke's *Regicide Peace*, in the last *Monthly Review*, is ably written: the passage, which warms, in defending our national horror at despotism, is uncommonly animated; — it breathes the eloquence of passion." P. 23.

"Dec. 24, 1796. Finished the first three Books of *Robertson's America*, collating it as I went along, with Burke's '*European Settlements*;' a work, which has never been estimated by the public as it ought to be. Burke's is the hasty, but free and spirited sketch of a master-artist; Robertson's the elaborate composition of a very eminent proficient: the one writer, we perceive, by a thousand careless strokes, is capable of more; the other has done the best he can." P. 20.

“Aug. 4, 1797. Read Burke’s *Memorial on a projected Secession of Opposition during the American War*—a most masterly composition; not breathing the fierce passions and party-violence of the day, but temperate, guarded, firm; of measured strength; and adapted, by the largeness of its views, to the reason of unborn generations. It is brought forward in the *Monthly Magazine*; but they do not mean, I should hope, to charge this against him as a proof of inconsistency.” P. 38.

“Sept. 9, 1797. Read the first two of Burke’s *Memorials on French Affairs*. The latter, strongly marks the distinguishing character of the French Revolution; illustrates its influence in producing new and most important interests in the surrounding states, by the analogous cases of the aristocratic and democratic factions in Greece, headed by Lacedæmon and Athens, the parties of the Guelphs and Ghibbelines in Italy, and the Reformation of Luther; and prepends, in a masterly survey, its probable course through all the States of Europe. We see in this grave composition, pure and unadorned, the native force and vigour of Burke’s mind; and have a taste of the immense stores of information, from which he drew in his more popular works.” P. 45. “Sept. 10. Read the 3rd. and 4th. of Burke’s *Memorials on French Affairs*. The latter opens, in a masterly style, the true interior of France; and points out with infinite force of mind, and a consummate knowledge of the human character and the case before him, the only feasible, and the only honourable course for the allied Powers to pursue, in their endeavour to restore a regular government in France—which is, to consider the Emigrants, each in his department, as the only true representatives of the French State; to treat them as their ally; and to reinstate them in their property

and their authority, as they advance. One grieves to see a man of Burke's genius and intentions, conflicting against a giant evil with such intractable instruments! — What a hopeless case do these *Memorials*, written in 1791, 1792, and 1793, now make out!" P. 45.

Nov. 2d, 1797. Read Burke's *Letter to Elliot on the D. of N.'s Speech in the House of Lords*: a most animated, festive, and poignant philippic, against those leaders of the aristocracy, who, by their conduct, precipitated that cause, which with little personal interest in it, he had been struggling to uphold in their favour, in despite of themselves. This piece exhibits Burke in somewhat a new light — frolicsome in satire; with a mind unbroken by disappointment, though stung with indignation, and sportive, though afflicted; mingling contempt and scorn and laughter, at the defection of those, on whose policy, if not their virtue, he had relied for support, in the great question now at issue between the advocates for ancient order and sweeping innovation, on which his whole soul seems suspended. The latter part, where he exhorts his young correspondent not to despair, and animates him to take an active part in the contest, is prodigiously spirited and fine." P. 50.

"Dec. 6th, 1797. Was much pleased with Burke's *Letter to Murphy*, inserted in the last *European Magazine*, in which he strongly inculcates, the adopting that easy natural style in writing, which we pursue in conversation; in opposition to the prevailing affectation of modern authors. His own example powerfully strengthens this recommendation." P. 53.

"Aug. 18, 1798. Read Burke's *Memorial on the Conduct of the Minority* — a powerful composition, purely argumentative, and, I believe, without a single metaphor." P. 93.

“ Sept. 5, 1798. How accurately and justly has Burke appretiated, only in a side-glance, (*Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs,*) the merits of Sir Robert Walpole’s character and administration !” P. 98.

“ Sept. 13, 1798. Read Brown’s *Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times*. The 2d vol. is merely a supplementary comment on the 1st; and in *that*, after allowing us a spirit of liberty, of humanity, and of equity, he maintains, that a vain, luxurious, and selfish effeminacy, introduced by ex-orbitant trade and wealth, has sapped our principles of religion, honour, and public spirit, weakened our national capacity, our national spirit of defence, and our national spirit of union, and left us a helpless prey to foreign invasion; — a condition beyond the reach of cure or palliation, and from which nothing can relieve us, but the regenerative force of dire necessity. Burke has alluded to this Tract in his 1st *Letter on a Regicide Peace*, with a perfect recollection of its spirit and tendency: and he has borrowed from the last section of the 1st Vol., that refutation of the popular analogy between the body politic and natural, which he first started in his *Letter occasioned by the Duke of Norfolk’s Speech*, and which he afterwards transplanted into his 1st *Regicide Letter*. Brown talks the cant first introduced by Bolingbroke, of an Administration purified from all party-attachments: — a thing impossible under our present system of government; and not desirable, could it be obtained.” P. 99.

“ Sept. 30. 1798. Read Burke’s *Vindication of Natural Society*. Except in parts, (as in the opening and ending,) I cannot think that this piece has much of Bolingbroke’s style and manner: — there is, throughout, an air of constraint, most abhorrent in its nature, to the bold and rapid flow of Bolingbroke’s



declamation.—Burke certainly began and ended his labours in the same cause.” P. 102.

“October 14, 1798. Read Burke’s *Short Account of a Late Administration*; a clear, calm, well-digested and dexterous memorial;—a perfect model for compositions of this nature:—and, afterwards, his *Observations on a Late State of the Nation*; in which we see in the germ, many of those principles, which he afterwards more fully unfolded in his political career. One observation in the latter piece, particularly shews the depth of his reflection, and the extent of his views:—“Politics ought to be adjusted, not to human reasonings, but human nature; of which the reason is but a part, and by no means the greatest part.” The account of the mode, and the consequences of a dereliction of party and principle, towards the close of this piece, is exquisitely given, and evinces a deep insight into human nature. It is curious that the main part of Burke’s first, and of his last, political labour, should have been an exposition and defence of the resources of his country, against the croakings of despondency,” P. 110.

“Oct. 19, 1798. Read Burke’s *Speech on American Taxation* (1770;) which from the beginning to the end, is strictly argumentative. He takes the subject up entirely as a question of expediency—Whether we should be content to derive advantage from our Colonies through the old œconomy of commercial regulation, under which both parties had flourished; or persist in the new, and at the same time, odious and unprofitable scheme of drawing a direct revenue from them, began in the Grenville-Administration by the Stamp-Act of 1764, and revived, in the shape of duties, after its abolition by the Rockingham-Administration in 1766. This masterly address must, in its form at least, have

been extemporary, as it takes the shape of a reply. In his subsequent *Speech, on Conciliation with America*, he occupies pretty nearly the same ground, putting entirely aside the discussion of right. ‘The question with me is,’ says he, ‘not what a lawyer tells me I *may* do, but what humanity, reason, and justice tell me I *ought* to do: not whether the spirit in America deserves praise or blame, but what we shall do with it.’ How strangely has Burke’s conduct respecting America been misconceived, to be charged upon him as an inconsistency! So far from his appearing ever to have been inclined to popular courses, in an *election-speech* at Bristol, in 1780, he actually goes out of his way to combat the doctrine of *instructing representatives*.” P. 111.

“Oct. 24, 1798. Read Burke’s *Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol*; in which he combats the decision of political questions on metaphysical and abstract principles, then (1777) coming into vogue, and the specious cant of imputing corruption to all political parties — a weed of congenial growth, — with the spirit, and almost in the terms, of his latter productions. His two subsequent *Letters to Gentlemen in Bristol*, in defence of an unpopular concurrence on his part in the repeal of some restrictive laws on Irish trade, strikingly evince the liberality and extent, and at the same time the minute exactness, of his views on commercial subjects; nor can anything exceed the easy and happy mode, in which his arguments are brought home to the feelings and understandings of his mercantile constituents.” P. 112.

“Oct. 25, 1798. Read Burke’s *Speech on Economical Reform*. This is, I think, the most magnificent of Burke’s performances; and studiously of that character. It displays a mind most thoroughly purified from all party-passions and party-views;

tender to personal interests, even where they interfere with national concerns; and though ardently engaged in reform, most carefully guarded against the intemperate pursuit of it. It was on this Speech, I believe, somebody observed of Burke, that he seemed equally prepared to regenerate empires, or compose a *Red Book*. P. 113.

“Oct. 28. 1798. Pursued Burke’s *Works*. His *Address to the Electors of Bristol*, previous to the election in 1780, I have always regarded as the most perfect of all his effusions; nor is it, perhaps, to be equalled by any composition of the same length in the English language. His *Speech on Fox’s East-India Bill*, has something of an air of pomposity; owing, perhaps, to his necessary conversance at the time with Oriental topics: — it wields, it must be acknowledged, most ponderous interests. The *Representation, on a Speech from the Throne*, moved June 14th, 1784, strikes me as the heaviest and the most tinctured with a party-spirit, of any of his productions: — not that it does not contain a very just and weighty censure of the means, through court-intrigue and popular delusion, by which the present Administration came into power.” P. 113.

“Nov. 14. 1798. Read Burke’s *Reflections*. They appear to me, on this review, far more temperate, than from my recollection of the first impressions they made, I expected to find them; and I really believe, had their publication been deferred till near the present period, they would have excited little of that amazement and indignation, with which they were at first received. However overcharged his representations might appear at the time, subsequent events have lowered them to truth and moderation. His exposition of the character of our Revolution, is surely most sound and just. He kindles much more fiercely, and speaks more unre-

servedly in his subsequent *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly*. Paine has been guilty of a gross misrepresentation of a passage in the *Reflections*, which I have never seen detected and exposed. Ridiculing the love of liberty *in the abstract*, Burke observes, that government, too, as well as liberty, abstractedly speaking, is good; 'yet could I', he indignantly asks (p. 8,) 'in common sense, ten years ago, have felicitated France on her enjoyment of a government, without enquiry what the nature of that government was, or how it was administered?' This sentence Mr. Paine, (*Rights of Man*, P. 1, p. 23.) quotes as an *affirmative* proposition, *directly in the contrary sense*, to that in which it is urged; and proceeds, after his fashion, to load his opponent with abuse, for maintaining so slavish a doctrine! It demands some degree of charity to believe that such a blunder was merely accidental. — In this passage, Mr. Burke has been scandalously misrepresented: in another, he has been generally misunderstood. It has been imputed to him, that he has spoken contemptuously (p. 117.) of the lower orders, as a 'swinish multitude.' But of what multitude was he speaking? Of a people let loose from all restraint of government and manners, — a collection, as he presently afterwards describes them, of 'gross, stupid, ferocious, and at the same time, poor and sordid barbarians, destitute of religion, honour, and manly pride, possessing nothing at present, and hoping for nothing hereafter.' Had he maddened his herd of swine with a legion of dæmons, as emblematical of the savage passions, with which such a miserable assemblage would be torn and distracted and agitated to perdition, his image could hardly have been regarded as too strong." P. 115.

" March 22, 1799. Read Burke's *Heads for Con-*

*sideratiou on the State of Affairs in 1792.* His foresight, as a statesman, is astonishing:— he was pretty nearly *then*, where we are *now*.” P. 128.

“ April 15, 1797. Finished a cursory perusal of Burke on the *Sublime and Beautiful*. The penetrating sagacity, various knowledge, and exquisite taste displayed in this disquisition, are subordinate merits: it is the original and just mode of investigation on such topics, of which it exhibits so brilliant an example, that stamps upon it, in my estimation, its principal value.” P. 30. “ Oct. 6, 1798. Read Burke’s *Disquisition on Taste*, prefixed to his *Sublime and Beautiful*. He seems to consider the object of Reason, to be Truth and Falsehood; and of Taste, Sentiment; but without drawing a determined line between their respective provinces: and his object is to prove, that the standard of both is the same in all human creatures. Taste, he defines ‘ that faculty or those faculties in the mind, which are affected with, or which form a judgment of, the works of imagination and the elegant arts.’ He first examines the *natural* pleasures of SENSE; which he shews to be the same in all, and that our *acquired* relishes are distinguishable from them to the last. He next considers the pleasures of IMAGINATION. These, so far as the faculty is concerned in representing the objects of *Sense*, must, like those of Sense, be common to all. But in works of the Imagination, a new pleasure is derived from discerning the resemblance, which the imitation bears to the original: this pleasure must of course depend on a knowledge of the object represented; but, where this knowledge is the same, seems nearly the same in all. In exercising our Taste, on the objects of sense, or the representations of these objects, or the representations of the passions, which, acting, and acting upon certain principles, on all,

leave a standard in every breast, little more than the sensibility seems concerned, which may be assumed to differ only in degree: but where the representation embraces the character, manners, actions, and designs of men, their relations, their virtues, and vices, here, he thinks, attention and reasoning are required, and Taste becomes no other than a refined judgment, differing as judgments differ. Taste is thus composed of sensibility and judgment: from a defect of sensibility, arises a *want* of Taste; and from a defect of judgment, a *wrong* or *bad* Taste.— I am not sure that I have represented his ideas very exactly; indeed they do not seem, especially with regard to a leading point I have in view, very distinctly enuntiated. As far however as I am qualified to form an opinion, it appears to me, that in attempting to withdraw a certain class of objects from the proper jurisdiction of Taste, and to place them under that of judgment, he yields at last, after an earnest of better things, to a delusion, which has misled, in a still greater degree, most writers, who have treated the same subject. That an exercise of the judgment is often necessary to put us in possession, (if I may be allowed to say so,) of the case, on which the Taste is to be exerted, admits of no dispute. Mr. Burke had before observed, that where the subject submitted to our Taste is the imitation of any natural object, a competent knowledge of the original, is necessary to determine the justness of the copy;—and, I would add, a competent acquaintance with other imitations in the same way, to ascertain its comparative excellence, and to form a complete decision on its merits. Intelligence of a higher order and more difficult acquirement, no doubt, is necessary to enable us to judge of the truth and accuracy of any representation of the human character, modified by its manners, its habits, its

passions, its virtues and its vices: but in neither case, surely, should this information, or the capacity to gain it, though indispensable as preliminary qualifications for the exercise of Taste, be confounded with that faculty itself;—incorporated with it as an integrant part, or (still less) allowed to supersede it altogether. By Taste we emphatically mean, a quick and just perception of beauty and deformity in the works of nature, or of art; and it is only by making it a distinct subject of consideration in this character, and separating from it those talents and attainments, which however requisite to enlarge the sphere of its action, are at least equally subservient to other and totally different purposes in our moral oeconomy, that we can reasonably expect to obtain a clear and just conception of this peculiar part of our constitution, and of the laws, which regulate its exercise. Oct. 8. Read the 1st, 2d, and 3rd arts of Burke on the *Sublime and Beautiful*. In the 1st, he considers Novelty, as the object of our first and simplest passion—curiosity: and, next to Novelty, and the sources of all our other passions, he places Pain and Pleasure. Pain and Pleasure he regards as totally independent of each other; and he carefully distinguishes the *delight* consequent on a cessation of pain, and which is always accompanied with a certain horror, from positive *pleasure*; and the *uneasiness* consequent on the cessation of pleasure, which is always accompanied with an attractive sensation, from positive *pain*. Our sensations of pain are stronger than those of pleasure; and of course the passions, which turn on pain, will be stronger than those, that turn on pleasure. Our passions he divides, from their destination, into those which conduce to *self-preservation*, and those which conduce to *society*. Those, which belong to *self-preservation*,

turn on *pain* and *danger*; — passions, which are simply disagreeable, when their causes immediately affect us, but which become *delightful*, when we have an idea of pain or danger without being actually in such circumstances: — whatever excites this *delight* is **SUBLIME**. Those which concern *society*, whether of the sex, or society at large, turn on *pleasure*: the passion excited, is love, or a sense of tenderness and affection; and the quality, which decides our preference and excites this passion, is **BEAUTY**. Having thus determined the distinguishing character of the Sublime and Beautiful, by ascertaining the different species of emotion, which they produce in the mind, he proceeds, in the two succeeding Parts, to point out the peculiar properties in objects, by which those different emotions are excited: in neither instance does he confine himself, with Addison, to the Sight, but runs through all the senses: and he concludes with enforcing, as a fundamental and unalterable distinction between the two species of affection and their causes, that the one is founded in pleasure and the other in pain.

Burke powerfully exposes, on various occasions, the error, to which we are prone, of ascribing feelings and affections, which result from the mechanical structure of our bodies, to conclusions of our reason on the objects presented to us — of deducing beauty, for instance, from proportion or fitness, qualities with which it may be accompanied, but which are in themselves mere objects of the understanding, and touch neither the imagination nor the passions; yet he condemns (P. 3, c. 11.) the opposite fault in morals, the deducing moral distinction from feeling, (instancing, it is true, only the application of beauty to virtue, but in spirit going as far as I have stated,) as a practice, which tends to remove the science of our duties from their proper basis —



our reason, our relations, and our necessities, to rest it upon foundations altogether visionary and unsubstantial. There is here a similar inconsistency to that, which I remarked, the evening before last, in the same Author, on the extent of the province of Taste; and arising, like that, from a partial view of the subject. The same reasoning surely is applicable in both cases — to the origin of Moral Distinction, as well as the distinctions of Taste. Whenever we are prompted to distinguish between objects, in consequence of the different impressions, which they make on our sensibility, we must search for the cause of this distinction, in some quality or relation of those objects adapted to produce that particular species of effect; and must never rest satisfied with the discovery of any correspondent mark of discrimination, (however exactly it may coincide with the division we have in view,) that is not expressly competent to such a result. Distinctions in matters of Taste, and Moral Distinctions, are both precisely of this description. We do not discriminate beauty from deformity, or virtue from vice, as we do a square from a triangle, blue from red, heavy from light, or dense from rare, — by certain manifest differences in the objects themselves, with respect to which the mind stands absolutely neutral and indifferent: we are attracted with delight or repelled with disgust, in the first case; we glow, with applauding rapture, or throb with indignant anguish, in the other; and it is *because* we are thus affected, and, (as the various and inconsistent hypotheses, which have been offered to account for these feelings, incontestably evince,) *solely* because we are thus affected, that we are determined to make the received distinctions we do, in the objects, by which we have been thus differently impressed. There is no pretence for separating Moral distinction from the

distinctions of Taste, in this particular : they stand exactly on the same ground ; and precisely the same fallacy misleads our speculations in both cases. In either instance we are prompted to make a distinction between objects, in consequence of their different action on our sensibility : this distinction, by the frequent recurrence of such an impression, becomes habitually established and recognized in our thoughts and communications as a fixed and permanent difference in the objects themselves ; but the impression, out of which it arises, is by no means of this permanent and immutable nature : it is only when the mind is excited by the immediate presence and action of some interesting case, that it is vividly felt ; in moments of calmness its influence is slight and feeble ; and the bare attempt to submit the subject to the rigours of philosophical analysis, puts it to flight altogether. Thus circumstanced, the speculative enquirer, whose great aim it will of course be, to assign some hypothesis, which furnishes a clear and ready criterion of the distinction he undertakes to resolve, instead of resorting for this purpose to any thing so fluctuating and evanescent as the feeling, out of which it arises, or the exciting cause of such a fugitive effect, will, naturally, turn his attention to the permanent and distinguishing properties and relations of the objects, in which it obtains ; and, should he be so fortunate as to find among these any one, which pretty nearly coincides with the received division, of whose explanation he is in quest, he will eagerly adopt it as the solution sought, and will readily be followed by many, to whom the discovery will carry all the marks of plausibility and truth. If this be the specious, but false track, which speculation is likely to take in exploring the principles of Taste, it is that, into which it is still more likely to be seduced in

investigating the principles of Morality; where, from the deep and general importance of the subject, it will appear a still more incumbent duty, to ascertain some clear and broad distinction in the nature of things, correspondent to that, which our moral sentiments suggest: and we find accordingly that the delusion in question has prevailed in a still greater degree on this subject than the other; and that Mr. Burke, who has rejected and exposed it in the former instance, still retains and defends it in the latter. But surely the least reflection must satisfy us, that moral distinction can be nothing, but what has ever been felt and recognized as such in the general sentiments and conduct of mankind; that it is a distinction, not of reason, convincing the understanding and determining merely the belief, but of feeling, touching the passions and influencing the will; that its efficient cause, therefore, must not be sought in any properties or relations of objects, possessing no power over the affections, nor even in any unobvious qualities, which do; and, that though in a system constructed by one supreme Disposer, and of which all the parts will of course bear a correspondence to each other, divisions of objects coinciding with that, which our moral sentiments suggest, may no doubt be derived from other sources, some of which, as their congruity or incongruity with truth and the fitness of things, may imprint the distinction itself more forcibly and deeply on the mind, and others, as their conducement or repugnance to the general good, and their conformity or opposition to the divine will, may furnish additional incentives to its observance—still, that moral distinction, as it springs up in the hearts of men, must be explored, and can alone be found, where Mr. Burke has so successfully investigated the principles of Taste—in the immediate

action of the objects, to which it refers, on our sensibility. It is here accordingly that Adam Smith, in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, has directed his enquiries;—and the more I meditate on his hypothesis, and compare it with others, the more satisfied I am that the solution he has offered, is the true one.” P. 106. “ Oct. 9. Read the 4th Part of Burke’s *Sublime and Beautiful*—on the efficient causes of the affections excited by these qualities: in which he endeavours to make out, That whatever produces a similar mechanical effect upon the body, though arising from different causes, and though in one instance the mind affects the body, and in another external matter, still the effect produced by the body on the mind will be similar; That thus pain and fear, the primary engines of the Sublime, produce a violent tension of the nerves, and that whatever produces this tension, though not in itself terrible, will operate as Sublime; and, That Love, in like manner, relaxes the nerves, and whatever effects such a relaxation, will operate as Beauty. The delight produced by the Sublime, he accounts for, on the principle of its occasioning a tension, and affording an exercise necessary to brace and strengthen the finer organs; thus qualifying them to perform their functions properly, and obviating the convulsions consequent on over-relaxation.— I am afraid much of this is merely visionary.” P. 109. “ Oct. 10. Read the 5th and last Part of Burke’s *Sublime and Beautiful*; on the effect of Words. He divides words into, 1st, *aggregate*, representing several simple ideas united by nature; 2dly, *simple abstract*, representing one simple idea of this combination; and 3dly, *compound abstract*, representing an arbitrary union of these. The effects of words, he divides into, 1st, the sound, 2dly, the image exhibited, and 3dly, the affection of mind

produced by either of these. He then maintains, that aggregate, and simple abstract, words, do only occasionally, and then usually by a particular effort, produce the second of these effects; that compound abstract words never produce this effect; and that poetry and rhetoric principally affect, not by exhibiting to the mind any distinct images, but by exciting immediately those feelings, with which the words employed on the occasion have by habit been associated in our minds. — This is very ingenious, and I believe original." P. 110.

" Oct. 18, 1797. Finished Gibbon's *Extracts Raisonnés*. His critique on Burke's *Sublime and Beautiful*, evinces that he had not sufficiently entered into the spirit of that disquisition. He expresses a surprise at the difference between Longinus and Burke, on the *effect* of the sublime; the former, describing it as calculated to rouse and elevate the mind; the latter to overpower and depress it: but this is not a just representation of Burke's sentiments. B. makes the sublime turn, indeed, on pain and danger, which *when near*, overpower and oppress; but on pain and danger *removed*; in which case, the mind, arrogating to itself some portion of the importance, which these qualities confer, feels that swelling and triumph, that glorying and sense of inward greatness, which he expressly quotes Longinus as ascribing to the Sublime." P. 48.

" Aug. 11, 1798. Looked over Sir Joshua Reynolds' papers in the *Idler*: curious as containing the seeds of those doctrines, which he has more fully expanded in his subsequent discourses. In the third he maintains, (what Burke has controverted,) that Beauty is that invariable general form in every species, which nature always seems to intend, to which she is perpetually approaching, and which she more frequently produces than any par-

ticular description of deviation or deformity. He seems, with Plato, to ascribe a real independent existence to these mental abstractions." P. 93.

" June 3, 1799. Viewed afterwards the Miltonic Gallery; and was powerfully impressed with the striking illustration it affords of Burke's Doctrine, (*Subl. and Beau.* p. 2, sect. 3d, and 4th,) respecting the superior efficacy of the indistinctness of poetical imagery, in exciting emotions of the sublime, over the necessary precision and exactness of actual delineation, however forcible and vivid. The example perhaps may be considered as not altogether a fair one — for Fuseli is unquestionably rather bombastic than sublime; and in his vehement struggles to embody the preposterous phantoms of a fevered brain, exhibits the writhings and contortions of the Sibyl, without the inspiration: yet he has done enough, I think, to shew, how feeble and ineffective *any* attempt must be, to represent on canvas those awful and mysterious forms, which our great Bard has shadowed forth so impressively, yet obscurely, in his immortal Poem. The department, in which Fuseli appears most calculated to shine, is in the fantastic portraiture of fairies, sylphs, and elves — where the wildest freaks of fancy may be safely indulged without offence to truth and nature. He injudiciously represents the visions, and even the metaphors of *Paradise Lost*." P. 138.

" Nov. 23, 1799. Finished the perusal of Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric*. The praise of ingenuity, of a judgment in general accurate, and a taste for the most part timidly correct, I can readily allow him; but to the higher order of merit in a critic — to that superior sensibility, which imparts a just relish for transcendent excellence, and to that philosophical sagacity, penetrating discernment, and nice tact,

which qualify the possessor for tracing the pleasures of the imagination to their secret springs, he has certainly not the slightest pretensions. There is no *raciness* — no smack of an original cast of thought or feeling in his work; where little is hazarded, little can be gained; and though his *Lectures*, (I feel the qualifying force of the title,) are exempt, accordingly, from any gross or offensive errors, they are destitute, on the other hand, of whatever is adapted powerfully to awaken interest, and enchain attention, on the most engaging of all human speculations. — He starts on a right principle, by maintaining at the outset (L. 2.,) that Taste is founded on a natural instinctive sensibility to beauty, refined by exercise, and guided and improved by reason; whose office he appears to limit (on this head) to the ascertaining the resemblance of an imitation to the original, or the reference of parts to the whole, or of means to an end, so far as any beauty depends on such resemblance or reference. Thus far, he seems to think that reason may act as a standard to taste: but then, as the application of this test is not sufficiently extensive, and as our reasonings appeal always, in the last resort, to feeling, he has recourse for this purpose, to the concurring sentiments of men placed in situations favourable to the exertions of taste. Truth, the object of reason, he remarks, is one; beauty, the object of taste, manifold; so that men may differ in preferring one beauty to another, according to their age, sensibility, &c., provided they agree in considering the same object as still beautiful, in sufficient consistency with justness of taste. Genius (L. 3.) he distinguishes as the power of executing, taste as the power of judging, and criticism as the application of taste to the fine arts; and maintains here again, that the rules of criticism are not formed by any induction

*a priori* — by any train of abstract reasoning — but are derived from an observation of such beauties as most generally please, though reason afterwards approves them as just and natural. His ideas on this subject, are, on neither occasion, so precisely and determinately marked as one could wish; but they are valuable as enforcing, however loosely, a fundamental distinction too generally overlooked in our researches into the principles of criticism. Abandoning the efficient causes of the pleasures of taste as inscrutable, he proceeds to the consideration of sublimity or grandeur; which he divides, into sublimity in objects, and sublimity in writing; and the former, into physical and moral — the sublime in external things, and the sublime in sentiment. He differs from Burke, who makes terror the source of the sublime; and suggests, with diffidence, that if there is any one quality, in which all sublime objects agree, and which is the cause of their producing a similar emotion, it is ‘mighty power:’ but mighty power, Burke has very justly remarked, is terrible; since so much does our sense of pain predominate over that of pleasure, that we are instinctively prompted to anticipate rather the evils such a power may inflict, than the benefits it may confer. Sublimity in writing, he makes to consist (L. 4.) in describing sublime objects, or exhibiting sublime sentiments, so as to give us forcible impressions of them, viz. with conciseness, simplicity, and strength — the result of lively feelings in the writer. — In treating of beauty (L. 5.) he professes himself unable to discover any common quality running through all the varieties of objects regarded as beautiful, which entitle them to that distinction; and he proceeds accordingly to consider separately, the beauty of colour, figure, and motion, the union of these, the beauty of expression of the mind —



where he takes occasion to observe, that the higher virtues, (such as I should term, those which turn on self-command,) excite an emotion of the sublime, the social and more gentle, (those which turn on sensibility,) of the beautiful, — and lastly the beauty arising from the fitness of means to an end: — he distinguishes, too, an appropriate beauty in writing, consisting in a certain turn in the style and sentiment, calculated to diffuse a serene delight. The truth is, I think, that beauty, in its popular sense, and regarded as applicable to the exciting causes of every species of the *gentler* pleasurable sensations, is much too lax to oppose to the sublime; except in the very vague sense, in which that term is employed by Longinus, who seems to include under it, whatever produces *vehement* emotion; and a consequent embarrassment, I suspect, must ever take place in the treatment of this subject, till a more precise circumscription of these qualities obtains. Besides beauty and sublimity, Blair considers that there are other pleasures of taste, such as those arising from novelty, imitation, melody, harmony, numerousness, and the effect produced by wit, humour, and ridicule; and remarks, that poetry and eloquence avail themselves of all these modes of touching the affections." P. 177.

" July 15, 1797. Read in the *Star*, this morning, the following solemn and affecting account of the death of Edmund Burke. It has all the appearance of coming from authority. ' On Saturday night died, at his seat near Beaconsfield, after a long and painful illness, which he bore with a pious fortitude suited to his character, in his 68th year, the Right Honourable E. B. His end was suited to the simple greatness of mind, which he displayed through life; every way unaffected; without levity, without ostentation. Full of natural

‘ grace and dignity, he appeared neither to wish  
 ‘ nor to dread, but patiently and placidly to await,  
 ‘ the appointed hour of his dissolution. He had  
 ‘ been listening to some essay of Addison’s, in which  
 ‘ he ever took delight; he had recommended him-  
 ‘ self in many affectionate messages to the remem-  
 ‘ brance of those absent friends, whom he never  
 ‘ ceased to love; he had conversed some time with  
 ‘ his accustomed force of thought and of expression,  
 ‘ on the awful situation of his country, for the wel-  
 ‘ fare of which his heart was interested to the last  
 ‘ beat; he had given, with steady composure, some  
 ‘ private directions, in contemplation of his approach-  
 ‘ ing death, when, as his attendants were conveying  
 ‘ him to his bed, he sunk down, and, after a short  
 ‘ struggle, passed quietly and without a groan, to  
 ‘ eternal rest, in that mercy which he had just de-  
 ‘ clared, he had long sought with unfeigned humili-  
 ‘ ation, and to which he looked with a trembling  
 ‘ hope.’ I shall never forget the chilling reply of a  
 French emigrant of condition, to whom I had com-  
 municated this awful event with some considerable  
 emotion; ‘ Ah! une grande perte: voila *un orateur*  
 ‘ *de moins!*’ P. 36.

“ June 13, 1799. Had a long and interesting  
 conversation with Mr. Mackintosh turning princi-  
 pally on Burke and Fox. Of Burke he spoke with  
 rapture; declaring that he was, in his estimation,  
 without any parallel in any age or country—except  
 perhaps Lord Bacon and Cicero; that his works  
 contained an ampler store of political and moral  
 wisdom than could be found in any other writer  
 whatever; and that he was only not esteemed the  
 most severe and sagacious of reasoners, because he  
 was the most eloquent of men,—the perpetual force  
 and vigour of his arguments being hid from vulgar  
 observation by the dazzling glories, in which they

were enshrined. In taste alone he thought him deficient ; but to have possessed that quality in addition to his others, would have been too much for men. Passed the last Christmas with Burke at Beaconsfield ; and described, in glowing terms, the astonishing effusions of his mind in conversation. Perfectly free from all taint of affectation : would enter, with cordial glee, into the sports of children ; rolling about with them on the carpet, and pouring out, in his gambols, the sublimest images mingled with the most wretched puns. Anticipated his approaching dissolution, with due solemnity, but perfect composure. Minutely and accurately informed, to a wonderful exactness, with respect to every fact relative to the French Revolution. — M. lamented, with me, Fox's strange deportment during this tremendous crisis ; and attributed it, partly to an ignorance respecting these facts, and partly to a misconception of the true character of the democratic philosophers of the day, whom he confounded with the old advocates for reform, and with whose genuine spirit he appeared on conversation totally unacquainted, ascribing the temper and views imputed to them, entirely to the calumny of party. Idle and uninquisitive, to a remarkable degree. Burke said of him, with a deep sigh, ' He is made to be loved.' Fox said of Burke, that M. would have praised him too highly, had that been possible ; but that it was not in the power of man, to do justice to his various and transcendent merits. Declared, he would set his hand to every part of the *Preliminary Discourse on the Law of Nature and Nations*, except the account of Liberty — a subject which he considered with Burke, as purely practical, and incapable of strict definition. Of Gibbon, M. neatly remarked, that he might have been cut out of a corner of Burke's mind, without his missing it.—Spoke

highly of Johnson's prompt and vigorous powers in conversation, and, on this ground, of Boswell's *Life* of him: Burke, he said, agreed with him: and affirmed, that this work was a greater monument to Johnson's fame; than all his writings put together.— Condemned democracy as the most monstrous of all governments, because it is impossible at once to act and to control, and consequently the sovereign power, in such a constitution, must be left without any check whatever: regarded that form of government as best, which placed the efficient sovereignty in the hands of the natural aristocracy of a country, subjecting them in its exercise to the control of the people at large. — Descanted largely in praise of our plan of representation; by which, uncouth and anomalous as it may in many instances appear, and indeed on that very account, such various and diversified interests became proxied in the House of Commons. Our democracy, he acutely remarked, was powerful, but concealed, to prevent popular violence; our monarchy, prominent and ostensible, to provoke perpetual jealousy. — Extolled in warm terms — which he thought as a foreigner, (a Scotchman,) he might do without the imputation of partiality, for he did not mean to include his own countrymen in the praise — the characteristic *bon naturel*, the good temper and sound sense, of the English people; qualities, in which he deliberately thought us without a rival in any other nation on the globe. — Strongly defended Burke's paradoxical position, that vice loses its malignancy with its grossness, on the principle, that all disguise is a limitation upon vice. — Stated with much earnestness, that the grand object of his political labours should be, first, and above all, to extinguish a false, wretched and fanatical philosophy, which, if we did not destroy, would assuredly destroy us; and then to revive and rekin-

dle that antient genuine spirit of British liberty, which an alarm, partly just and partly abused, had smothered for the present, but which, combined with a providential succession of fortunate occurrences, had rendered us, in better times, incomparably the freest, wisest, and happiest nation under heaven." P. 139.

" Aug 4, 1798. With respect to Mr. Fox's eloquence, (another topic of discussion this evening,) there are few circumstances, I confess, which render me so justly diffident of my own taste, as the not feeling for it, 'horresco referens,' that keen relish which the world tells me that I ought to do. Its admirable adaptation to the purposes of debate in an English House of Commons, I distinctly perceive and eagerly acknowledge; but while it assails at once our judgment and our passions, in this character, with matchless dexterity and force, it certainly furnishes little of that aliment to the imagination, which is so delectable, and, to my intellectual cravings, so indispensable, in works on which we wish to revel in the closet. That this ground of *dissatisfaction*, is no just cause of *complaint*, against compositions intended for other purposes, and which perform those purposes with such incomparable success, I feel, while I am assigning it: but — it operates: and with the deepest sense of their transcendent merit as effusions addressed, on the exigency of the occasion, to the business and bosoms of men, I turn, in the hour of literary recreation, whatever be the shame, with delight, from the vehement harangues of Fox, to the 'variegated and expanded eloquence' of Burke; which if it does not hurry us along, like the other, by its impetuous and reiterated assaults, directly to the goal, yet, by the ample stores of moral and political wisdom, which it unfolds, the radiant imagery, with which it

illuminates these treasures, and the powerful appeals to our best affections, by which it seconds their operation, enlarges the understanding, replenishes the fancy, dilates the heart, and generously aims to effectuate the purpose of the speaker, rather by elevating us to his own standard in contemplating the subject, which he treats, than by accommodating itself to the contracted views and dispositions, which we may bring to its discussion." P. 92.

" July 12, 1798. Finished Bissett's *Life of Burke*. He has a right view and just estimation of this wonderful man; and his work derives an additional interest, from the contemporary characters introduced: but it by no means precludes, what I have sometimes meditated, *A Dissertation on the Genius and Character of Edmund Burke*, — a subject rich in interest, but for which the public mind, agitated as it has been by recent events, is yet far from prepared." P. 90.

" Aug. 18, 1799. Still at Dolgelle. Our table, here, has become a sort of ordinary to the Inn; and we have been infinitely entertained, to-day, with a very extraordinary character under a most unpromising aspect — the Rev. Mr. T.; once the Porson of Oxford, for genius, eccentricity, and erudition. He has visited Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, and Sicily; conversed with Voltaire, had an interview with Rousseau, and was acquainted with Johnson. Scarce a place could be mentioned, or a character named, with which, from personal knowledge or exact information, he was not perfectly conversant: and though positive, captious, irritable, and impatient of contradiction, he amply atoned for all the rubs he gave us, by the acuteness of his remarks, the originality of his sallies, the vivacity of his anecdotes and descriptions, and the promptness and depth he evinced on every

topic, that was started, however remote from the ordinary track of conversation. Such a companion would be an acquisition anywhere, but was inestimable here. — Had spent an evening with Lavater, who pronounced him flatly, at first view, an incorrigible rogue: — L. himself, something more than an enthusiast, and very near mad; fancying that he resembles Jesus Christ in the countenance, with many other such preposterous whimsies. Represented the King of Naples, with whom he had frequently conversed, as perfectly stupid, sottish, and ignorant; — literally scarcely able to write. Had twice attempted *Ætna*; the second time successful, and saw from its summit the sun rise in all its glory: affirmed Brydone's glowing description of this gorgeous scene, however carped at, to be very correct, and not more than just. Described, with great force, his having heard a religious enthusiast preach his own funeral sermon, with the ghastly horrors of the 'facies Hippocratica' depicted in his aspect — a thrilling spectacle.

"We have been fortunate, too, in meeting with Mr. D —, the grandson of the chronologist. He knew Hume well; and spoke of him as the most amiable of men, and of the most accommodating manners. Mentioned that his father, a Canon of Salisbury, piqued himself much on having distinguished and patronised Burke, when quite obscure at Lincoln's Inn; and having then pronounced, from the rare combination he observed in him of transcendent ability and unwearied application, that he would become one of the brightest ornaments of his country." P. 156.

"Nov. 20, 1799. Mr. L., with some other friends, dined with me. Mentioned that Fox confessed to his friend Dr. Jebb, that he had personal ambition — that he wished for power; but trusted that he

should employ it to good purposes. Never disguised from his adherents of this school, his decided aversion to their schemes of parliamentary reform. This is quite according to Fox's characteristic candour: yet I well remember Horne Tooke's sarcastically telling me on the Hustings at Covent-Garden, that he regarded him as a *cunning*, but not a *wise*, man! Exactly, I conceive, the reverse of the truth. Mr. Fox's wisdom, few but Mr. Tooke will be disposed to question: it is a species of wisdom, however, if ever there was one, which neither his supporters nor his opponents can reproach with guile; and rarely, I believe, has this illustrious statesman had occasion to blush, at proving himself too shrewd, in those cases, — and such Mr. Burke has actually remarked there are, — in which a man of honour would be ashamed *not* to have been imposed upon. P. 174.

*Extracts from the Diary of a Lover  
of Literature.*



## SECOND APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

*Extracts from various Writers respecting Burke.*

---

“ I hope that on these subjects, (the character and influence, of vanity, marriage, and the family-relations,) as Mr. Hall has aspired to imitate Mr. Burke, he really feels the sentiments he has retailed with force only inferior to his favourite author. I will not say of his eloquence that I descry in it every excellence but the enthusiasm of the heart, as Dr. Drennan has said of Mr. Burke’s. I do not discover in Mr. Hall’s eloquence every excellence, which adorns Mr. Burke’s. Mr. Hall wants the ease and flow, the fertility of allusion, the boundless fancy, and the rich and inexhaustible treasure of knowledge, which constituted the pride and ornament of Burke’s mind. He has strength indeed, but it is the strength of a camel, rather than that of a bounding steed, equally distinguished for its vigour, and the grace and elegance of its motions. He is fierce and savage in expression—he burns, but he does not illuminate. His merit consists in repeating in different, and certainly not improved language, the opinions of Burke often by himself and by others repeated; for his Sermon (*on Infidelity*) neither boasts originality of thought, novelty of arrangement, nor acuteness of reasoning. I will suppose, however, that Mr. Burke happened to express the feelings of Mr. Hall, and that Mr. Hall has therefore copied his feelings, as well as Mr. Burke, in his declamation upon sensibility, tender-

ness, gratitude, and all the finest feelings of the finest minds.”

Anthony Robinson's *Examination of a Sermon, preached at Cambridge by Robert Hall, M.A. entitled 'Modern Infidelity considered with respect to its Influence on Society,' with an Appendix containing Observations upon a Critique on the Sermon, in the Monthly Review for Febr. 1800.* Lond. 1809, 8vo. p. 44.

“ *On Theories and the Rights of Man.* Among the many alarming symptoms of the present time, it is not the least that there is a prevailing disposition to hold in contempt the *theory* of liberty as false and visionary. For my own part, it is my determination never to be deterred by an obnoxious name from an open avowal of any principles, that appear useful and important. Were the ridicule, now cast on the *Rights of Man*, confined to a mere phrase, as the title of a book, it were of little consequence; but, when *that* is made the pretence for deriding the doctrine itself, it is matter of serious alarm. To place the rights of man as the basis of lawful government, is not peculiar to Mr. Paine; but was done more than a century ago by men of no less eminence than Sidney and Locke. It is therefore extremely disingenuous to impute the system to Mr. Paine as its author. His structure may be false and erroneous, but the foundation was laid by other hands. That there are *natural* rights, or in other words, a certain liberty, which men may exercise, independent of permission from society, can scarcely be doubted by those, who comprehend the meaning of the terms. Every man must have a natural right to use his limbs in what manner he pleases, that is not injurious to another. In like manner he must have a right to worship God after the mode he

thinks acceptable; or in other words, he ought not to be compelled to consult anything but his own conscience. These are a specimen of those rights, which may properly be termed *natural*; for, as philosophers speak of the primary qualities of matter, they cannot be increased or diminished. We cannot conceive, therefore, the right of using our limbs to be created by society, or to be rendered more complete by any human agreement or compact. But there still remains a question, whether this natural liberty must not be considered as entirely relinquished, when we become members of society. It is pretended, the moment we quit a state of *nature*, as we have given up the controul of our actions in return for the superior advantages of law and government, we can never appeal again to any original principles, but must rest content with the advantages, that are secured by the terms of the society. These are the views, which distinguish the political writings of Mr. Burke; an author, whose splendid and unequalled powers have given a vogue and fashion to certain tenets, which from any other pen would have appeared abject and contemptible. In the field of reason the encounter would not be difficult; but who can withstand the fascination and magic of his eloquence? The excursions of his genius are immense. His imperial fancy has laid all nature under tribute, and has collected riches from every scene of the creation, and every walk of art. His eulogium on the Queen of France is a masterpiece of pathetic composition; — so select are its images, — so fraught with tenderness, — and so rich with colours, ‘dipt in heaven,’ that he, who can read it without rapture, may have merit as a reasoner, but must resign all pretensions to taste and sensibility. His imagination is in truth only too prolific; — a world of itself,

where he dwells in the midst of chimerical alarms, is the dupe of his own enchantments, and starts, like Prospero, at the spectres of his own creation. His intellectual views in general, however, are wide and variegated rather than distinct; and the light he has let in on the British constitution in particular, resembles the coloured effulgence of a painted medium, a kind of mimic twilight; solemn and soothing to the senses, but better fitted for ornament than use. A book has lately been published, under the title of *Happiness and Rights*, written by Mr. Hey, a respectable member of the University of Cambridge, whose professed object is, with Mr. Burke, to overturn the doctrine of natural rights. The few remarks I may make upon it, are less on account of any merit in the work itself, than on account of its author, who being a member of considerable standing in the most liberal of our Universities, may be presumed to speak the sentiments of that learned body. The chief difference between his theory and Mr. Burke's seems to be the denial of the existence of any rights, that can be denominated natural, which Mr. Burke only supposes *re-signed* on the formation of political society,"

Robert Hall's *Apology for the Freedom of the Press, and for General Liberty*, Edn. 3, Lond. 1802. 8vo. p. 52.

When two such eminently intellectual men as the Rev. Robert Hall, and Dr. Parr, in language so beautiful that each might have disputed the palm with the other, speak of Mr. Burke as a wizard, and own the magic influence, which he exerted over their souls by the work in question, we may imagine the overwhelming power, with which it must have acted on the public mind:—

“ Upon the first perusal of Mr. Burke's book I

felt, like many other men, its magic force; and, like many other men, I was at last delivered from the illusions, which had 'cheated my reason,' and borne me onward from admiration to assent. But, though the dazzling spell be now dissolved, I still remember with pleasure the gay and celestial visions, when 'my mind in sweet madness was robbed of itself.' I still look back with a mixture of pity and holy awe, to the wizard himself, who, having lately broken his wand in a state of phrensy, has shortened the term of his sorceries; and of drugs so potent to 'bathe spirits in delight,' I must still acknowledge that many were culled from the choicest and 'most virtuous plants' of paradise itself." Dr. Parr's *Sequel to the Printed Paper*, p. 63.

"When philosophers assure us we cannot understand causes, that we perceive only effects, philosophically speaking, they say truth: but all our actions, — this is no less true, — are wheels within wheels, a train of causes and effects. Though of primary causes we know nothing, yet what are but effects with respect to phenomena that preceded, become causes with respect to those that follow. And what is our guide in all the regular, useful pursuits of human life, but correct observations of those causes, and a right application of our knowledge for purposes of just reasoning, and daily experience.

"Thus when the body is diseased, we refer, as to the cause, to the taking of too much or too little food, of too much or too little exercise, to inordinate passions, or to other casualties and influences incident to our nature: on beholding a building in ruins, we consider the materials of which it was composed, and the purposes for which it was raised, more than the time it has lasted, or the power, by which it was destroyed. So with respect to those

tumults, and wars, and violent deaths in civil communities, it is not so much a question of what now is, as of what has been? ‘*Whence come wars and rumours of wars?*’

“ The opinions, professions, and conduct of men, are as necessarily influenced by causes, as the events, which take place in civil society; and we must estimate the writings of men in the same manner. Thus in the writings of Bacon and Hobbes, judging from the principles laid down, or the occasional concessions introduced in the writings of these philosophers, I infer, that some of their opinions took an impulse from their relative situations, from the circumstances of the times, more than from the genuine impulse of their own great minds, or from following the order of their own systems. And this is the most candid account, that can be given of the matter, in cases where the principles of civil liberty and of arbitrary power are intermingled, like contradictory masses amalgamated in one body, in the same system.

“ Burke was a striking example of this vacillating state of mind. Whether, as another person spake of himself, he could not afford to keep a conscience, and should always yield to *expediency*, I do not inquire; but he was certainly a political engineer, full of manœuvring powers; taking his stand often in opposite points, moving in opposite directions, and pursuing his operations by such contradictory designs, that he hardly seemed the same man; at one time laying down natural laws and fundamental principles, pleading for liberty against power and the usurpations of political establishments, for reforms against public abuses and unconstitutional influence. Then again he rallies:— behold him pleading for power against liberty, for the usurpations of establishments against the laws of nature;

for the continuance of corruptions, in defiance of his own high demands for the independence of parliaments; and for the support of an influence, which he had before denounced as having increased beyond all due bounds, and as being unconstitutional! Such was the political progress of Mr. Burke's mind, from the American War, to that epoch in the French Revolution, which he lived to witness.

“ Highly probable, too, it is, that the recent commotions and changes, which have taken place on the Continent, — changes, which were preceded by violent flashes of light, and often followed by sensible darkness, — have occasioned, I will not say tergiversation, but rather confusion, perplexity, contradiction, unmanageable points in the opinions of many in England at this time: that some from unexpected events have receded from opinions, which were thought violent, because they were earnest, and from demands, which were deemed clamorous, because they were popular. But examples occur, where men are rather confounded than converted; where they may be said rather to yield to circumstances, than to abandon their principles: and they become like musical instruments, which, though not shattered and broken, are miserably out of tune, or played on by unskilful hands. Because they do not understand the world, they think they do not understand themselves: and, perhaps in both cases they think truly. For if man has been justly called a microcosm, or little world, for the variety of his individual nature; society, from its combination of different inclinations, pursuits, interests, powers, passions, and conditions, may be called the megacosm, [*megalocosm*,] or great world; a machine of vast compass, intricate contrivances, inexplicable movements, and deep recesses: and in

contemplating it very honest men may be mistaken, when they think themselves right; and they may have been right, when they think themselves to have been mistaken. And should any of us have trembled, as it were for a while on that narrow neck of land, FEAR, which Hobbes makes the origin of society, I hope we shall never plunge into that ocean of arbitrary power, which for all the valuable purposes of life, would be its destruction.

“Nor is it improbable, that some have gone, from the same cause, the contrary way; that, as some have been moved backward, to Fear, others may have been led forward, to Hope; that thinking circumstances of public calamity and alarm should lead nations, no less than individuals, to serious thoughts, and permanent reformations, they have eyed more narrowly public abuses, and perceived their consequences; that, thinking corruption tends to division, dissolution and death; and that mutual sympathies, mutual confidence, and mutual protection, the great ends of civil society, can bring the dispersed interests of individuals to a resting place, and by exciting the most pleasing, the most salutary feeling of co-operation, can unite and consolidate them for purposes of public utility, they have renounced claims, which they once advocated, and advocate claims, which they once opposed; and that after vacillating backwards and forwards like a pendulum, for a long time, they may at length, perhaps, imagine they are now come to their proper point of rest; believing there is much truth in the declaration, that when ‘the divine judgments are abroad in the earth, the nations should learn *righteousness.*’ ”

George Dyer's *Four Letters on the English Constitution*, Edn. 3. Lond. 1817. 8vo. p. 113.



“ Mr. Canning was a great admirer of Mr. Burke, and in a poem called *New Morality*, speaks of him as a sage,

‘ To whom late times shall turn their rev’rent eyes,  
‘ Led by his light, and by his wisdom wise.’

In words of similar import, a pre-eminent scholar\* not long deceased, says of Mr. Burke’s speeches and writings in general, ‘ That there is in them a ‘ happy application of sound, solemn, saintly morality to political subjects,’ and further declares that in his famous *Reflections on the French Revolution*, he (Mr. Burke) ‘ has spread before the ‘ world many adamantine and imperishable truths, ‘ which unfold the secret springs of human actions, ‘ and their effects upon human happiness; — many, ‘ in which he unites the ready discernment of a ‘ statesman with the profound views of a philosopher; — many, which at all times and in all countries, must deserve the consideration of all governments and all subjects; many which the principles ‘ of the British constitution amply justified, and ‘ in which the good morals and the good order ‘ of society, were interested deeply and permanently.’ The same writer, however, agrees with Sir James Mackintosh,† that instances are to be found, in that work, of truths misapplied, facts distorted, as well as of partial and inadequate views of some of the topics discussed in it. Mr. Canning himself remarks of Mr. Burke, that

‘ Sometimes his vent’rous spirit lov’d to urge  
‘ The lab’ring theme to reason’s utmost verge.’

While, therefore, Mr. Canning, like Mr. Burke, combined a decided hostility to jacobinical licentious-

\* “ See *Characters of Charles James Fox*, by *Philopatris Varvicensis*.”

† “ See the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ* of this eloquent writer.”

ness, with the warmest attachment to rational, well-regulated liberty, and while he hated the former, chiefly because in its direct tendency it is subversive of the latter, there is ground to conclude that Mr. Canning's political philosophy, though founded on that of Mr. Burke, was corrected by his own judgment, and improved by experience. He was not so original a thinker as Mr. Burke; yet much better fitted to be a practical statesman, especially as a leader. He did not possess in the same degree, but kept under better controul, a faculty, in which Mr. Burke surpassed all the great men of the last century. I mean that high faculty of imagination, which, by its diffusive and modifying influence, calls up for the poet new creations, out of the existing worlds presented to him by nature, by learning, by science, and by art. But as it is a complex principle, including more particularly abstraction, and a vivid conception, its combinations are of great use to a philosophic reasoner, not merely giving to style the highest graces, and richest magnificence, not only decorating the operations of intellect, but frequently supplying it with the materials, on which it acts, the wings, by which it soars, and the light, by which it sees comprehensively around it. In popular language, and in poetry, it is often confounded with fancy. But in a strict acceptation of the term, fancy is a lower property of mind, and when used by orators, shews itself in comparisons, in apt allusions, in the playfulness of humour, in the corruscations of wit, in illustrations, that only shine around the body of argument, like the halos, which Newton speaks of, as 'seen by reflexion, in a vessel of stagnating water,' and which he describes as 'crowns or rings of colours about the sun.' In the exercise of this

faculty, Mr. Canning was quite as much distinguished as Mr. Burke.”

The Rev. R. Kennedy's *Tribute in Verse, to the Character of the late Right Hon. George Canning, with prefatory Observations, as also with Notes relating to the same Subject, and to present political circumstances.* Lond. 1827. 8vo. p. 10.

“ How much soever men may differ as to the soundness of Mr. Burke's doctrine, or the purity of his public conduct, there can be no hesitation in according to him a station among the most extraordinary men, that have ever appeared; and we think there is now but little diversity of opinion as to the kind of place, which it is fit to assign him. He was a writer of the first class, and excelled in almost every kind of prose-composition. Possessed of most extensive knowledge, and of the most various description; acquainted alike with what different classes of men knew, each in his own province, and with much that hardly any one ever thought of learning; he could either bring his masses of information to bear directly upon the subjects, to which they severally belonged, — or he could avail himself of them generally to strengthen his faculties and enlarge his views — or he could turn any portion of them to account, for the purpose of illustrating his theme, or enriching his diction. Hence, when he is handling any one matter, we perceive that we are conversing with a reasoner or a teacher, to whom almost every other branch of knowledge is familiar, His views range over all the cognate subjects; his reasonings are derived from principles applicable to other theories as well as the one in hand: arguments pour in from all sides, as well as those which start up under our feet,

the natural growth of the path he is leading us over ; while, to throw light round our steps, and either explore its darker places, or serve for our recreation, illustrations are fetched from a thousand quarters, and an imagination marvellously quick to descry unthought of resemblances, points to our use the stores, which a lore yet more marvellous has gathered from all ages, and nations, and arts, and tongues. We are, in respect of the argument, reminded of Bacon's multifarious knowledge, and the exuberance of his learned fancy ; while the many-lettered diction recalls to mind the first of English poets, and his immortal verse, rich with the spoils of all sciences and all times. The kinds of composition are various, and he excels in them all, with the exception of two the very highest, given but to few, and when given, almost always possessed alone, — fierce, nervous, overwhelming declamation, and close, rapid reasoning. Every other he uses easily, abundantly, and successfully. He produced but one philosophical treatise ; but no man lays down abstract principles more soundly, or better traces their application. All his works, indeed, even his controversial, are so informed with general reflection, so variegated with speculative discussion, that they wear the air of the Lycæum as well as the Academy. His narrative is excellent ; and it is impossible more luminously to expose the details of a complicated subject, to give them more animation and interest, if dry in themselves, or to make them bear, by the mere power of statement, more powerfully upon the argument. In description he can hardly be surpassed, at least for effect ; he has all the qualities, that conduce to it, — ardour of purpose, sometimes rising into violence, — vivid, but too luxuriant fancy, — bold, frequently extravagant, conception, — the faculty of shedding over mere inanimate scenery the light imparted by

moral associations. He indulges in bitter invective, mingled with poignant wit, but descending often to abuse and even scurrility; he is apt moreover to carry an attack too far, as well as strain the application of a principle; to slay the slain; or turn the reader's contempt into pity."

"In fact, he was deficient in judgment; he regarded not the degree of interest felt by his audience in the topics, which deeply occupied himself; and seldom knew when he had said enough on those, which affected them as well as him. He was admirable in exposition; in truth, he delighted to give instruction both when speaking and conversing, and in this he was unrivalled: *Quis in sententiis argutior? in docendo edisserendoque subtilior?* Mr. Fox might well avow, without a compliment, that he had learnt more from him alone, than from all other men and authors. But, if any one thing is proved by unvarying experience of popular assemblies, it is that an excellent dissertation makes a very bad speech. The speaker is not the only person actively engaged, while a great oration is pronouncing; the audience have their share; they must be excited, and for this purpose constantly appealed to as recognized persons of the drama. The didactic orator, (if, as has been said of the poet, it be not a contradiction in terms,) has it all to himself; the hearer is merely passive; and the consequence is, he soon ceases to be a listener, and if he can, even to be a spectator. Mr. Burke was essentially didactic, except when the violence of his invective carried him away, and then he offended the correct taste of the House of Commons, by going beyond the occasion, and by descending to coarseness. When he argued, it was by unfolding large views, and seizing upon analogies too remote, and drawing distinctions 'too fine for hearers,' or

at the best, by a body of statements, lucid, certainly, and diversified with flower and fruit, and lighted up with pleasantries, but almost always in excess, and overdone in these qualities, as well as in its own substance. He had little power of hard stringent reasoning, as we have more than once remarked; and his declamation was addressed to the head, as from the head it proceeded, learned, fanciful, ingenious, but not impassioned. Of him, as a combatant, we may say what Aristotle did of the old philosophers, when he compared them to unskilful boxers, who hit round about, and not straight forward, and fight with little effect, though they may by chance sometimes deal a hard blow: *Οἷον ἐν ταῖς μάχαις οἱ ἀγύμναστοι ποιοῦσι καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι περιφορούμενοι τύπτουσι πολλάκις καλὰς πληγὰς, ἀλλ' οὐτ' ἐκεῖνοι ἀπ' ἐπιστήμης.* (*Metaphys.*)\*

“Cicero has somewhere called eloquence *copiose loquens sapientia*. This may be true of written, but of spoken eloquence it is a defective definition, and will, at the best, only comprehend the *demonstrative*, (or *epideictic*,) kind, which is banished, for want of an audience, from all modern assemblies of a secular description. Thus, though it well charac-

\* “The Attic reader will be here reminded of the first *Philippic*, in which a very remarkable passage, and in part, too, applicable to our subject, seems to have been suggested by the passage in the text; and its great felicity both of apt comparison and of wit, should, with a thousand other passages, have made critics pause, before they denied those qualities to the chief of orators: *Ὡσπερ δὲ οἱ βάρβαροι πυκτεύουσιν, οὕτω πολεμεῖτε Φιλίππῳ· καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ πληγεὶς ἀεὶ τῆς πληγῆς ἐχέται· κἂν ἐτέρωσε πατάξῃ τις, ἐκεῖσε εἰσιν αἱ χεῖρες, προβάλλεσθαι δ' ἢ βλέπειν ἐναντίον οὐτ' οἶδεν, οὐτ' ἐθέλει:* which he proceeds to illustrate by the conduct held respecting the Chersonese and Thermopylæ.”

terises Mr. Burke, yet the defects, which we have pointed out, were fatal to his success. Accordingly, the test of eloquence, which the same master has in so picturesque a manner given, from his own constant experience, here entirely failed:—*Volo hoc oratori contingat, ut cum auditum sit eum esse dicturum, locus in subselliis occupetur, compleatur tribunal, gratiosi scribæ sint in dando et cedendo locum, corona multiplex, judex erectus; cum surgit is, qui dicturus sit, significetur a corona silentium, deinde crebræ assentiones, multæ admirationes: risus, cum velit; cum velit, fletus; ut, qui hæc procul videat, etiamsi quid agatur nesciat, at placere tamen, et in scena Roscium intelligat.* For many years, that is, between the latter part of the American war, and the speeches, which he made, neither many nor long, nor in a very usual or regular style, on the French revolution, the very reverse of all this was to be seen and lamented, as often as Mr. Burke spoke. The spectator saw no signs of Roscius being in action, but rather of the eminent civilian, (Dr. French Laurence,) we have already spoken of. *Videt,* (as the same critic has, in another passage, almost to the letter described it,) *oscitantem judicem, loquentem cum altero, nonnunquam etiam circumstantem, mittentem ad horas; quæstionem, ut dimittat, rogantem; intelligit, oratorem in ea causa non adesse, qui possit animis judicum admovere orationem, tanquam fidibus manum.*

“ But it may justly be said, with the second of Attic orators, that sense is always more important than eloquence; and no one can doubt that enlightened men in all ages will hang over the works of Mr. Burke, and dwell with delight even upon speeches, that failed to command the attention of those, to whom they were addressed. Nor is it by their rhetorical beauties that they interest us. The

extraordinary depth of his detached views, the penetrating sagacity, which he *occasionally* applies to the affairs of men and their motives, and the curious felicity of expression, with which he unfolds principles, and traces resemblances and relations, are separately the gift of few, and in their union probably without any example. This must be admitted on all hands; it is possibly the last of our observations, which will obtain universal assent, as it is the last we have to offer before coming upon disputed ground, where the fierce contentions of politicians cross the more quiet path of the critic.

“ It is another characteristic of this great writer, that the unlimited abundance of his stores makes him profuse in their expenditure. Never content with one view of a subject, or one manner of handling it, he for the most part lavishes his whole resources upon the discussion of each point. In controversy this is emphatically the case. Indeed, nothing is more remarkable than the variety of ways, in which he makes his approaches to any position he would master. After reconnoitring it with skill and boldness, if not with perfect accuracy, he manœuvres with infinite address, and arrays a most imposing force of general principles mustered from all parts, and pointed, sometimes violently enough, in one direction. He now moves on with the composed air, the even, dignified pace of the historian, and unfolds his facts in a narrative so easy, and yet so correct, that you plainly perceive he wanted only the dismissal of other pursuits to have rivalled Livy or Hume. But soon this advance is interrupted, and he stops to display his powers of description — when the boldness of his design is only matched by the brilliancy of his colouring. He then skirmishes for a space, and puts in motion all the lighter arms of wit — sometimes not unmingled with drollery —



sometimes bordering upon farce. His main battery is now opened, and a tempest bursts forth, of every weapon of attack — invective, abuse, irony, sarcasm, simile, drawn out to allegory, quotation, fable, parable, anathema. The heavy artillery of powerful declamation, and the conflict of close argument alone are wanting; but of which the garrison is not always aware; his noise is oftentimes mistaken for the thunder of true eloquence; the number of his movements distracts, and the variety of his missiles annoys the adversary; a panic spreads, and he carries his point, as if he had actually made a practicable breach; nor is it discovered till after the smoke and confusion is over, that the citadel remains untouched.”

“ Not content with the praise of his philosophic acuteness, which all are ready to allow, the less temperate admirers of this great writer have ascribed to him a gift of genius approaching to the power of divination, and have recognised him as in possession of a judgment so acute and so calm withal, that its decisions might claim the authority of infallible decrees. His opinions have been viewed as always resulting from general principles deliberately applied to each emergency; and they have been looked upon as forming a connected system of doctrines, by which his own sentiments and conduct were regulated, and from which after-times may derive the lessons of practical wisdom.”

“ In the imperfect estimate of this great man’s character and genius, which we have now concluded, let it not be thought that we have made any very large exceptions to the praise unquestionably his due. We have only abated claims preferred by his unheeding worshippers to more than mortal endowments. Enough will remain to command our admiration, after it shall be

admitted that he, who possessed the finest fancy, and the rarest knowledge, did not equally excel other men in sound and calm judgment; enough to excite our wonder at the degree, in which he was gifted with most parts of genius, though our credulity be not staggered by the assertion of a miraculous union of them all. We have been contemplating a great marvel certainly, not gazing on a supernatural sight; and we retire from it with the belief that, if acuteness, learning, imagination so unmeasured, were never before combined, yet have there been occasionally witnessed, in eminent men, greater powers of close reasoning and fervid declamation, oftentimes a more correct taste, for the most part a safer judgment." *The Edinburgh Review*, No. 92.

"Of Burke the *Edinburgh Reviewer* expatiates with the kindred appetite of an eloquent and philosophizing spirit. The different and far inferior position, which this great man occupied as the instructor, perhaps we might say the lecturer, of Parliament, on its highest duties of legislation and state-policy, from that which was assigned to him as an efficient member of a party, and as himself an actor on the stage of government, is to be accounted for, not altogether by his original humbleness of station in society, but by something in the texture of his mind, which seems, in spite of the zealous and daring enterprise, with which Burke rushed forward personally on all occasions, to have fitted him far more for study than for successful action — so little in the real strife and turmoil of affairs were his restless imagination and his vehement passions under the restraint of judgment, sobriety, or good taste. As an orator, Burke dazzled his hearers, then distracted them, and finished by fatiguing or offending them. And it was not uncouth elocution and exte-

rior only, which impaired the efficacy of his speeches; Burke almost always deserted his subject, before he was abandoned by his audience. In the progress of a long discourse he was never satisfied with proving that, which was principally in question, or with enforcing the single measure, which it was his business and avowed purpose to enforce,— he diverged to a thousand collateral topics, — he demonstrated as many disputed propositions, — he established principles in all directions, — he illuminated the whole horizon with his magnificent, but scattered lights. There was, nevertheless, no keeping in his spoken compositions, — no proportion, — no subserviency of inferior groups to greater, — no apparent harmony or unity of purpose. He forgot that there was but a single point to prove, and his auditors in their turn forgot that they had undergone the process of conviction upon any. To the political history of Mr. Burke the Reviewer pays no marked or reverential homage; and posterity will, we apprehend, confirm the sentence, which has already begun to be passed upon the revolution in the *principles* of his policy, — that it was the work of passions becoming more irresistible, and of a judgment more gradually declining with age, much more than of the præternatural penetration and foresight, for which during the war with France, and by the partisans of high monarchical doctrine, credit was so lavishly afforded to him. Mr. Burke, indeed, has this in common with Mr. Pitt, (to whom, by the way, he felt neither love nor gratitude,) that they are both appealed to by the same wretched faction, which, odious while in office, is become worse than contemptible when dismissed from it, in support of a narrow and grovelling system of state-policy, which Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt had equally reprobated; for, except on the single subject of the

French Revolution, Mr. Burke professed the old Whig principles, by defending which the most flourishing era of his public life and character had been distinguished, and to the day, when they each expired, they were decided and uncompromising friends to the cause of equal liberty at home." *The Editor of the Times Dec. 5, 1827. in his Notice of the Edinburgh Review No. 92.*

"Junius's *Letter* on the disputes respecting Falkland's Island, has this remarkable passage: — 'The King of France's present aversion for war, and the distraction of his affairs, are notorious. He is now in a state of war with his people. In vain did the Catholic King solicit him to take part in the quarrel against us. His finances were in the last disorder, and it was probable that his troops might find sufficient employment at home.'

"In his observations on Mr. Grenville's *State of the Nation*, — a publication nearly contemporary with the *Letters* of Junius, Mr. Burke thus expresses himself: — 'Under such extreme straitness and distraction labours the whole body of the French finances; so far does their charge outrun their supply in every particular, that no man, I believe, has considered their affairs, with any degree of attention or information, but must hourly look for some extraordinary convulsion in the whole system, the effects of which, on France and even all over Europe, it is difficult to conjecture.'

*Mens præsaga futuri!*

How superior does the mind of Burke shew itself in this passage, to that which Junius exhibits in the passage cited from him!

"In 1773., Mr. Burke visited France. In the following sessions of Parliament, 'he pointed out,' says his biographer 2, 246. 'the conspiracy of atheism to the watchful jealousy of government.

‘ He said that, though not fond of calling in the aid of the secular arm to suppress doctrines and opinions yet, if ever it was raised, it should be against those enemies of their kind, who would take from man the noblest prerogative of his nature, that of being a religious animal. Already, under the systematic attacks of those men, I see, said Mr. Burke, many of the props of good government and religion beginning to fall; I see propagated principles, which will not leave to religion even a toleration, and make virtue herself less than a name. Memorable words, indeed,’ says the biographer, ‘when we consider their literal fulfilment.’

“ Surely no person, who has read the passages we have just cited from Mr. Burke, can be justified in charging him with adopting, from private views, the principles, which he urged, at the distance of twenty years afterwards, in his speeches and writings on the French Revolution, and which are identical with those, which we have cited, and with others, which we might cite from the same work, and others written by him about the same period.” Mr. Butler’s *Reminiscences* 2, 123.

To Lord Chesterfield, and Horace Walpole, and Oliver Goldsmith, belongs the praise of having distinctly foreseen the French Revolution and its consequences in France; but to Burke belonged the higher honour of having predicted ITS EXTENSIVE EFFECTS OVER EUROPE:—

“ It appears from Horace Walpole’s 69th *Letter* to Conway that he saw as early as 1765., the seeds of the late Revolution, in the atheistic philosophers of Paris, ‘ who, avowing war against Popery, aim, many of them, at a subversion of all religion; and still many more, at the destruction of the regal power.’ And in a *Letter* from Paris to Mr. Bland,

dated Oct. 19, 1765, he observes of the people there:—‘ They have no time to laugh; there is God and the King to be pulled down first; and men and women, one and all, are devoutly employed in the demolition.’ This is an early and strong scent; but Lord Chesterfield (see Oct. 5, 1796.) was still before him.” *Extracts from the Diary of a Lover of Literature*, [by Mr. Green of Ipswich,] p. 125. The passage referred to occurs in p. 9.:—“ In the 26th *Letter* (of Lord Chesterfield) there is a very remarkable prediction, which, as we have lived to see it fully accomplished, is worth curtail- ing and transcribing:—‘ The affairs of France grew more and more serious every day. The King is irresolute, despised, and hated; the minis- ters disunited and incapable; the people poor and discontented; the army, though always the sup- porters and tools of absolute power, are always the destroyers of it too; the nation reasons freely on matters of religion and government;—in short, all the symptoms, which I have ever met with in history, previous to great changes and revolutions in government, now exist, and daily increase in France.’ This was written Dec. 25, 1753.; and, considering the clearness, with which the causes are unfolded, and the consequence foretold, I am sur- prised that it has not been noticed.”

On the other hand, so far was Dr. Maty from discerning ‘ the signs of the times,’ that in 1783. he actually denied the probability of any approach- ing change in the government of France. Mr. Green p. 169. writes thus:—“ It is amusing to mark his speculations, in the first article (of his *Review*,) for Jan. 1783., on the probability of a change in the government of France; an event, which he thinks not likely to take place in the then reign, nor for a great length of time, and at last only

from the extreme misconduct of its rulers ; — but which in fact did take place within seven years from his penning of that article, and without the immediate agency of any such misconduct.”

I sympathise with Mr. Butler in his desire to rescue the memory of Burke from a most serious and most unfounded charge, and therefore I shall most readily make two other quotations from Mr. Green's book. He says in p. 11. : —

“ Lord Chedworth looked in, (*Oct. 9, 1796.*) Adverting to a late event, I remarked that Earl Fitzwilliam was at least consistent — that he pursued the same steps I should myself have taken, had I originally encouraged the war on its only defensible ground — and that he had put administration in a much more awkward situation than it was now possible for opposition to place them — but that I feared his motives were disappointment and chagrin. Burke and the Earl, his Lordship said, had deserted their political principles entirely. This may, or may not be true. The principles, on which they *profess* to have seceded from their party, are so distinct from those, which originally bound that party together, that the mere act of separation can furnish no conclusion on the subject. To be sure, if they have done it on *corrupt* motives, they have abandoned *all* principle ; but they may have separated, and retain the common principles, which once held them together still.” “ The conversation then turned on Burke, against whom, for his late conduct, his Lordship bears an enmity approaching to rancour. I ventured, notwithstanding, to remark that I saw so distinctly the principles of his present opinions scattered through his former works, that, COULD THE CASE OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION HAVE BEEN HYPOTHETICALLY PUT TO ME EIGHT

YEARS AGO, I SHOULD HAVE PREDICTED THAT HE WOULD TAKE PRECISELY THE COURSE HE HAS PURSUED. The care, indeed, with which this wonderful man, during a long series of strenuous opposition to the measures of government, uniformly occupied his ground, and the caution with which he qualified his reasonings,—a care and caution, which really seemed superfluous on the occasion,—might almost indicate that he foresaw the time would come, when he should be glad to urge a very different strain of argument: as we can scarcely, however, give him credit for such foresight, it unquestionably affords a most extraordinary example, in a mind so vehement and impassioned, of the predominance of philosophical over party-spirit.”

It was natural for Mr. Burke, as a man of political caution, to guard his meaning against the possibility of misapprehension in the minds of his less wise, and the misrepresentation of his more cunning, political antagonists; and as a man of philosophical accuracy, to define precisely his meaning, so that his hearers or readers could entertain no doubt as to the extent or the limitations of his meaning.

“Read (Oct. 17, 1798.) Burke’s *Thoughts on the present Discontents*,” says Mr. Green p. 111. “He here assumes his proper and peculiar tone; and winding gracefully into his subject, opens the political grievances of the times with his characteristic plenitude of thought and vigour of expression. It is usual with party-writers, in the vehemence of their zeal and contraction of their views, to urge arguments, which, if a different course of conduct is required by any turn of affairs, must inevitably involve them in the charge of inconsistency: in this piece of Burke’s, on the contrary, are registered, as if by a prophetic forecast, the rudiments of many



of those principles, which he has expanded and enforced in his latter productions; but which, at the time, must have appeared superfluously cautionary; and gave rise, probably, to those imputations of Jesuitism, with which, from my earliest remembrance, he was calumniated by his enemies, without much strenuous opposition from the zealots of his own party. He was never relished, I believe, — he was never formed to be relished, — as a party-man.”

One of the causes, perhaps the main cause, of his not being so ‘relished’ by ‘the zealots of his own party,’ was that his mind soared far above their limited powers of observation — they could not much respect what was above their apprehension and comprehension — they suspected him, because they understood him not — they could not control his movements, which they feared — they found no deference paid by Mr. Burke to them as a party, and their pride was wounded — they had little encouragement for their fiery zeal, and they tamely acquiesced in, or secretly rejoiced at any slight, which Mr. Burke received — whatever lowered him in the public estimation, brought him more to a level with themselves — they saw in his abasement their own exaltation; in his shame, their own glory; in his weakness some hope that those principles would triumph, which his prudence had checked, and those schemes would be adopted, which his judgment had rejected.

“Events certainly were against him, returned Mr. Fox, and neither he nor his ministers had sufficient ability or strength to stem the torrent of revolutionary lava, that flowed so suddenly upon them from all quarters. The volcano has been labouring ever since the expensive wars of Louis XIV, and

its throes are not yet over. Eruption after eruption will take place, until the mountain is exhausted, or nearly levelled with the surrounding plain. France was divided between misery and splendour; the mass of the people toiled without remuneration; and the aristocracy and clergy became rich, powerful, and insolent, by extortions, by pillage, and by exemption from those taxes, which pressed so heavily on the people. This exclusive system was unnatural, and the re-action must consequently be violent, until the energies of the nation are exhausted, or until the people shall begin to feel the benefit of the restoration of their rights. The time is gone by, when a bone would have quieted the dog: he will now fight for the whole carcase.

“ But, Sir, as it was impossible to foresee these events, how could the King, or his counsellors have prevented them ?

“ It was very easy to see, continued the statesman, that the unnatural state of things under the *ancien regime* could not last. It might easily have been foreseen that the increasing misery of the people must, in the course of time, have had an end, either by general revolt, or by general starvation. Many of the people themselves foresaw it. The eyes of the nation were gradually opening by the writings of the philosophers of late years, but particularly by the American war; and they were prepared to assert their rights on the first opportunity, that offered. But the government put off the evil day as long as they could; for they had no desire to clip the wings of aristocracy, so long as the taxes were collected, and the treasury well supplied.

“ Not, however, that they were not well-apprieved that some great change must occur at some period not far distant. Even Louis XV. foresaw it, and

his observation was, I am afraid, but too prophetic of present events. During the contests between the clergy and the parliament, he came in one day to the Marchioness de Pompadour, in great irritation, saying: — ‘ These fellows drive me mad with their disputes ; and because I cannot please both parties, they would vent their rage upon me, if they dared. Unless some measures are projected and acted on, to curb their insolence, they will cut off the head of my successor.’ A Princess, too, of the same family, had forebodings of some such catastrophe. When this modern Cassandra heard some officers, who returned from America, speak of a disorder, termed *influenza*, which had raged throughout the French army, — which many of the soldiers had brought home with them, — and which, it was feared, would prove contagious throughout the kingdom, she said to one of them: — ‘ I fear, General, that you and your troops have imported a disease of a still more contagious and terrible character, *independenza* !’

“ But even our own poet, Goldsmith, so far back as 1760., in his *Chinese Letters*, foretold the present Revolution in France. He says somewhere that, as the Swedes are making concealed approaches to *despotism*, so the French, on the other hand, were daily and imperceptibly vindicating themselves into *freedom*. ‘ When we consider,’ says he, ‘ that their parliaments, the members of which are created by the court, and the presidents acting by the immediate direction of the sovereign or minister ; — when we consider that *they presume even to MENTION privileges and freedom*, and that till lately they received directions from the throne with implicit humility, we cannot help fancying that the Genius of Freedom has entered that

‘ kingdom in disguise. *If they have but three weak Monarchs successively on the throne, the mask will be laid aside, and France will certainly be free.*’”\*

*The Clubs of London, with Anecdotes of their Members, Sketches of Character and Conversations*, Lond. 1828. 12mo. V. 1. p. 56.

The *Edinburgh-Reviewer* p. 282., writes thus: “ Neither shall we look into his speeches, exceeding as they did, the bounds, which all other men, even in the heat of debate, prescribe to themselves, in speaking now of the first magistrate of the country, while labouring under a calamitous visitation of Providence, — now of Kings generally.” And in p. 283, he refers to the phrase, *swinish multitude*.

It is matter of surprise to me that so accurate a reasoner, and so discriminating a judge as the Reviewer is, should have lent a confiding ear to such unjust calumnies against Burke. The latter calumny, so often repeated, has been satisfactorily refuted in the above quotations from the work of Mr. Green; and the former is equally capable of refutation: —

“ Very early after the appearance in 1792., of the two first volumes of *Indian Antiquities*, Mr. Burke, to whom I had been introduced some years before by Dr. Parr, did me the honour, by Mr. Broughton Rouse, to transmit his name and subscription, together with some observations upon the plan and conduct of the work, of which I failed not to avail myself. I afterwards had several instructive interviews with him in Duke-Street, St. James’s; and when, on his appointment to his well-earned pen-

\* “ The Earl of Chesterfield, likewise, who died in 1773., foretold that the French monarchy would not last to the end of the 18th century.”

sion, a few years afterwards, the hostile attacks upon his character being renewed on account of that perhaps too fervid speech of his on the Regency-question, in which he was said cruelly and contemptuously to have spoken of his Sovereign ‘as hurled by the Almighty from his throne,’ I ventured to stand forth in his defence in a periodical publication of that day, he put it in my power effectually to vindicate that character from the foul charge of either cruelty or disloyalty. I mean in *Part III.* to present my readers with the *Letter* of some extent, which he wrote to me upon that occasion, by which it will be seen that he was interrupted in the middle of that speech by loud and vehement clamours from the opposite side of the house, in consequence of which he sat indignantly down, without adding the concluding part of the sentence, which would have annihilated the ideas apparently conveyed by the former part.” *Memoirs of an Author* [by the Rev. T. Maurice,] *Part II.* p. 187. Lond. 1820.

The probability that such was the fact, is confirmed by the occurrence of a similar event at Paris, where the intrepid M. Baruel was in the Chamber of Deputies, compelled by clamour to conclude his speech, before he had finished the sentence, which he was uttering; a sinister interpretation was put on the completed clause by the ministerial members, and he was expelled from the house.

“ Mr. Burke had said of Junius :— ‘ Were he a  
 ‘ Member of that House, what might not be ex-  
 ‘ pected from his knowledge, his firmness, and in-  
 ‘ tegrity? He would be easily known by his con-  
 ‘ tempt of all danger, by his penetration, by his  
 ‘ vigour. Nothing would escape his vigilance and  
 ‘ activity. Bad ministers could conceal nothing  
 ‘ from his sagacity; nor could promises nor threats

‘ induce him to conceal anything from the public.’ What then were the peculiar circumstances, which, in the case of Sir Philip, prevented the character of Junius from discovering itself, as Mr. Burke had predicted? To answer this question properly, it is requisite to consider how much of the character of Junius could have been displayed in the House of Commons. Had he manifested the same daring spirit there, which animated his anonymous productions, he certainly would have been known. But who would have had the hardihood to sustain this part of his character? Not Junius. He knew it would have been his *destruction*; — ‘ he was sure ‘ he should not survive a discovery three days.’ (1, p. \*230. *private Letter* to Woodfall.) Mr. Burke, therefore, evinced an uncommon ignorance of human nature, if he expected *that* conduct to be pursued by Junius in Parliament, which was one of his chief characteristics, only because he was unknown. Of the same unfounded nature was his expectation that Junius would be known by his *knowledge*, his *firmness*, and *integrity*. The two latter qualities are still, thank Heaven! too common for any Member to be exclusively distinguished for possessing them. And as for his knowledge, not only would any man reasonably dread to declare in his own person the facts revealed by Junius, but at the time Sir Philip was a Member of the House, he had not those secret means of acquiring information, which he possessed, when the *Letters* were written. Nothing remains then, by which he might have been discovered, but the force and splendour of his eloquence. And of this how little can be expected, when we recollect the labour, which Junius confessedly bestowed upon his writings to fit them for the public eye. ‘ Such finished forms of composition,’ says the Author of the *Essay*, (1, p.\* 91.) ‘ bear in them-

---

‘ selves the most evident marks of elaborate forecast and revisal ; and the author rather boasted of the pains he had bestowed upon them, than attempted to conceal his labour.’ This difficulty of composition in the case of Junius arose from his great scrupulousness in the choice of words ; and this habit, without being counteracted by public speaking, would of course impede that *copia fandi*, by the aid of which an orator in general retouches his piece till it equals his first conception.” Mr. Taylor p. 149. I must confess that I concur with Mr. T. in this censure of Burke.

The *Edinburgh Reviewer* p. 275. observes :— “ As in the various kinds of writing, so in the different styles, he had an almost universal excellence, one only being deficient, the plain and unadorned. Not but that he could, in unfolding a doctrine or pursuing a narrative, write for a little while with admirable simplicity and propriety ; only he could not sustain this self-denial ; his brilliant imagination and well-stored memory soon broke through the restraint. But in all other styles, passages without end occur of the highest order—epigram—pathos—metaphor in profusion, chequered with more didactic and sober diction. Nor are his purely figurative passages the finest even as figured writing ; he is best when the metaphor is subdued, mixed as it were with plainer matter to flavour it, and used not by itself, and for its own sake, but giving point to a more useful instrument, made of more ordinary material ; or at the most, flung off by the heat of composition, like sparks from a working engine, not fire-works for mere display. Speaking of the authors of the Declaration of Right, he calls them ‘ those whose penetrating style has engraved in our ordinances and in our hearts the words and spirit of that immortal law.’ (*Refl.*

on the *Fr. Rev.*) So, discoursing of the imitations of natural magnitude by artifice and skill: ‘ A true  
‘ artist should put a generous deceit on the specta-  
‘ tors, and effect the noblest designs by easy me-  
‘ thods.’ (*Subl. and Beaut.* 2, 10.) ‘ When plea-  
‘ sure is over, we relapse into indifference, or rather  
‘ we fall into a soft tranquility, which is tinged with  
‘ the agreeable colour of the former sensation.’ (1,  
3.) ‘ Every age has its own manners, and its po-  
‘ litics dependent on them; and the same attempts  
‘ will not be made against a constitution fully formed  
‘ and matured, that were used to destroy it in the  
‘ cradle, or resist its growth during its infancy.’  
(*Thoughts on the Causes of the present Discontents.*)  
‘ Faction will make its cries resound through the  
‘ nation, as if the whole were in an uproar.’ (*Ibid.*)  
In works of a serious nature, upon the affairs of real  
life, as political discourses and orations, figurative  
style should hardly ever go beyond this. But a  
strict and close metaphor or simile may be allowed,  
provided it be most sparingly used, and never de-  
viate from the subject matter, so as to make it ap-  
pear in the ornament. ‘ The judgment is for the  
‘ greater part employed in throwing stumbling-  
‘ blocks in the way of the imagination,’ (says Mr.  
‘ Burke,) ‘ in dissipating the scenes of its enchant-  
‘ ment, and in tying us down to the disagreeable  
‘ yoke of our reason.’ (*Disc. on Taste.*) He has  
here at once expressed figuratively the principle we  
are laying down, and illustrated our remark by the  
temperance of his metaphors, which, though mixed,  
do not offend, because they come so near mere fi-  
gurative language, that they may be regarded, like  
the last set of examples, rather as forms of expres-  
sion than tropes. ‘ A great deal of the furniture of  
‘ ancient tyranny is worn to rags; the rest is en-  
‘ tirely out of fashion.’ *Thoughts on the Discon-*



tents.) A most apt illustration of his important position, that we ought to be as jealous of little encroachments, now the chief sources of danger, as our ancestors were of *Ship-Money* and the *Forest-Laws*. ‘A species of men,’ (speaking of one constant and baneful effect of grievances,) ‘to whom a state of order would become a sentence of obscurity, are nourished into a dangerous magnitude by the heat of intestine disturbances; and it is no wonder that, by a sort of sinister piety, they cherish in return, those disorders, which are the parents of all their consequence.’ (*Ibid.*) ‘We have not,’ says he, of the English Church-establishment,) ‘relegated religion to obscure municipalities or rustic villages—No, we will have her to exalt her mitred front in courts and parliaments.’ (*Refl. on the Fr. Rev.*) But, if these should seem so temperate as hardly to be separate figures, the celebrated comparison of the Queen of France,\* though going to the verge of chaste style, hardly passes it: ‘And surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw her just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just began to move in, — glittering like the morning-star, full of life, and splendour, and joy.’ (*Ibid.*) All his writings, but especially his later ones, abound in examples of the abuses of this style, in which, unlike those we have been dwelling upon with unmixed admiration, the subject is lost sight of, and the figure usurps its place, almost as much as in Homer’s longer *similes*, and is oftentimes pursued, not merely with extravagance and violence, but into details, that offend by their coarseness, as well as their strained connexion with the matter in question.

\* The opinion of the Rev. Robert Hall on the beauty of this eulogium has been already cited.

The comparison of a noble adversary to the whale, in which the grantee of the crown is altogether forgotten, and the fish alone remains; \* of one repub-

\* I am not prepared to assent to the propriety of this stricture. For I consider 'the grantee of the crown' to be sufficiently connected with the whale throughout the comparison; certainly at the beginning, and as certainly at the end of the passage, and this being the case the mind cannot be said in the intermediate matter, which is of no great extent, to lose sight of the noble Duke. The words are, if my memory be exact, these:—

"The Duke of Bedford is the leviathan among all the creatures of the crown; he tumbles about his unwieldy bulk; he plays and frolics in the ocean of the royal bounty. Huge as he is, and whilst he 'lies floating many a rood,' he is still a creature; his ribs, his fins, his whalebone, his blubber, the spiracles, through which he spouts a torrent of brine against his origin, and covers me all over with the spray, every thing of him and about him is from the throne."

Let it be observed that the words 'crown,' 'royal,' 'his origin,' 'me,' 'throne,' form so many successive helps to the understanding of the reader in connecting the Duke and the leviathan, 'the grantee of the crown' and the whale, the Duke as the object and Burke as the writer, and that in point of fact there is no solution of the continuity, which ought to be maintained between the metaphor and its subject.

In the writings of the Rev. Robert Hall may be found many examples to illustrate the remarks of the Reviewer on the use of metaphors. In his Sermon, entitled *Reflections on War*, he says:— "Partial interests and feelings are suspended; the spirits of the body are collected at the heart; and we are awaiting with anxiety, but without dismay, the discharge of that mighty tempest, which hangs upon the skirts of the horizon, and to which the eyes of Europe, and of the world are turned in silent and awful expectation." I have long been deeply impressed with the exquisite harmony of this passage, and the rhetorical beauty of its concluding words, which are admirably chosen for the purpose of producing the right effect on the mind of the hearer or reader by the monosyllabic energy, the solemn gravity of their march, and the necessity, which is imposed on us to halt in the pronunciation, not only of each word, but almost of each syllable—in spite of our eagerness to advance with the matter, we are compelled to pause with the sacred orator. In the same Sermon occur two other examples of the same kind, where the words selected in their sound re-echo the sentiments:—"The enemy will not need to proclaim his triumph; it will be felt in the more expressive silence of extended desolation." To enter into the spirit and the beauty of these words, we must recite the first clause of the sentence in an

lican ruler to a cannibal in his den, where he paints him as having actually devoured a king, and suffering from indigestion; of another, to a retailer of

elevated tone, lay a mighty emphasis on the word *proclaim*, and lower our voice in pronouncing the other clause, making a solemn pause at the word *felt*, and short pauses at each subsequent word. The other example is this: — “It is for you to decide whether this freedom shall yet survive, or be covered with a funeral pall, and wrapt in eternal gloom.” This sentence should be recited in a similar way; the word *survive* is emphatic; a long pause should ensue, and short pauses accompany the pronunciation of the subsequent words. If any man is disposed to doubt whether great writers of prose do often make the sound re-echo the sense — (not from an effort at studied harmony, but from the natural harmony of their soul, imperceptibly guiding them at the moment of composition in the choice of the words best suited to the character of the sentiments, which they intend to express,) let him read the following extract from Burke about the seizure of the King of France by his rebellious subjects, and contrast the awful solemnity of the first part, which requires grave words and long pauses, with the rapid declamation and vast accumulation and powerful indignation, by which the orator substantiates his statement, and realises his picture, and enchains our hearts, and rules our reason, and fills us with the greatness of his own mind, and carries us away in the torrent of his own ideas: — “Their heads were stuck upon spears, and led the procession, while the royal captives, who followed in the train, were slowly moved along amid the horrid yells and shrilling screams, and frantic dances, and infamous contumelies, and all the unutterable abominations of the furies of hell, in the abused shape of the vilest of women.” A writer of ordinary powers would have stopped at the word *hell*, and conceived that he had completed his portraits; but Burke was resolved ‘to pursue the triumph’; he wished, not to set before us the portraits, however complete in proportions, and exact in features, and exquisite in colours, but to bring under our eyes, by the vivacity of his description, the living originals, and to make our hearts within us tremble with horror, not at the awfulness of the scene, but at the reality of the event.

Burke’s description of Howard preeminently marks the powers of his own mind in conveying, not only large, but full, — not only full, but complete, — not only complete, but perfect ideas of the merits of the philanthropist; — he sets before us a series of portraits, and if one fails to attract our eye, another is more adapted to excite our attention, a third more engages the heart, and at length we are by successive steps ‘lost in wonder, love, and praise:’ —

“I cannot name this gentleman without remarking that his labours and writings have done much to open the eyes and hearts

dresses, in which character the nature of constitutions is forgotten in that of millinery,—are instances too well known to be further dwelt upon; and they were the produce, not of the ‘audacity of youth,’ but of the last year of his life. It must, however, be confessed that he was at all times somewhat tainted with what Johnson imputes to Swift, a proneness ‘to revolve ideas, from which other minds shrink with disgust.’”

“In my long intimacy with Edmund Burke, to me a great and venerable name, it could not escape me, nor did he wish to conceal it, that Cicero was the model, on which he laboured to form his own character, in eloquence, in policy, in ethics, and philosophy. With this view he acted on a principle of general imitation only, and, in my opinion, infinitely surpassed the original. Yet, in the year 1790, when the French Revolution had taken effect, the first thing he did, was to discard one of the wisest political maxims to be found in his archetype, and by him at least to be revered as the instruction of a master: *Peregrini officium est minime in aliena esse republica curiosum.*” Sir Philip Francis’s *Letter Missive to Lord Holland* p. 17.

In p. 204. I have introduced some remarks on Burke’s power of generalisation, and I ought to

of mankind. He has visited all Europe, not to survey the sumptuousness of palaces, or the stateliness of temples,—not to make accurate measurements of the remains of ancient grandeur, or to form a scale of the curiosity of modern art,—nor to collect medals, or to collate manuscripts, but to dive into the depths of dungeons,—to plunge into the infection of hospitals,—to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain,—to take the gauge and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt,—to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken,—and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries. His plan is original—it is as full of genius as of humanity—it was a voyage of discovery, a circumnavigation of charity. Already the benefit of his labours is felt more or less in every country; I hope he will anticipate his final reward by seeing all its effects fully realized in our own!”

have appealed to the testimony of my excellent friend, Mr. Butler (*Reminiscences* 1, 90.) who says: — “Between the styles of Junius and Burke, there is a great dissimilitude: it is answered that Mr. Burke could disguise his style. But could he disguise his mind? Could he write so many *Letters* in a mind lower than his own? Nothing can be more different from Mr. Burke’s general manner, or from each other, than the ambitious style of his *Vindication of Natural Society*,\* and the simple style of his *Short Defence of the late short-lived Administration*; but a lower mind than Mr. Burke’s appears in neither. Mr. Burke generalizes everything; Junius dwells for ever on particulars. Junius frequently leaves half his meaning to be guessed; Burke displays all.”

“Causes, which it had been too generally the habit of former statesmen to regard as belonging to another world, are now admitted by all ranks to

\* “Were we disposed, in imitation of Plutarch, to draw a parallel, the writer, whose talents those of Junius seem most to resemble, is the late Lord Bolingbroke. It was probably this congeniality of mental abilities, rather than any error in judgment, that led our author in one of the earliest pieces, with which he obliged the world, to copy the stile and sentiments of that noble writer so exactly, that the performance passed, for some time, even with the critics and connoisseurs, as a posthumous production of his Lordship. This piece was entitled *A Vindication of Natural Society, or, a View of the Miseries and Evils arising to Mankind from every Species of artificial Society*, (written in the character of the noble writer above-mentioned, and in the form of a *Letter to Lord*———. It was first printed in the year 1756, and is to be found in Dodsley’s *Collection of Fugitive Pieces*.) If the title of this tract carried with it the air of irony, its contents were perfectly conformable: experience, however, on this, as on many other occasions, serves sadly to confirm the veracity of that trite, though pertinent proverb, that *Truth is often spoken in jest*. This little performance may be regarded as a *certamen ingenii*, a kind of exercise of his literary and logical abilities; and affords no mean proof of the proficiency he had made in the rhetorical and dialectic arts.” *Anecdotes of Junius, to which is prefixed the King’s Reply*, p. 27.

have been the main agents of our success. *We fought from heaven: the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.* If, then, unanimity grounded on moral feelings has been among the least equivocal sources of our national glory, that man deserves the esteem of his countrymen, even as patriots, who devotes his life and the utmost efforts of his intellect to the preservation and continuance of that unanimity by the disclosure and establishment of *principles*. For by these all *opinions* must be ultimately tried; and, (as the feelings of men are worthy of regard only as far as they are the representatives of their fixed opinions,) on the knowledge of these all unanimity, not accidental and fleeting, must be grounded. Let the scholar, who doubts this assertion, refer only to the speeches and writings of Edmund Burke at the commencement of the American war, and compare them with his speeches and writings at the commencement of the French Revolution. He will find the *principles* exactly the *same* and the deductions the same; but the practical inferences almost opposite, in the one case, from those drawn in the other; yet in both equally legitimate, and in both equally confirmed, by the results. Whence gained he this superiority of foresight? Whence arose the striking *difference*, and in most instances even the discrepancy between the grounds assigned by *him*, and by those, who voted *with* him, on the same questions? How are we to explain the notorious fact, that the speeches and writings of Edmund Burke are more interesting at the present day, than they were found at the time of their first publication, while those of his illustrious confederates are either forgotten, or exist only to furnish proofs that the same conclusion, which one man had deduced scientifically, *may* be brought out by another in consequence of errors, that luckily chanced to neutralize each other? It would be un-

handsome as a conjecture, even were it not, as it actually is, false in point of fact, to attribute this difference to deficiency of talent on the part of Burke's friends, or of experience, or of historical knowledge. The satisfactory solution is that Edmund Burke possessed, and had sedulously sharpened that eye, which sees all things, actions, and events, in relation to the *laws*, that determine their existence, and circumscribe their possibility. He referred habitually to *principles*. He was a *scientific* statesman, and therefore a *seer*. For every principle contains in itself the germ of a prophecy; and, as the prophetic power is the essential privilege of science, so the fulfilment of its oracles supplies the outward, and, (to men in general,) the *only* test of its claim to the title. Wearisome as Burke's refinements appeared to his Parliamentary auditors, yet the cultivated classes throughout Europe have reason to be thankful that

---

‘ he went on refining;  
‘ And thought of convincing, while they thought of dining.’

Our very sign-boards, (said an illustrious friend to me,) give evidence that there has been a *Titian* in the world. In like manner, not only the debates in Parliament, — not only our proclamations and state-papers, but the essays and leading paragraphs of our journals are so many remembrancers of Edmund Burke. Of this the reader may easily convince himself, if either by recollection or reference he will compare the opposition-newspapers at the commencement, and during the five or six following years of the French Revolution, with the sentiments and grounds of argument assumed in the same class of journals at present, and for some years past. Whether the spirit of jacobinism, which the writings of Burke exorcised from the higher, and from the literary classes, may not, like the ghost in *Hamlet*,

be heard moving and mining in the underground-chambers with an activity the more dangerous, because less noisy, may admit of a question. I have given my opinions on this point, and the grounds of them, in my *Letters to Judge Fletcher*, occasioned by his *Charge to the Wexford Grand-Jury*, and published in the *Courier*. Be this as it may, the evil spirit of jealousy, and with it the Cerberian whelps of feud and slander no longer walk their rounds in cultivated society." *Biographia Literaria, or Biographical Sketches of my (his) Literary Life and Opinions, By S. T. Coleridge, Esq.* Lond. 1817: V. 1. p. 181.

"To the weight of these great names let me add the opinion of two illustrious men of the present age, as both their opinions are combined by one of them in the following passage: — 'He, (Mr. Fox,) always thought any of the simple, unbalanced governments bad; simple monarchy, simple aristocracy, simple democracy; he held them all imperfect or vicious, all were bad by themselves; the composition alone was good. These had been always his principles, in which he agreed with his friend, Mr. Burke.' Mr. Fox *on the Army-Estimates*, Febr. 9, 1790. In speaking of both these illustrious men, whose names I here join, as they will be joined in fame by posterity, which will forget their temporary differences in the recollection of their genius and their friendship, I do not entertain the vain imagination that I can add to their glory by anything, that I can say. But it is a gratification to me to give utterance to my feelings; to express the profound veneration, with which I am filled for the memory of the one, and the warm affection, which I cherish for the other, whom no one ever heard in public without admiration, or knew in private life without loving." Sir James Mackintosh's



*Discourse on the Study of the Law of Nature and Nations*, Lond. 1799. 8vo. p. 49.

“ Windham said that there was scarcely to be found in the writings of Burke, of whom he was a warm idolater, a metaphor more beautiful in itself, nor [or] more exactly illustrative, than that which Paine used, whilst he was commenting upon Burke’s exclusive sympathy for the fallen throne and the ruined aristocracy of France, without bestowing an equal portion of commiseration on the people, who had endured the ills of the subverted government: ‘ Mr. Burke pities the plumage, but he forgets the dying bird.’ ‘ When I read that passage,’ said Windham, ‘ I almost cried with Pierre — *I could have hugged the greasy rogue, he pleased me so.*’\* ”

“ From the monotonous and measured style of elo-

\* “ In the Reminiscent’s opinion, Junius’s *Letter* on this subject, (Falkland’s Island, 2, 194. Jan. 30, 1771.) is his best performance. It closes with a simile, which several have not scrupled to pronounce the finest in any language :— ‘ The ministry, it seems, are labouring to draw a line of distinction between the honour of the crown and the rights of the people. This new idea has yet been only started in discourse; for in effect, both objects have been equally sacrificed. I neither understand the distinction, nor what use the ministry propose to make of it. The king’s honour is that of the people. Their real honour and interest are the same. I am not contending for a vain punctilio. A clear, unblemished character comprehends, not only the integrity, that will not offer, but the spirit, that will not submit to an injury; and whether it belongs to an individual or to a community, it is the foundation of peace, of independence, and of safety. *Private credit is wealth;—public honour is security. The feather, that adorns the royal bird, supports its flight. Strip him of his plumage, and you fix him to the earth.*’ It is difficult to mention another, where the image, at the same time, is so exquisitely beautiful and proper, and so happily illustrates and confirms the argument; but *its* and *his* should not have been applied in the same sentence to the same being. The simile, used by Mr. Burke to describe the rise of Mr. Charles Townshend on the decline of Mr. Pitt:— ‘ Even then, even before this splendid orb was entirely set, and while the western horizon was in a blaze with his descending glory, on the opposite quarter of the heavens arose another luminary, and, for his hour, became lord of the ascendant:’—has uncommon

quence, which is a prominent characteristic of the *Vindicia Gallica*, Mackintosh's improved taste afterwards weaned him. In the *Monthly Review* of

merit, but yields to that of Junius.'" Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences* 1, 86.

1. Mr. Butler should not have compared a simile expressed in Burke's exuberance of style, with one written by Junius in all the simplicity, conciseness, and energy of Tacitus. 2. The impropriety of Junius in using *its* and *his*, as applied to 'the royal bird,' is not so great as might be supposed; the sentences, in which they occur, are perfectly distinct; but, as they are very short sentences, the repetition of *it*—*it*, in the latter sentence, would have been unpleasant, and the introduction of *him* not only gives variety to, but 'supports the flight' of the sentence, and brings more strongly and emphatically under our view the Royal object of the comparison. 3. Mr. Paine's simile may be fairly contrasted with Junius's, and while it has equal beauty, it has the merit of superior conciseness and energy.

Mr. Taylor quotes the above cited words of Junius in p. 332., and seeks to identify the writer with Sir Philip Francis, as the reporter of Lord Chatham's speech Jan. 22, 1770. :— 'My lords, I do from my conscience, and from the best weighed principles of my understanding, applaud the augmentation of the army. As a military plan, I believe it has been judiciously arranged. In a political view, I am convinced it was for the welfare, for the safety of the whole empire. But, my lords, with all these advantages, with all these recommendations, if I had the honour of advising his Majesty, I would never have consented to his accepting the augmentation, with that absurd, dishonourable, condition, which the ministry have submitted to annex to it. My lords, I revere the just prerogative of the crown, and would contend for it as warmly as for the rights of the people. They are linked together, and naturally support each other. I would not touch a feather of the prerogative. The expression, perhaps, is too light, but, since I have made use of it, let me add that the entire command and power of directing the local disposition of the army is the royal prerogative, as *the master-feather in the eagle's wing*; and, if I were permitted to carry the allusion a little farther, I would say, they have disarmed the *imperial bird*, *the ministrum fulminis alitem*. The army is the thunder of the crown. The ministry have tied up the hand, which should direct the bolt.'

Mr. Taylor adds :— "This fine figure affords another proof of perfect consimilitude of thought, which is visible throughout these speeches, and the *Letters* of Junius." But I am not prepared to believe that the two passages must necessarily have been written by the same writer. I discern in them only such a similitude of thought

1796., he reviewed for Griffiths, the then editor of that Journal, Mr. Burke's *Thoughts on a Regicidal Peace*, — and certainly a finer political disquisition hardly ever appeared. All its propositions are admirably limited, and logically stated; and the controversial asperities, which now and then broke forth in the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ*, having been in a great measure softened by the more subdued state of party-feelings at the time he wrote it, as well as by the admiration of that great author, which Mackintosh, in common with every man of taste must have felt — it was a calm, dispassionate animadversion on the excesses, to which Burke had pushed his principles, and by no means a marked opposition to the principles themselves.\*

“The constitutional indolence of the writer, (for the partiality of friendship has never denied that he was deeply infected with the charms of that seducing Syren,) did not permit him to pursue the subject beyond two articles; but they attracted universal attention, and above all other distinctions, they procured him the acquaintance of Burke himself; who, from his sick-bed, (for his constitution was rapidly sinking,) invited him to Beaconsfield.

“Mackintosh staid there two days, and often re-

and diction as to preclude the notion of identity in the writers. 1. *The master-feather in the eagle's wing* is different from *the feather that adorns the royal bird*; 2. the difference is as wide between the *imperial bird*, the *minister fulminis alites*, and the *royal bird*; 3. between the phrase, *they are linked together and naturally support each other*, and the phrase, *the feather supports the flight of the royal bird*. E. H. B.]

\* [“This publication, (the two *Letters on a Regicidal Peace* 139 — 156., is the best exposition and defence of Mr. Burke's system on the war with France. The critique of them in the *Monthly Review for Nov. and Dec. 1796.*, attributed to Sir James Mackintosh, (*aut Erasmi aut Diaboli*,) is the ablest exposition and defence of the opposite system of Mr. Fox.” Mr. Butler's *Reminiscences* 1, 172. E. H. B.]

lated the very interesting conversations, that passed during this memorable visit. In the short intervals from pain, which his disease allowed him, Burke was frequently cheerful. But the exuberant flow of his mind, which was a tablet, on which every variety of knowledge, every species of learning was inscribed, whether recondite or light, was never for a moment suspended. No cloud, whether of sickness or of sorrow, had darkened either his memory or his imagination. When the discourse turned upon politics, then it was evident how he felt for his country, and the great cause, in which she then stood foremost, amidst the general wreck of Europe. She was his latest vow; but he was not a little querulous of the puerile policy, as he called it, on which she was then carrying on war with the Jacobin, and he could not forbear breathing portentous prophecies of its result.

“ Talking of the anti-moral paradoxes of certain philosophers of the new school, he observed, with indignation — ‘ They deserve no refutation but that of the common hangman: *Carnifice potius quam argumentis egent.* Their arguments are, at best, miserable logomachies; base prostitutions of the gifts of reason and discourse, which God gave to man for the purpose of exalting, not of brutalizing his species. The wretches have not the doubtful merit of sincerity; for, if they really believed what they published, we should know how to work with them, by treating them as lunatics. No, Sir, these opinions are put forth in the shape of books, for the sordid purposes of deriving a paltry gain, from the natural fondness of mankind for pernicious novelties. As to the opinions themselves, they are those of pure, defecated atheism. Their object is to corrupt all that is good in man, — to eradicate his immortal soul, — to dethrone

‘ God from the universe. They are the bright  
 ‘ that putrid carcass — that mother of all evil, the  
 ‘ French Revolution. I never think of that plague-  
 ‘ spot in the history of mankind without shuddering.  
 ‘ It is an evil spirit, that is always before me. There  
 ‘ is not a mischief, by which the moral world can be  
 ‘ afflicted, that it has not let loose upon it. It re-  
 ‘ minds me of the accursed things, that crawled in and  
 ‘ out of the mouth of the vile hag in Spenser’s *Cave*  
 ‘ *of Error.*’ Here he repeated that sublime, but  
 nauseous stanza. ‘ You, Mr. Mackintosh, are in  
 ‘ vigorous manhood — your intellect is in its fresh-  
 ‘ est prime — and you are a powerful writer. You  
 ‘ shall be the faithful knight of the romance — the  
 ‘ brightness of your sword will flash destruction on  
 ‘ the filthy progeny.’

“ Even in the midst of those painful and convul-  
 sive spasms, which were almost perpetually assailing  
 him, the playfulness of his imagination did not de-  
 sert him. Whilst Mackintosh was conversing with  
 him, Burke was seized with a vehement spasmodic  
 pain, which was relieved by vomiting. The mat-  
 ter, which proceeded from his stomach, was watery,  
 but tinged with strong streaks of black. ‘ There,’  
 said he, (probably in allusion to the overcharged  
 and exaggerated descriptions imputed to him by  
 his political opponents,) ‘ there, I have been accu-  
 ‘ sed of being too bold a painter. There it is now;  
 ‘ black and white; light and darkness, Rembrandt  
 ‘ to the last.’

“ The conversation once turned accidentally up-  
 on his son, the late Mr. W. Burke, whose prema-  
 ture death was, it is well known, more the proximate  
 than the predisposing cause of the disorder, which  
 brought such a course of protracted suffering upon  
 Mr. Burke, and his death, which happened not very  
 long after Mackintosh’s visit. It was unmixed

grief; it suffered no comfort, no satisfaction to approach him; even the kind and affectionate cares of Mrs. Burke were unheeded. It was that suppressed sorrow, — that broken heart, that buries its victims by hundreds, — that disease, for which the medicinal art has neither a name nor a category, which never intermits its work, and corrodes unseen even under the smiles, which the forms and conventions of life compel us to assume.

‘ You, Mr. Mackintosh, knew my departed son well,’ said Burke. ‘ He was in all respects a finished man, a scholar, a philosopher, a gentleman, and, with a little practice, he would have become a consummate statesman. All the graces of the heart, all the endowments of the mind, were his in perfection. But human sorrowing is too limited, too hedged in, by the interruptions of society, and the calls of life, for the greatness of such a loss. I could almost exclaim, with Cornelia, when she bewailed Pompey, (you know that fine passage in Lucan,)

*‘ Turpe mori post te solo non posse dolore.’*

It is a remarkable circumstance, that William Burke, whom paternal idolatry had sketched as a being of the rarest perfections both of genius and understanding, was not a man of extraordinary powers. He was a truly sensible man, well read in the literature of a gentleman; but by no means entitled to such superlative panegyric. By his early death, therefore, Burke was spared the agony of seeing his son fall off from the promise of his youth, and the lofty and sanguine hopes of his father. Such a disappointment would have been too much for a man of Burke’s exquisite sensibility, and it would have inflicted upon him a species of sorrow, equally acute, and not softened by the tenderness and affection,

with which we mourn for those, that are dear to us."

*The Clubs of London*, 1828. V. 2. p. 271.

In Burke's *Letter to a Noble Lord* there is a passage of exquisite tenderness and great poetic beauty respecting his son, which, if my memory does not deceive me, runs thus:— "But a disposer, whose power we are little able to resist, and whose wisdom it behoves us not at all to dispute, has ordained it in a different manner, and, (whatever my querulous weakness might suggest,) a far better. The storm has gone over me, and I *lie* like one of those old oaks, which the late hurricane has scattered about me; I am stripped of all my honours; I am torn up by the roots, and *lie prostrate* on the earth. But *there*, and *prostrate there*, I most unfeignedly recognize the divine justice, and in some degree submit to it." The artless repetition of the words, marked in italics, which is so natural to real grief, at the same time constitutes the rhetorical beauty of the passage, and the reference to the recent effects of a storm in the neighbourhood of Beaconsfield is most appropriately happy.

I shall lay before the reader some observations about Burke, Pitt, Fox, and others communicated by a very friendly and very intelligent correspondent:—

"*Brighton, May 2, 1827.* Both Pitt and Fox had a parliamentary tact, of which Burke was quite destitute. Both had been brought up by parliamentary orators and tacticians; both had been accustomed to hear parliamentary talk from their infancy. During the whole of his early life Burke was a *literateur*, a rhetorician. Burke had an Irish accent of a very bad kind, and a very displeasing action. His arguments were often too refined, and too excursive. All this was, to my knowledge, owned and lamented by his best friends. He had

so completely fired the house, that, till he restored himself to eminence by his impeachment of Hastings, his rising to speak served almost as a dinner-bell. On one occasion he was so much affected by the slight of the House, that he burst into tears. This immediately procured him the attention and favour of the House. I cannot think his style *Asiatic*: that seems to denote a superabundance of glitter, point, and hyperbole. His speeches were, in their general tone, mere discussions. Mr. Pitt's solemnity, splendor, and bitter irony, — Mr. Fox's argumentative vehemence and argumentative ridicule, gave them an ascendancy in the house, which Mr. Burke never attained. But, when we read their speeches by the fire-side, Burke is pre-eminently great. Mr. Prior's book is respectable; but he had not a just notion of his hero. Burke's fluctuation between a good and a bad style, made a style peculiar to himself, and the usual tenor of it appears to me to be excellent. Erskine had no jealousy, and in every place, except at the Bar, was a common man."

"Oct. 23. The first *Letter*, which appeared under the signature of *Junius*, brought the writer into instant and full celebrity; it was established, rather than increased by his subsequent *Letters*. *Junius* is immeasurably superior to Francis in *style*; but his superiority in *mind* is still greater. Burke's mind is greatly superior to that of *Junius*. See the quotations in p. 136-7. of your *Letters*, from Burke's *Letter* to Mercer. *Junius's Letters* have nothing equal to them. Are you justified in calling Burke's style *Asiatic*?"

"Nov. 8. I return you the *Philopatris Varricensis*. I was not a stranger to it. The opinion, which I originally formed of it, is confirmed by what I have now read of it: — that it contains some fine writing,



but none that is good, and that it gives no distinct view either of the political or personal character of Fox, or of his style of oratory. How could Dr. Parr find a resemblance between Demosthenes, who weighed his sentences, his phrases, and his words in the nicest scales, — who arranged his speeches with the greatest art, — who abounds in the passionate and the terrible; and Mr. Fox, who paid no attention to his language, never organised a single speech, never once appealed to the passions or the imagination? May I request you to read what I have said upon Demosthenes and Fox in the first volume of the *Reminiscences*?

“Your account of *Asiatic* eloquence is very good. But finery *is*, or rather *was*, one of its most distinctive marks; from this Burke’s oratory is quite free. I think the speeches of no orator of our times can be termed *Asiatic* with so much propriety as Mr. Canning’s.

“A difference between Burke and Junius is that the former wrote as much from the heart as the head; this cannot be predicated of Junius.”

[“Nov. 12, 1827. Your observations about Dr. Parr’s *Philopatris Varvicensis* are, I think, too just; he may be said to give a *grand*, but not a *distinct* idea of Fox’s oratory and politics; it is a *panegyric*, not a *biography*. Fox is the best instance of *unpremeditated* oratory; \* no orator ever acquired so much

\* [“They know nothing of Mr. Fox, who think that he was what is commonly called *well-educated*. I know it was directly, or very nearly the reverse. His mind educated itself, not by early study or instruction, but by active listening, and rapid apprehension. He said so in the House of Commons, when he and Mr. Burke parted. His powerful understanding grew like a forest-oak, — not by cultivation, but neglect. A friend of Mr. Fox, observing that he listened attentively to Dr. Laurence, at that time a slow, benumbing speaker, though full of information, asked him,

celebrity with so little pains — so great was the natural force of his genius; but his speeches will not bear examination — we must judge of him by the

*How can you endure him?* Answer: ‘I intend to speak the Doctor’s speech again, and let nobody know it.’ Sir Philip Francis’s *Letter Missive to Lord Holland* pp. 49. 77.

[In the *Edinburgh Review* No. 92. this story is given in a different form, and with a less degree of probability: — “It was in reference to this unvarying effect of Dr. Laurence’s delivery, that Mr. Fox once said, a man should attend, if possible, to a speech of his, and then speak it over again himself: it must, he conceived, succeed infallibly; for it was sure to be admirable in itself, and as certain of being new to the audience. But in this saying there was considerably more wit than truth. The Doctor’s speech was sure to contain *materials*, not for one, but for half a dozen speeches; and a person might with great advantage listen to it, in order to use those materials, in part, afterwards, as indeed many did both in Parliament, and at the Bar where he practised, make an effort to attend to him, how difficult soever, in order to hear all that could be said upon every part of the question. But whoever did so, was sure to hear a vast deal, that was useless, and could serve no purpose but to perplex and fatigue, and he was equally sure to hear the immaterial points treated with as much vehemence, and as minutely dwelt upon, as the great and commanding features of the subject. In short the commentator was here again displayed, who never can perceive the different value of different matters, — who gives no relief to his work, and exhausts all the stores of his learning, and spends the whole power of his ingenuity as eagerly in dethroning one particle, which has usurped another’s place, as in overthrowing the interpolated verse in St. John, or the spurious chapter in Josephus, upon which may depend the foundations of a religion, or the articles of its faith.”

[I have cited the entire passage for the purpose of making one or two remarks on it. Injustice is here done to the commentator. It is his business and his duty to discuss fairly and fully what relates to the readings of the text, and the illustration of its meaning; nothing is unnecessary or redundant, which is proper for either purpose; if in attending to the one, he neglects the other, he must leave either the text unsettled, or its meaning obscure; if he de-

testimony of those, who heard him, not by the records of his speeches. He was a better *debater* than *orator*. Parr himself was a *rhetorician*, not an

sires to fulfil both parts of his office, he must manifest an equal desire to discharge the duties required by each ; if he has a preference for the one, it will be at the expense of the other ; he *does* ' perceive the different value of different matters,' he *does* know that the restoration or the dethronement of one particle for another is less important than the confirmation of a disputed doctrine, or the rejection of an interpolated verse, but he knows too that, when he engaged to write an elaborate commentary, he undertook to satisfy the reasonable expectations of readers of every class, and he can hope to please all his readers by shewing no partialities for particular topics to the exclusion of others — it is required of him as a faithful commentator that he should ' give no relief to his work,' because he can give it only by abandoning his duties — he knows also that the sense of a passage, in Greek particularly, is often affected by the substitution of one *particle* for another, as well as by the insertion or the omission of the *article*.

A writer in the *Times*, Jan. 29, 1828. who signs himself *H. B.*, is grievously offended at the sarcasm, which represents ' the foundations of a religion' and ' the articles of its faith' as involved in an interpolated verse of St. John, or a spurious chapter in Josephus ; he thinks the ' paragraph conceived in the very spirit of Gibbon,' and to be ' an insidious attack on our common Christianity.' I am persuaded that the writer of the Review in question has a mind and a heart too rightly constituted to disbelieve Christianity, or to attack its doctrines in any insidious way. The paragraph was written without due consideration, and therefore should not be severely criticised ; for the ' foundations of' no ' religion' rest on ' the interpolated verse in St. John,' and ' the articles' of no creed ' depend on the spurious chapter' in Josephus *A. J.* 18, 3. where Jesus Christ is warmly commended, his miracles attested, and his resurrection after his crucifixion recorded. For an excellent summary of arguments respecting the interpolation of the chapter in Josephus, I refer the reader to the note of Professor Anthon, under the word *Josephus*, in my reprint of his edition of *Dr. Lempriere's Classical Dictionary* : he will be satisfied with the statement there given.

*orator*; and perhaps the greatest *rhetorician*, that ever lived. He certainly ought not to have compared Demosthenes and Fox, and I quite agree with you on this subject." E. H. B.]

"Nov. 15. The Irish oratory of Grattan and his imitators is *genus per se*. I have had occasion to observe that the Irish listen to oratory with at least as great enthusiasm, as they speak. O'Connell is certainly a great orator. Whatever Mr. Prior may say to the contrary, you may be assured that Mr. Burke's speeches, as he wrote them, were very different from what he delivered. If he had pronoun-

"We talked about theology, and among other particulars, about the remarkable passage in Josephus, in which Jesus Christ is mentioned, and of the three reasons for believing it to be interpolated. He thought there was no force in one of these reasons, viz. that the line immediately before the disputed passage, obviously relates to the line, which immediately follows this passage; so that, if the disputed passage is struck out, the text is consistent sense, but, as it now stands, the passage has no connexion with what goes before and after it, but dissevers parts naturally connected — this he thought proved nothing, because it was easy to suppose that Josephus himself had done, what authors are continually doing — that is, that, after having written his *History*, he wrote this passage, and inserted it in the most convenient place he could find. It was certainly an interpolation, but Josephus himself might be the interpolator. He thought that the decisive reason for believing that it was a *fraudulent* interpolation by a later hand, was the fact that the early defenders of Christianity never referred to it. Have the Jews preserved the work of Josephus? And, if so, is this passage contained in their copies? I have several times put the question to Jews, but could never get a distinct answer from them. One, who is now a Christian, and a very sensible man, said — 'There is not a Jew, not even a Rabbi, who could answer the question; the Jews have preserved nothing, and know nothing.'"

*Two Days with Dr. Parr, in Blackwood's Magazine, No. 106. Nov. 1825. p. 597.*

ced them, as he wrote them,—in a good manner,—with good action, — with a good pronunciation, — and with vehemence and rapidity, he would have borne the palm from Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox. I should have added, if he had spoken less often, and kept his temper. His written speeches have nothing of the prettiness or pleonasm, by which ancient *Asiatic* oratory was principally distinguished. Is not Mr Burke's *Speech to the Electors of Bristol* his best work?

“ Dec. 1. In reply to your last *Letter* I have to mention that the last No. of the *Edinburgh-Review* contains a Critique on the characters of Edmund Burke and Dr. Laurence. The latter, so far as my acquaintance with him went, seems to be overpraised: to the former justice is not done. In estimating the merit of Mr. Burke, particularly in a comparison between him, and Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox, a distinction should always be made between their speeches, as they were heard, and their speeches as they are read. As they were heard, the superiority of Mr. Pitt's and Mr. Fox's is very great; as they are read, Mr. Burke's have at least an equal superiority. The distinguishing excellence of Mr. Burke's speeches consists in the multitude of lessons of moral and political wisdom, with which they abound, and the stores of learning on every thing, which relates to the government or policy of the country, which they exhibit. In this Mr. Burke considerably excelled his rivals.”

[From a quotation, which I have already made, the reader will recollect that Dr. Parr formed a just judgment of Burke in this respect. It is true that the *Edinburgh-Reviewer* has in p. 269. ranked Burke among “ the greatest names in the philosophy and the history of the country;” it is true that he says p. 274. that “ Burke produced but one philosophi-

cal treatise, but no man lays down abstract principles more soundly, or better traces their application;” and it is true that he has in p. 281. spoken of Burke as a philosopher, (though the words are not now present to my mind,) yet it is apparent that he estimated Burke’s philosophy from this celebrated treatise, rather than from the ethical and political philosophy, which pervades all his other compositions. E. H. B.]

“*Dec. 3.* I do not see any resemblance between Demosthenes and Lord Chatham. Think how methodically the former spoke,—how carefully his words and sentences were chosen, arranged, and polished.”

“*Dec. 8.* Brougham is said to be the author of the article in question. Mackintosh, I am told, said it was Brougham’s best work. I do not think it does justice to Burke: it does not prove his assertion of the contradiction between Burke’s earlier and later sentiments, and it does not make due mention of the numerous passages of sublime and useful philosophy, which abound in his speeches and political writings. Mr. Brougham is a wonderful man. His mind is of an extraordinary nature: I conjecture that we do not yet know its extent and power. He seems to me born for the present time. We are tired with Whiggism, with Toryism, with Radicalism: we are looking out for a new school: I think Brougham will be the founder of one, and the leader of it. The actual spread of information is wonderful. I am told that passages in *Lord Bacon’s Works* indicated that he foresaw it, and thought it augured no good. Of this I am sure that it is impossible to stop the actual march of intellect, and that all to be done is to give it a right direction. One of the most distinguished Members of the House of Commons told me a few days ago

that there had been finer speaking in the House than at present, but that the general speaking never was so good as at present."

In corresponding with my respected friend about the term *Asiatic*, which I had vaguely applied to characterise the oratory of Burke, and by which my friend erroneously understood me to mean *the modern Asiatic eloquence*, of which the distinguishing characteristic is *ornament* and *glitter*, I thus in a *Letter* dated Nov. 4, 1827, explained and defended my meaning:—

"It should seem that Asiatic eloquence designated oratory more ambitious about the mode of expressing thoughts, so as to effect great terseness and point, than about the propriety of the thoughts themselves; oratory more like the empty declamation of an umbratic sophist, than the business-like address of a well disciplined and rightly-experienced speaker; oratory more diffuse and profuse and redundant in expression, than the subject requires—than propriety requires—than the hearer requires—and in this last sense Cicero and Burke are decidedly Asiatic, but Cicero is more so than Burke, because the latter spreads more mind over the surface of expression; Cicero displays more the art of a rhetorician, and is more distinguished by set phrases, balanced periods, and studied harmony; he has in him more the spirit of a pompous declaimer, but Burke's affluence of words results from the richness of a full mind—his ideas are so copious, his views of a subject so enlarged, that he requires a multitude of words to convey them in all their forms to the minds of others—Cicero, having less richness of ideas compensates for the want of them by clothing the same thoughts in every variety of colour. The former makes you think of the subject and forget the orator; but the latter makes you

admire the orator at the expense of the subject. The general characteristic of Asiatic eloquence was poverty of matter concealed beneath a load of expression: Cicero's enemies taxed his eloquence with this fault. Another characteristic was affected phraseology and meretricious ornament: Cicero may occasionally exhibit these defects. A third characteristic was splendid declamation and an exuberance of expression opposed to Attic elegance and conciseness; — a body displaying more blood than muscle; a river rising gradually and calmly overflowing its banks, as opposed to the collected energy and impetuous force of the torrent. Cicero and Burke have this characteristic, as contrasted with Demosthenes and Lord Chatham. The Asiatic eloquence, as described by Cicero and Quintilian, is to be contradistinguished from the Asiatic eloquence of our own times, though both agree in some points; the principal difference lies in the extravagant hyperboles, and the wild conceits, and the superabundant glitter, which appear in the productions of the modern Asiatics. In general we should say that Irish oratory is more like the Asiatic eloquence, described by Cicero and Quintilian, than any other; and that the French oratory has the nearest resemblance to the Rhodian style, which was a mixture of the Asiatic and the Attic styles."

"Nov. 12, 1827. Please to look at the *Initia Rhetorica* of Ernesti p. 200., and you will see that what he says about Asiatic eloquence, does not justify us in supposing that it consisted of superabundant ornament, as in the case of modern Asiatic eloquence. If you were to define it by one word, you would say *verbosity*, (as Petronius says of it, *Ventosa et enormis loquacitas.*) The Irish eloquence is exactly analogous, full of ornament and amplification, but yet distinct from modern Asiatic elo-



quence. Canning might be admitted within the list of Asiatics; but only in the same way as Cicero is admissible. Canning had the most correct taste, and Attic elegance and terseness; Burke was deficient in taste, and more loose in style, and if placed among Asiatics, there must be a *longum intervallum* between him and the next, who would be Cicero. Hervey's *Meditations among the Tombs* are Asiatic; so the Irish orator, Phillips the Barrister, is the best living example."

The subject may be a little illustrated by what the beautiful American poet, Dr. James G. Percival of New-Haven in North-America, (whose selected Poems, were republished by Miller in London 1824.) says of poetry; the italicised words convey an accurate idea of ancient Asiatic eloquence, as described in the classical writers:—

'Tis not the chime and flow of words, that move  
 In measured file, and metrical array;  
 'Tis not the union of returning sounds,  
 Nor all the pleasing artifice of rhyme,  
 And quantity, and accent, that can give  
 This all-pervading spirit to the ear,  
 Or blend it with the movings of the soul.  
 'Tis not *the noisy babbler, who displays,*  
*In studied phrase, and ornate epithet,*  
*And rounded period, poor and vapid thoughts,*  
*Which peep from out the cumbrous ornaments,*  
*That overload their littleness.* Its words  
 Are few, but deep and solemn; and they break  
 Fresh from the fount of feeling, and are full  
 Of all that passion, which on Carmel fired  
 The holy prophet, when his lips were coals,  
 His language winged with terror, as when bolts  
 Leap from the brooding tempest, armed with wrath,  
 And missioned to affright us, and destroy.

Dr. Parr, in his celebrated *Preface to Bellenden's Tracts*, vindicates Burke from the charge:—

“*Architectum quendam verborum esse scio, qui*

a vulgo inter optimos oratores, propter expeditam ac profluentem quodammodo celeritatem, et commissiones meras, (Suet. 4, 53.) Fremant ejus fautores licet, dicam de Burkii eloquentia, quod sentio. Hujus suavitate maxime hilaratæ essent doctrinarum omnium illæ inventrices Athenæ: hujus maxime admiratæ ubertatem et copiam: hujus in libris *Suadam* sessitantem maxime veneratæ, (Cic. *Brut.* p. 140.) Fuerunt inter Romanos, qui siccitatem et inopiam, (*Brut.* p. 152. et *de Opt. Gen. Or.* p. 183.) dummodo esset polita, dum urbana, dum elegans, in Attico genere ponerent, orationemque amplam, copiosam, excelsam, magnificam plane contemnerent. Qui autem se credebant eruditas habere aures, intelligensque judicium, illi ipsi et gradus, et dissimilitudines, et varietatem Atticorum ignorabant. Marcus tamen Tullium, (Quintil. 12, 12.) incessere audebant, ut tumidum, *Asianumque*, et redundantem. Nostra etiam in ætate non desunt, qui eandem de Burkio nobis insusurraverint insulsam et frigidam cantilenam. Sed melius de hoc nomine sentiant, qui Atticos se volunt esse, eo quod clarior vim eloquentiæ ferre non possunt. Burkium si quis imitetur, eum credant et Attice dicturum, et optime. In litteris ipsi se sciunt plurimum profecisse, quibus Burkus valde placuerit. In quo autem homine, cum illa, quæ jucunda et grata, tum etiam illa, quæ mirabilia sunt in virtute, elucent, ejus de moribus hoc solum dicere necesse habeo, semper innocentiam Burkii et integritatem singularem fuisse, vitæque rationem justissime ab aliis repositum eum, qui reddere non reformidet suæ.”\*

\* In the *Addenda ad Præfationem, quæ Editioni secundæ trium Librorum Gulielmi Bellendeni de Statu, præfixa est*, there is a very important addition to this notice of Burke, which is too long for insertion in this place. Mr. Beloe has thus translated the words cited in the text:—

“ There is a man, who has a great command of words, esteemed

But, while Dr. Parr rejected with disdain the opprobrium of the epithet *Asiatic* as applied to the eloquence of Burke, he did not object to the use of it as descriptive of that eloquence, and on one occasion at least employed it himself. My learned friend, John Symmons, Esq., in a *Letter*, dated *Abermarlais, Llandovery, S. W. Aug. 27, 1827.* informed me that “ of the style of his famous *Spital Sermon* Dr. Parr is reported to have said after its delivery, whilst unrobing himself in the vestry: — ‘ I have not the ‘ monotonous pomposity of Johnson; I have not the ‘ *Asiatic efflorescence of Burke.*’ ”

The following story told by Boswell in his *Life of Johnson* 4, 108. relates to Burke: — “ Talking of oratory, Mr. Wilkes described it as accompanied with all the charms of poetical expression. JOHNSON. No, Sir; oratory is the power of beating down your adversary’s arguments, and putting better in their

by the vulgar a first-rate orator, simply from his celerity of speaking. Whatever his followers may say, will not deter me from speaking what I think of the eloquence of Burke. Athens was the parent and patroness of science; but an Athenian audience would have listened with delight to Burke; would have admired his inventive copiousness of diction; would have thought the Goddess *Suada* herself enthroned upon his lips, (Cic. *Brut.*) There were some amongst the Romans, who considered a dry style, (Cic. *Brut.*) and poverty of sentiment as Attic, provided the language was polished, courtly, and elegant; and who disdained the lofty, magnificent, copious style of oratory. But many, who prided themselves on their taste, their learning, and their judgment, were ignorant of the gradations, the inequalities, and variety of Attic eloquence. Cicero himself (Quintil. 12, 8.) was by some insolently termed diffuse, Asiatic, and tumid. In these days also there are not wanting those, who insinuate that Burke is destitute both of energy and modulation. I am proud to speak a different language; — I do not hesitate to aver that such affected sentiments proceed from an inability to bear the lustre of his eloquence. He, who imitates Burke, may be assured that his model is marked by Attic excellence; he, who hears him with delight, may be satisfied that his own progress in literature is far from contemptible. That man requires no studied panegyric as to his moral character, whose manners are conciliating and agreeable, and whose actions are directed by the rules of virtue. But the

place. WILKES. But this does not move the passions.\* JOHNSON. He must be a weak man, who is to be so moved.† WILKES, (naming a celebrated orator.) Amidst all the brilliancy of——'s imagination, and the exuberance of his wit, there is a strange want of *taste*. It was observed of Apelles's *Venus*‡ that her flesh seemed as if she had been nourished by roses; his oratory would sometimes make one suspect that he eats potatoes, and drinks whisky."

"A philosophical review of the speeches and writings of Mr. Burke," says Mr. Butler in his *Reminiscences* 1, 167. "keeping his politics, as his inferior gift, in the back-ground, might serve for the subject of an useful and interesting discussion. What particularly distinguished him from the Greek and Roman orators, and from his contemporary rivals, were the countless lessons of civil and moral wisdom, by which he dignified his compositions, and both enforced and illustrated his arguments; his sudden transitions from the grand to the gay, from sublimity to pleasantry, from the refined and recondite to the ordinary and obvious; and his frequent admixture of coarse and low expressions, even into his most splendid passages. (The 'pigging together in a truckle-bed,' and the 'sow of imperial augury' will occur to every reader of these lines.) The effect of those was sometimes great, and then redeemed them; but they sometimes deformed and disgusted.

rectitude and integrity of Burke have been so obviously conspicuous; that, defying all scrutiny into his own, he may be justified in exacting a rigorous account of another's conduct."

\* A friend, with whom I lately conversed on the subject of eloquence, defined it to be 'the art of satisfying the judgment through the medium of the passions.' I asked him if it was not, as Johnson said, of a proper style, 'proper words in proper places'?

† This observation is sophistical, opposed alike to the principles of human nature, the experience of mankind, and the records of history.

‡ "Mr. Wilkes mistook the objection of Euphranor to the *Thesens* of Parrhasius for a description of the *Venus* of Apelles. Vide Plutarch. *Bellone an Pace Clariores Athenienses?* K."

‘The Venus of Phidias,’ Wilkes used to say, ‘was so lovely, that the Athenians called her the *Venus of Roses*: lovely too, speaking generally, is the *Venus of Burke*, but she sometimes is the *Venus of Whisky*.’” The saying here attributed to Wilkes is the same as that, which is more correctly related by Boswell. Mr. Butler in p. 70. observes of the late Lord Erskine: — “The eloquence of this remarkable man was an era at the bar. His addresses to juries have not been equalled; they alike captivated their understandings, their imaginations, and their passions. He often rose to the highest oratory; but it was always simple, and even in his sublimest flights there was much, that was very familiar; but this rather set off than clouded their splendour, rather increased than diminished their general effect.” The use of these familiar terms was probably accidental, not designed; he was not always disposed to sustain an equal flight; his imagination might sometimes take repose, and his spirit would sometimes fail to exert its becoming and customary energies. But, though he occasionally used familiar terms, he never descended to coarseness and vulgarity; and this is the difference between his pure taste and the less refined taste of Burke. One main cause of the difference of taste might be Burke’s early personal acquaintance with humbler life, and the unavoidable accommodation of his mind to the obscurity of his origin, the noble birth of his Lordship, the consciousness of ancestral merits, the superiority of his education, the dignity of his soul even in narrow circumstances, preserved for him a less corrupted stream of eloquence.

It is possible to use a common word without detracting from the gravity of the subject, and in a way to heighten the beauty of the composition. I would, by way of illustrating this idea, give the

following passage from a Sermon, written by the late Rev. Newcome Cappe, and quoted in the *Memoirs of his Life*, written by Mrs. Catharine Cappe, (*Critical Remarks on many Important Passages of Scripture*, York, 1802. V. 1. p. lxxi.)

“To-morrow, that idol Deity, in which the world have agreed to place their trust; — to-morrow, that hair-spun thread, on which they hang the weighty concerns of eternity, what is to-morrow? No part of our possessions, no part of our inheritance; it is a part in the great chain of duration, but perhaps no part of our present being. Clear, and bright, and steady, as it shines to-day, some sudden blast may blow out the lamp of life, and to-morrow may have conveyed us into other COMPANY, and settled us in other scenes. ‘Boast not,’ my friends, ‘of to-morrow,’ till you have unrolled the book of fate, and learnt what to-day shall bring forth.”

“One fine passage more we extract for the novelty, as well as wisdom, with which the *Reviewer* treats a subject of the very first importance, — namely, the duty entailed upon every man in public life to secure his personal respectability and independence by the pursuit of some honourable profession. The topic is suggested by certain *Letters* of Mr. Burke, where he complains of the poverty, which oppresses him: — ‘It is possible that men, ‘in their sympathy for the fate of genius, as they ‘will phrase it, may lament over the sight of a man ‘like Mr. Burke, thus feeling the ordinary inconvenience of straitened circumstances. We do not ‘allow of any feelings of this caste, unless they be ‘the very same, which the spectacle of imprudence ‘and its result excites towards other men. Genius, ‘so far from having any claim to favour, when it ‘neglects the ordinary precautions or exertions for

‘securing independence, is in truth doubly inexcusable, and far less deserving of pity than of blame. Mr. Burke ought to have earned his income in an honest calling. Every man of right feeling will prefer this to the degrading obligations of private friendship, or the precarious supplies, to virtue so perilous, of public munificence. It is certain that he chose rather to eat the bitter\* bread of both these bakings, than to taste the comely, the sweet, the exquisite fruit, however hard to pluck, of regular industry. He was a politician by trade, a professional statesman. There is no such craft recognized in this state; all our institutions are ignorant of it—all our habits averse to it—nor is there one of a British statesman’s functions, which may not be conjoined with the cares of an industrious life.’” The Editor of the *Times*, Dec. 5, 1827. in his Notice of the *Edinburgh-Review*, No. 92.

But the Reviewer should have recollected, 1. that Mr. Burke was not the only great man of his time, who was either without a profession, or dependent on private bounty, and that the censure is no more justly applicable to Burke than it is to Pitt or Fox, or Canning; 2. that if these or other great men had commenced life with professional practice, they must have relinquished it, as soon as they became involved in political affairs; 3. that Mr. Canning found the affairs of state, unconnected with any professional duties, too weighty even for his Atlantean shoulders; 4. that very few men are so constituted, either bodily or mentally, as to be capable of uniting much professional practice with the

\* *Tu proverai siccome sa di sale  
Lo pane altrui e com' e duro calle  
Lo Scender' e salir altrui scale.*

DANTE.

performance of laborious and incessant political duties; 5. that, while the Reviewer may be allowed to blame the imprudence of Burke in not having engaged in professional practise, while he may be permitted to lament the degradations of genius in soliciting private aid or accepting public bounty, while he may continue to inculcate the pure dictates of morality, the stern suggestions of wisdom, and that independence of mind, of which so very few examples are recorded in history, let him not forget to bestow his warmest commendation on the genuine *patriot*, who is more intent on promoting the true interests of his country, than on filling his own coffers, and on the generous *philanthropist*, who is wholly occupied in 'devising means to meliorate the condition of mankind,' and in superintending the execution of them. He, who, like Burke, has devoted the morning and the noon of a long life to the service of his country, need not be condemned for *imprudence*, if his necessities, in the evening of his days, oblige him to accept a pension, when it is offered to him; though we may heave a sigh over the weakness of human nature, which descends to accept it, or mourn over the degradation, which hesitates not to solicit it, or feel our honest indignation roused, when it is purchased by a sacrifice of principle, or obtained as the reward of treachery.

"Large as may be the space," says Dr. Parr in the *Reply to Dr. Combe's Statement*, "which political subjects occupy in my mind, — strong as are my attachments and aversions to political men, and warm as are my approbation and disapprobation of political measures, I am not inattentive to *other*, and perhaps higher considerations. It is not my fortune to coincide in opinion with Mr. Burke and Mr. Windham, upon some of the steps, which have



lately been taken, and some of the doctrines, which have lately been disseminated in this country. But have I forgotten the indisputable and distinguished merits of these great men upon former occasions? Or am I authorised to refuse them the praise of upright intention in their present conduct? Far from it. I *yet* remember that Mr. Windham is an acute disputant, an accomplished scholar, a polished gentleman, and a senator, of whom I have hoped that he would be, like Abdiel, 'among the faithless, faithful found.' In Mr. Burke, I have not lost sight of his splendid eloquence, of his numerous and celebrated writings, of knowledge so various and so comprehensive, that imagination cannot assign its limits; and of genius more vigorous, more versatile, and more elevated, than at this day can be found among the enlightened inhabitants of the British empire, and, I had almost said, in the whole circle of the human race."

Dr. Parr here distinctly admits Burke's "upright intention" in his conduct respecting the French Revolution; the admission is honourable to Dr. Parr himself, and just to Burke, on whom too much calumny has been heaped by less generous opponents.

"As to the sentiments of Mr. Burke on the claims of the Dissenters, he thought they were attributable solely to the French Revolution. Many of his opinions were formed with an eye to that favourite subject of his political lucubrations; and he might be said to have long viewed domestic policy through a distorted medium. It was notorious that but for this he would have supported the question on the African slave-trade. He, (Mr. Brougham,) sincerely regretted that the honourable Member, who conducted that great cause, was not at present in the House, in order to give the weight of his va-

luable opinion to the question now pending. Burke had told Mr. Wilberforce that he would certainly have supported him on the occasion alluded to, but for his opinions on the other subject, which he believed to interfere with the point he sought to carry. Mr. Wilberforce afterwards observed to himself, (Mr. Brougham,) in reference to Burke's opposition, that he could only attribute it to a shred of the cursed web of Jacobinism. He felt a deep veneration for the character of Mr. Burke, but in a question of such importance, — a question, which so materially concerned the welfare and interests of millions, to acquiesce in his sentiments, warped as they were by wild notions respecting a fantastic theory, which intercepted his better judgment, would be only an affectation of respect quite unworthy of the occasion." Mr. Brougham's *Speech on the Test and Corporation Acts*, (*Times*, Febr. 27, 1828.)

To the kindness of my intellectual friend, H. C. Robinson, Esq. of the Temple, I am indebted for permission to use an interesting and unpublished *Letter*, addressed by Mr. Fox to the late Mr. Anthony Robinson \* : —

“ SIR,

In answer to your Letter of the 9th instant, I have no difficulty in saying that what has been told you of Mr. Burke's ignorance of Greek, and superficial knowledge of Latin, is perfectly false. He knew of Greek as much, or more than persons usually do, who have neglected it since their leaving school, or college, which was, I believe, in a great

\* Author of the following pamphlets — *A Short History of the Persecution of Christians by Jews, Heathens, and Christians*, 1793. 8. ; 2. *A View of the Causes and Consequences of English Wars, from the Succession of Julius Cæsar to the present Time*, 1798. 8. ; 3. *An Examination of a Sermon preached by the Rev. Robt. Hall on Modern Infidelity, with an Appendix*, 1800. 8.

degree his case. I have heard him quote Homer and Pindar. Latin appeared to me to be very familiar to him, and particularly the works of Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Tacitus. It is impossible to read Mr. Burke's *Works*, and not to see that he imitated the first mentioned of these authors most particularly, as well in his turn of thinking, as in the manner of his expression. I believe, however, he had not any very nice critical knowledge even of Latin, and less of Greek, nor were grammatical enquiries in general much in his way.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,  
C. J. Fox."

" *St. Anne's Hill, 18. Feb.*

" To Mr. Anthony Robinson."

Dr. Robert Sumner, Head-Master of Harrow-School, told to my friend, the Rev. David Roderick, then one of the under-Masters, who communicated the fact in a Letter to myself, that Burke always appeared to Dr. Sumner afraid to quote from the *Odes* of Horace, lest he should blunder in the quantities of syllables, from profound ignorance of the metre.

Another kind friend communicated to me the following anecdote : — " Having from my boyhood highly revered Burke both in his moral and intellectual character, and seeing him once, as I was passing before *Corpus Christi* College, making some enquiry at the gate, from which he retired seemingly dissatisfied, I respectfully accosted him, and asked him if I could give him any information. He thanked me and added that he had been enquiring at the Lodge whether or not Dr. Walker King was then in college, but that the porter being out of the way, his daughter could not tell. I replied — Neither,

Sir, can I, but perhaps I may take this opportunity of shaking Mr. Burke by the hand, which with a most benignant smile he extended towards me, and heartily thanking me with a low bow, added — ‘ Sir, ‘ you do me more honour than I have yet received in ‘ this place.’ This happened at the time of the installation of the Duke of Portland, when the honorary degree of *Doctor in Civil Law* had been conferred on many a Member of both Houses of Parliament, whose merit was not *very superior* to that of Mr. Burke.”

I will conclude these notices of Burke with mentioning some of the attacks, which were made on him; and the reader will hardly repress a smile at the infuriated zeal of William Miles, who, in an anonymous *Letter to the Duke of Grafton*,\* with

\* The pamphlet commences with these words: — “ It is matter of surprise, my Lord, to many, and of offence to all, that your Grace should again provoke the suspended indignation of your country, and renounce that obscurity, to which the universal and well-founded contempt of the world had consigned you. To recur to past events, and recall the pitiful measures of an administration, marked by folly, turpitude, and cowardice, in which the kingdom was dishonoured abroad, and oppressed at home, would be wresting from the historian the painful, but indispensable obligation of recording the foul catalogue, not of crimes dignified by success and justified by necessity, but of innumerable mischiefs bequeathed to your successors, the sad effects of which an interval of twenty years has not been able to efface.

“ It is not the melancholy detail of a life nearly consumed in the wretched pursuits of every thing, that is mean and disreputable. — It is not your public or private history, that is offered to your notice, but a strong and well-merited remonstrance against proceedings, which mark the guilt and natural meanness of a character, known only to be reprobated, and which excites scorn and derision wherever it is mentioned. — It is an examination, my Lord, of your pretensions to that patriotism and respect, which your Grace has lately claimed in your legislative capacity; and with whatever ill-humour this remonstrance may be received, with whatever contempt you may affect to treat its substance or its language, the truths it contains, and the events, to which it alludes, will require the full exertion of your philosophy to bear

*Notes, to which is annexed a complete Exculpation of M. de la Fayette from the Charges indecently urged against him by Mr. Burke, in the House of Commons, on March, 17, 1794. among other passages, writes thus p. 31. :—*

“ Is it Mr. Burke, who carried on a correspondence with Dr. Franklin at Paris, during the whole period of our disgraceful contest with America, and who supported with all the fervour of enthusiasm the rebellion, as it was called, that now finds the conduct of M. de la Fayette criminal?— Is the suspicious evidence of men, who deserted their acres on the first alarm, and who abjectly sigh for that tyranny which they alternately felt and exercised, to be received in preference to facts? And is it with such beings, that Mr. Burke, a Member of the British

with fortitude, and the whole stock of family-effrontery to recollect without blushing.

“ Surely, my Lord, JUNIUS, who seems to have understood your character, and to have acquired a tolerable knowledge of human nature, must have counted too much on his discernment, when he supposed it possible for a man to be reclaimed, on whom precept and example never had any influence, but when they pointed to that pre-eminence, from which good men turn with anger and aversion.

“ What a misfortune it is, that your Grace has not availed yourself of the prediction of your adversary, and enabled the prophet to become the historian of your reformation!— The opportunity is lost; and, notwithstanding your present efforts to recover it, the reproach of having read JUNIUS as the Bishops read the Old Testament, cannot be avoided. *They would verify the prophecies of the Jews, without being warned by their fate, or benefited by the admonitions they received.* We know that the author, who has been quoted, is not a favourite with your Grace; but something is due to his generosity, when he asserts, that ‘ *there is hardly a period, at which the most irregular character may not be re-deemed.*’— Your character, my Lord, offers an exception to a rule, the application of which, as far as relates to yourself, may be denied, without any injury to your reputation, or offence to your feelings. The passage, however, to which we allude, has not been forgotten. Your Grace, it seems, has held it in faithful remembrance; and, alarmed at the prospect of internal commotions,

Parliament, descends to associate, and partaking of their baseness, would wrest from an absent and distressed individual, defenceless and forlorn, all that the savage ferocity of a vindictive tyrant has left him — man's last and dearest refuge — HOPE! — Is it Mr. Burke, that has joined a cowardly race of miscreants to assassinate the character of a man, whom the stoutest of them would tremble to encounter, and shrink into nothing at the sight of? Is it Mr. Burke, that offers himself as a sample of loyalty, and arrogates the right of prescribing to us rules of allegiance? — Is it Mr. Burke, in whom this spring-tide of loyalty flows in such profusion, who, callous to every sentiment of duty, of humanity, and of generosity, insulted fallen Majesty in that awful and distressing moment of universal grief and despondency, when every face was marked with affliction and gloom? Is this the apostle of religion, who, when every heart but his own was dissolved in sorrow, and every cheek bedewed with tears, pronounced

you would willingly make your peace before the day of retribution arrives; — but the deception is too gross to mislead our judgment; — a succession of impostures too impudent to be forgotten, and too calamitous to be forgiven, have put the people on their guard; and they know from experience, that it is not every man, who bellows for liberty, that is an enemy to despotism. Ever fertile in expedients, you seem anxious to provide against this difficulty, by espousing the cause of benevolence; so that what should be denied on the score of patriotism, might be amply made up to you on that of humanity. This, in the language of the turf, was no bad hedge! and if it did not succeed as you wished, we may venture to assert, that it was not owing to any delicacy on the part of your Grace.

“ It is really not meant, my Lord, to question with acrimony, or too much nicety, your claim to any one good quality of the mind or heart, to which any tolerable pretensions can be advanced; and do not attribute it to malevolence, when we express our surprise, that the only two instances, in which you have condescended to appeal to our judgment, should be precisely those, on which the world has long since decided, in a manner, it may not be prudent to repeat, and certainly not very consonant with your late declarations in Parliament.”

the illness of his Sovereign to be the well merited vengeance of Heaven, rejoiced at a calamity, which threatened his country with the greatest of all misfortunes? Has this man the effrontery to prate publicly of duty and affection for Kings?

“Is it Mr. Burke, that espoused the cause, and vindicated the honour of his deputy (Powel) who, ashamed of a panegyric he did not deserve, put a period to his existence, and gave the lie to the fulsome eulogiums of his parasite, that has the assurance to make a parade of his virtues, and to talk of submission to the laws, reverence for the magistrates, and loyalty to the throne?—The throne that he has vilified, and ridiculed!

“The crow contents itself with carrion, and batters on the moor; but this man, a glutton and an epicure, flies at higher game, and sets repletion at defiance; it is not the common, ordinary food of birds or beasts of prey, that suits him—his voracious and insatiate appetite must gormandize on dainties: and Kings, Ministers, Admirals, Generals, and Nabobs, have all fallen in their turn under the venomous gripe of his rude and savage claws.”

Again in p. 39.:—“Of what nature is the humanity of Mr. Burke, that mocked the agonizing pangs of his country in the hour of alarm for its beloved Sovereign, and that now weeps so abundantly over an outcast crew of mitred hypocrites, whose practical atheism has been infinitely more injurious to morals and religion, than all the wild and incoherent speculations of Voltaire and Rousseau?

“What are we to call this new-fangled zeal for Majesty, which has lately blazed forth with such uncommon violence in Mr. Burke? What are those new doctrines of passive obedience and non-resist-

“\* *Vide* the Parliamentary Debates on the Regency.”

ance, which he has the effrontery to bellow in our ears, as the measure of our duty, and the criterion of our affections? Is it from this man, that we are to learn our obligations to the King and to his Government? From the man, whose whole life almost has been marked by a steady, uninterrupted, and sometimes ferocious opposition to the crown? From the man, whose sudden and extraordinary conversion was less a matter of surprize to the world, who knew him *little*, than to his associates, who thought they knew him *well*? — Is it this man, who ‘*stiff in opinion, ever in the wrong,*’ that bends his proud knee to offended Majesty, and whose mind, become pliant, yields to the authority it spurned? Is it Mr. Burke, who has treated royalty like a very drab, that pretends to a purer loyalty than the rest of the nation, and that would teach us what a British subject owes to a British Sovereign? Is it to his warehouse, that we are to resort in future, not for fair and natural allegiance, such as the laws and constitution prescribe and authorize, but for that unqualified submission to undefined power, which has been prohibited, decried, and reprobated as dangerous and infamous ever since the year 1688, and which this Jesuit in politics, as well as in religion, would smuggle back into the country, and deal out to us in portions sufficient to disgust and provoke revolt in the veriest slave under the ancient Gabel laws in France? — Is it this camelion, that receives its hue from the transitory influence of passing objects, that pretends to bestow on others a permanent and never-fading complexion? Away with such impertinence; and attached as we are to our Sovereign from gratitude and affection, — bound as we are by duty and by interest to support the laws and constitution of our country—let us reject the insolent mandates of this high priest, who arrogates to him-



self the right of dictating to us the matters of Government, and who pretends to be the only loyal subject within his Majesty's dominions. — Let us leave this sovereign pontiff of a new description to lament that he cannot introduce into this happy country, Bastilles, *Lettres de Cachet* and all the other disgraceful implements of Despotism.

“ Let us leave him to console the wretched congregation of barefooted Carmelites, whom he has assembled at Beaconsfield, and whom he feeds with the vain hope of restoring to the land, from which they have been deservedly driven. It is time to leave him to his reflections, with this admonition, however, that if he trespasses again on the good sense of the nation, I will pursue him until he turns, like the enraged viper, on himself, and expires by his own poison.”

In another pamphlet with his name, entitled *A Letter to Henry Duncombe, Esq. M. P. for the County of York, on the Subject of the very extraordinary Pamphlet, lately addressed by Mr. Burke to a Noble Lord*, 4th Edn. Lond. 1796. 8. p. 24., Mr. Miles writes thus: —

“ It is not for the purpose of offering incense to the First Lord of the Treasury, that I have given this statement, for I am really very ill calculated to make my fortune by flattery; it is a pitiful and dishonourable road: but, were I ever so well disposed to take it, Mr. Pitt, notwithstanding my good wishes towards him, is, however, the last man in the world, to whom I would pay court. The gentlemen, who are in the constant habits of opposing him, may possibly doubt this fact; and the little credit, that is given to political writing in general, is one among many other reasons, that decided me to withdraw myself from politics, or at least to remain silent, until my character was better known, the purity of those motives acknowledged, which have invariably

influenced my conduct through life, and which can alone give efficacy to my exertions, or satisfaction to myself. I had communicated this intention to you, and several other friends; Mr. Burke has compelled me to change this resolution, necessary as it is to my repose, and to hazard myself once more on the turbulent and tempestuous ocean of politics; very contrary, indeed, to my wishes, and very repugnant to my feelings; but I am pledged, and must, in discharge of an obligation contracted in March 1794.,\* come forward to notice another production from the pen of that gentleman, pray heaven it may be his last! whose rank and sulphurous disposition to mischief, is likely to blaze, even to the last glimmering of his expiring lamp. Has he not already done this country sufficient wrong, that he comes tottering back from the bleak confines of the sepulchre, with fury in his haggard countenance, to ensure the ruin, that he has left unfinished, and blast us with the contagion of his poison? Is he not yet satiated; has his capacious stomach still room for more, that he comes surcharged with bile, even from the extreme verge of eternity, struggling with destiny, that calls him from the *pleasures and affairs of this world* to sorrow and repentance, but calls in vain? Can neither age nor misfortune, infirmity nor public execration, restrain this curse and mischief on the land, this fiend and lunatic within his cell? Is the family of Monroe, or his successors, no more? Has this man no kind friend, or faithful domestic, of sufficient piety or courage to bind him in a strait waistcoat, and make him harmless against his very nature? Sir, his very mind is out of joint, and he would render the times so if he could, that he might

\* "Vide a note at page 41, in the *Letter addressed to the Duke of Grafton*; at the end of which it is declared, that if ever Mr. Burke came forward again, I would meet him. He has come forward, and I have kept my word."

enjoy the mad banquet in its wildest perfection. This man, this strange, this inexplicable compound, of all that is captivating in genius, fluctuating in opinion, and morose, frantic, and ungovernable in temper; in whom the natural good qualities of the heart appear to have played the wanton with the very worst qualities of the mind, and to have abandoned themselves to all the irregular excesses of the most depraved prostitution. — This being, unassimilated to every thing, that has hitherto occurred in the variegated history of plants, animals, or fossils, and who has been, even to this late period of his existence, the friend and foe alternately of every man, with whom he has acted in public life, disdains the petty retail-infamy of setting individuals at variance, and dissolving, by force of cunning, old and long established friendship. He has commenced, on the strength and abundant resources of his own richly productive mint of mind and contrivance, a wholesale dealer in wrong, and striking boldly at title-deeds of every description, throughout this wide-extended empire, tells alike the necessitous and unprincipled, suffering at this alarming moment under the double pressure of war and famine, that, in the vast property and landed estates of the British nobility, a remedy may be found, for all the multiplied evils annexed to poverty, and a contempt of moral rectitude.

“The London-Corresponding Society, reproached as it has been with such a design, has stopt very far short of Mr. Burke, and has never yet in any of its resolutions, or authenticated proceedings, pointed confiscations out to a senseless rabble, as the means of alleviating their distress, and rescuing them from want. It is full time that this man should be muzzled and hand-cuffed, or his wild sallies may endanger the state, and realise the fable of Sampson and the Philistines. It was the general hope that

Mr. Burke would, on retiring from Parliament, have renounced all concern with politics; and that, as soon as his pecuniary difficulties were removed, he would have gone into absolute retirement. Such, it was thought, would have been his resolve, and he had warranted this hope by several declarations to that effect. With a mind so disposed, baffled, but not corrected, in all its arrogant and impracticable, I will not say, sanguinary projects, it was imagined that he would have sought refuge, not so much from others, whom he had deceived and deserted, as from himself, and the keen reproaches of his wounded mind and conscience. He even acknowledges that he left London for ever, (would to God he had never seen it!) and that, ‘devoted to obscurity and sorrow, he was insensible at once to the affairs and pleasures of this world.’ Thus resolved and thus resigned, it was reasonable to expect that he would have descended quietly to the tomb, without furnishing fresh matter of regret to the few friends, whom compassion has preserved in tenderness to old friendships, or of triumph to his numerous enemies, which a vindictive, restless temper, as incorrigible as it is irascible, and which neither age nor misfortune can temper into discretion or humanity, have armed, as it were, in defence of liberty and right.

“This lamentable old man, lamentable in every respect, continues to be wicked and mischievous beyond the ordinary term allotted to vice. Every thing is absorbed, enfeebled, or extinguished in him but his rancour, and that strikes deeper root, and blooms with brighter verdure in proportion as it should wither and decay from age; envious of the laurel, with which genius would have marked and decorated his grave, it has finally grappled with, seized, and out-topped it; its noxious qualities corrode whatever comes within the sphere of its putrid

atmosphere; its very touch imparts a rank and deadly poison, and, what will scarce obtain currency with remote posterity, the friendship of this forlorn and wretched being, separated, cut off, and avoided by those, who once valued him, is still more fatal than his hatred: it acts by contraries, and wounds even to death the hapless deluded victim in the embrace.

“ Those, with whom he lives in declared enmity, are less exposed to the direful effects of his ever-active and self-productive malice, than those, who admit him to their confidence! His very animosity, vigilant, bitter, and relentless as it is, serves as a shield to those, who are the objects of his resentment, while those, for whom he professes affection or regard, or who submit to be swayed by his counsels, are lost past redemption, and never fail to feel and lament the sad effects of their mistaken confidence.

“ This has been recently exemplified in the two greatest instances of his public life, upon which he most piques himself; from the one, for which he boldly claims the *greatest merit*; and from the other, for which he modestly contents himself with having received the *greatest recompence*; it has been exemplified in a manner so evidently strong, that it must force conviction on even the most prejudiced mind.

“ Mr. Burke collected, into the terrible focus of parliamentary rage, all the malignant rays, which envy and resentment had exhaled from disappointed avarice, or ambition, in order to destroy, by their concentrated force, the persecuted object of his vindictive animosity: he was, however, foiled in the attempt; for what, let me ask you, has been the result of all his criminal virulence and industry? What ill has resulted to Mr. Hastings\* from all the

\* In the *Advertisement*, prefixed to the pamphlet, Mr. Miles writes thus p. ix. : —

mischievous skill and exertions, of the immense chemical laboratory of this man's ever fertile brains? — None. Let the mortifications and insults, let the malice and scurrilities be subtracted, that Mr. Hastings has received from his invulnerable antago-

“ I request the favor of those, who are inclined to censure me for severity, to have the candor to recollect the gross scurrilities, with which he insulted Mr. Hastings, for a series of years, in a situation, where the object of his abuse, or rather, as he imagined, the victim of his malevolence, was bound hand and foot, precluded all means of defence, and compelled to suffer all the indignities, and to hear all the calumnies, false and malicious as they were, which his unfeeling persecutor, in a torrent of eloquence worthy of a better cause, had the wanton malignity to let loose against him. The frequent appeals of Mr. Hastings to the justice and humanity of the Court, against the cruel and unmanly aspersions of Mr. Burke, must be fresh in every man's memory. But Mr. Hastings is not the only instance, in which the gentleman, who is the object of these animadversions, has given full latitude to personal abuse; even the Sovereign, who has extended his royal compassion, with a munificence worthy of the empire and of himself, (for I deny that Mr. Burke has *deserved* the remuneration he has received,) was for some time the selected chosen object of his invective and abuse, and particularly at a moment when ‘ despondency prevailed throughout the nation, when every face was ‘ marked with woe, and every cheek bedewed with tears,’ (*Letter to the Duke of Grafton* p. 31.,) anxious for the return of health to a Monarch deservedly beloved, whose preservation, at all times devoutly to be wished, was rendered still more so then, from the peculiar and distressing circumstances of the moment. Yet it was at that moment, and when his Majesty was unhappily labouring under one of the heaviest misfortunes, that can befall humanity in its rude passage from the cradle to the grave, that Mr. Burke had the unfeeling insolence to his Sovereign at all times, and his very munificent benefactor at present, to insult him.”

I have already shewn that Mr. Burke is innocent of the charge of insulting afflicted Majesty, to which Mr. Miles has recurred as an admitted fact.

In p. 204. I have quoted a remarkable passage from Boswell's *Life of Johnson* respecting Warren Hastings, who, however, is not mentioned by name. With it let the reader compare the following extract from a *Letter*, addressed, by a Mr. White, complaining of wrongs suffered in India, to the Editor of the *Times*, (*April 15, 1828.*)

“ Unfortunately satisfactory proof can seldom be produced in England, as to the abuses, that have been practised in India; so it is with those general abuses, which I have named. But this has ever been the case, and, I fear, ever will be. The witnesses

nist, armed *cap-à-piè*, and doubly fenced by Lords and Commons, and Mr. Hastings is a gainer by the process. So much for the ENMITY of Edmund Burke. Now for his FRIENDSHIP.

“ Turn then, my dear Sir, I beseech you, to the

remain in those regions; they cannot be produced here. Thence arises one of the greatest evils attending the administration of that country; it prevents exposures, perpetuates a continual recurrence of crime with impunity, and casts more than doubt upon whatever may be advanced.”

One of the best defences made for Warren Hastings, is that which occurs in the following eloquent extract from Lord Erskine's *Speech on the Trial of John Stockdale, the Bookseller*:—“ If it be true that Mr. Hastings was directed to make *the safety and prosperity of Bengal the first object of his attention*, and that, under his administration, it has been safe and prosperous,— if it be true that the security and preservation of our possessions and revenues in Asia, were marked out to him as the great leading principle of his government, and that those possessions and revenues, amidst unexampled dangers, have been secured and preserved, then a question may be unaccountably mixed with your consideration, much beyond the consequence of the present prosecution, involving, perhaps, the merit of the impeachment itself, which gave it birth;— a question, which the Commons, as prosecutors of Mr. Hastings, should in common prudence have avoided, unless regretting the unweildy length of their proceedings against him, they wished to afford him the opportunity of this strange, anomalous defence. For, although I am neither his counsel, nor desire to have anything to do with his guilt or innocence, yet, in the collateral defence of my client, I am driven to state matter, which may be considered by many as hostile to the impeachment. For, if our dependencies have been secured, and their interests promoted, I am driven in the defence of my client to remark, that it is mad and preposterous to bring to the standard of justice and humanity the exercise of a dominion founded upon violence and terror. It may, and must be true, that Mr. Hastings has repeatedly offended against the rights and privileges of Asiatic government, if he was the faithful deputy of a power, which could not maintain itself for an hour without trampling upon both;— he may, and must have offended against the laws of God and nature, if he was the faithful viceroy of an empire wrested in blood from the people, to whom God and nature had given it;— he may, and must have preserved that unjust dominion over timorous and abject nations, by a terrifying, overbearing, insulting superiority, if he was the faithful administrator of your government, which having no root in consent or affection,— no foundation in similarity of interests,— nor support from any one principle, which cements men together in

other side of this man's ledger, and see how his account stands with those, with whom he has acted through life — with whom he has lived in the most familiar, confidential, and endearing intercourse — for whom he professed AFFECTION, not HATRED —

society, could only be upheld by alternate stratagem and force. The unhappy people of India, feeble and effeminate as they are from the softness of their climate, and subdued and broken as they have been by the knavery and strength of civilization, still occasionally start up in all the vigour and intelligence of insulted nature; — to be governed at all, they must be governed with a rod of iron, and our empire in the East would, long since, have been lost to Great Britain, if civil skill and military prowess had not united their efforts to support an authority, which heaven never gave, by means, which it never can sanction."

"The celebrated Edmund Burke was one of the members appointed by the House of Commons to enforce the charges of crime against Mr. Warren Hastings, and one day, when he had been pouring out all his splendid talents in a rich display of oratory against the accused, he addressed the splendid assembly of peers, ladies, and gentlemen, before him, in the following terms: — 'When I look round this glorious circle, bright with all that is high in rank, all that is powerful in talent, all that is amiable in virtue, all that is brilliant in beauty, and then turn my eyes to the criminal at the Bar, my mind is convulsed with horror, and I sicken at the sight.' The orator then placed his hands on the table before him, and dropped his head into them, as if overwhelmed by the dreadful contemplation. On coming out of Westminster-Hall, after this splendid oration, Burke could not find his carriage, and Lord Yarborough's having just drawn up, the peer offered to take him home. The ebullition of Burke's mind had not subsided, and on the way, without considering the indelicacy of appealing to one, who was ultimately to pronounce judgment in the case, he proceeded to re-urge the arguments of his speech on his noble auditor, concluding with the eager enquiry — 'Do you not think this man a great criminal?' Lord Yarborough, whose correctness of intellect was known to all, who had the opportunity of knowing him, immediately answered — 'Burke, all I can say at present, is that either you, or Hastings deserves to be hanged; but I cannot now tell



with whom he has lived in sworn and avowed amity; whose measures he approved, supported, and defended, with all the vehemence natural to his character, and whom he constantly extolled and held forth to the nation, as objects of its dearest hope and

‘ which of the two.’ *Verulam.*” *The Times, April 3, 1828.*

This story is calculated to make an erroneous impression on the mind of the reader, and therefore I shall accompany it with a few comments. 1. Admitting the violence of Burke, often indiscreet, often unjustifiable, often cruel, in the matter of Warren Hastings, who does not admire that habitual hatred of oppression, that honest sincerity and devotedness of heart, which it evinced, even according to this anecdote? 2. Burke’s mind was then in an effervescent state, and some ebullition was necessary to restore it to its wonted calmness. 3. A cold-blooded and calculating reasoner MIGHT HAVE recollected that he was talking to a peer of the realm, who would eventfully and judicially have to decide on the case, — he MIGHT HAVE restrained the fury of his invective within juster limits. For my part, I honour the GENEROUS FEELING displayed by Burke on this occasion, because I discern the PURITY of the fountain, from which it flowed, — the error ‘ leaned to virtue’s side,’ and it therefore hath sacredness in my eyes. 4. Right nobly did Burke forget the *peer*, while he remembered that the peer was a MAN; — right nobly did he forget the TITLE of his companion, whether it was the accident of birth, the caprice of fortune, the lavish gift of royalty, or the just reward of public merit, while he appealed to the common feelings of HUMAN NATURE, and that innate sense of right and wrong, without which the peerage has no value in the eyes of goodness, making vice at once more conspicuous and more odious.

A recent testimony, from a high quarter, has been borne to the literary merits of Warren Hastings: — “ I would not be supposed to assert that Lord Clive was himself an Oriental scholar; but his genius discerned the great benefit, that the public would derive from the attainment of the language by those, who were to serve their country in this quarter of the world. We find that this was a never-failing recommendation to his favour and patronage. Among the many distinguished individuals, whom the possession of this acquirement, joined to other qualifications, led him to promote, the name of Warren Hastings is preeminent. That

only refuge. What has been his conduct towards them? Behold them disjointed, broken, dispersed, and ruined, at enmity with each other, and their conduct and principles scouted, reprobated, and pronounced culpable by the very man, that formerly admired and defended them. His FRIEND, Sir, the heir of Rockingham, is a living, melancholy evidence of this woeful, this afflicting truth! The splendid house of Fitzwilliam is erased from the rich chart of political influence, power, and credit; its noble owner is reduced to a cypher, and driven into exile in the very country, where he was born, and where his exalted rank, fortune, and character would have ensured to him the consequence he ought to possess, if he had not come in contact with that heirloom, which descended with his uncle's vast property, at once a burthen and a disgrace to the inheritance! His Lordship, consigned to a premature and unmerited obscurity, is a sad monument of all that is amiable and excellent in private life, being irretrievably lost, and rendered useless to the state, by an indiscreet attachment to an unworthy object.

great man, who joined taste and learning to the wisdom of the statesman, gave the first effectual impulse to his countrymen, who, from his example and encouragement, were led to obtain, not merely a colloquial, but a classical knowledge of the languages of India, and particularly the sacred one of the Hindus. He was fully sensible that such knowledge was not more essential to promote the objects of general literature and science, than to maintain and improve the political interests and reputation of his country. Entertaining such views, and adopting such measures, he well merited the honour he received and prized, of being the patron of the *Asiatic Society of Calcutta*. This society, however, owed its immediate formation to Sir Wm. Jones." *Address to Sir John Malcolm*, G. C. B. Governor of Bombay, delivered at a Special Meeting of the *Literary Society of Bombay*, held on Wednesday Dec. 5, 1827. (*Courier*, May 8, 1828.)

“ I behold his Lordship, sorrowful and repentant, standing in the penitential attitude of convicted folly — a kind of beacon, to warn other mariners embarked in the same perilous navigation, of the fatal rock, upon which youth, honour, and genuine simplicity were unhappily wrecked. Mr. Windham might have profited by the disaster of his friend, but infatuation has rivetted him to ruin, and he must abide the issue.

“ Whether the Secretary at War is the next to be ‘killed-off,’ or whether he is preserved by bloody Banquo for a *bonne bouche*, I know not; but, if he he ever fixed his fondest hopes on Norwich — if he even considered that city as his Eden, the gates of Paradise, he may be assured, are shut against him for ever, and for this mortifying expulsion, for this heavy, this afflicting and degrading curse, he is indebted to his friend, his counsellor, and guide!

“ Under these various aspects, some of them pleasing, others offensive, and all of them instructive, either negatively or positively, Mr. Burke has appeared to us at different periods of his life, exciting the contradictory sensations of esteem, admiration, horror, and disgust: in a word, my dear Sir, he has travelled through the twelve signs of the zodiac, and, returned to the point from whence he departed, remains fixed to a certainty in *scorpion*.”

In a *Postscript* to the *Vindication of the Duke of Bedford's Attack upon Mr. Burke's Pension, in Reply to a Letter from the Right Hon. Edm. Burke to a Noble Lord*, Lond. 1796. 8vo. p, 67, written by T. G. Street, Esq, occur these words:—\*

\* Mr. Street p. 65. speaks of the effect produced on his mind by the writings of Burke in these terms, with which the reader can compare those, which I have already quoted from the Rev. Robt. Hall and Dr. Parr. “ I think I have now, my dear Sir, completed my original intention. I have made such remarks as

“The peculiar and invidious contents of Mr. Burke’s Letter have led many persons to enquire into the state of his own finances for many years, and into the conduct both of himself and other persons related to him, in pecuniary matters. Mr. B. cannot have forgotten the obscure hint, which Johnson once dropped, and which Mr. Boswell, with his usual accuracy, committed to paper, though with *delicacy* quite unusual, he has forborne to communicate that hint to the public in his *Biographical Memoirs of our great Lexicographer*. But the circumstances will,

the perusal of Mr. Burke’s Letter suggested to me.—Shall I candidly confess to you, that your refusal to acknowledge the justice of them will neither surprize nor hurt me?—It is difficult, and frequently impossible, to recover from the rapture and delirium, into which Mr. Burke’s works always throw us. The wizzard has such potent charms about him, that I could almost wish to remain for ever spell-bound by him. The vigour and eloquence of his periods enchant me—I admire, though I cannot approve, the energy of his invective—I cry out *Quando ullum invenium parem?* And I am ready to acknowledge with you that, since Cicero, there has been no such man.”

In p. 60. the following tribute of respect is paid to Dr. Priestley:—

“The mention of chymical operations naturally connects with it, in Mr. Burke’s, as well as in every other person’s mind, the name of Priestley—but few, I hope, will imitate him in his ungenerous treatment of that name. Now that Dr. Priestley has emigrated from this country, shame on the country that forced him to emigrate! it may not injure his personal safety to speak of him—Now that he can no longer be affected by the rage and rancour of a remorseless Church-and-King Mob, it may be permitted to me to pay him my humble tribute of respect. The studies, which Mr. Burke has lately pursued, lead him to support sentiments and principles, that inflame, and irritate, and goad mankind to warfare and to the destruction of each other. The studies, which Dr. Priestley has pursued, have invariably tended to preserve the health and life of man, and to promote the comfort and happiness of the human race—Dr. Priestley is dead to this country—he has sought repose and refuge from persecution in a distant climate—yet to that climate, and even across the Atlantic, Mr. Burke pursues him. Mr. Burke has lost a beloved son; yet I have not heard that Dr. Priestley has broken in upon *his* sorrow—Dr. Priestley has lost a beloved son too, yet *his* domestic calamity is no shield and protection to him.”

in all probability, be examined with the utmost strictness, and supported by clearest proofs; and should these proofs come, as they perhaps will, within my reach, I shall, without hesitation or apology, give a *detailed* account of certain Irish transactions, in a new and enlarged edition of this pamphlet. To Mr. Burke I must speak in the language of Terence, *Si pergit, quæ volt, dicere; ea, quæ non volt, audiet.*"

A very worthy and high-minded friend, to whom I am indebted for many acts of kindness, entertains a very strong prejudice against Burke, and has sent to me some communications, which I candidly promised to employ, and which, in the absence of all other information on the topics adverted to, I can only hope may not be founded on facts, but which I of my own knowledge can neither confirm nor refute; —

"June 20, 1827. I must, however, admit Burke to have been a remarkably clever man, and what Cobbett calls a *Cornelius Agrippa*-man, — a mountebank-orator: witness his dagger-pantomime in the House of Commons, and his shameful attack on the late King during his illness, and then his abject meanness in taking pension after pension under the same Sovereign. According to Dr. Milner, he was so weak and bigotted as to believe in transubstantiation, and see in Tone's *Memoirs*, (who all allow to have been an honest man,) his remarks on Burke: 'Edmund wants to get another 2,000 guineas, if he can, — dirty work, — Edmund no fool in money-matters, — flattering every one to carry his point. Is that *sublime and beautiful*?' But to cut the matter short, I enclose you two papers — one marked A, which you may copy, but must return to me — it is the original from a most worthy man, now no more, who was 50 years in high office in this country, (Ireland,) and who, I may say,

knew every thing and every body, and well knew what Burke was. The second paper, (B,) I copy, and therefore you may keep it. I must also add an anecdote of this *sublime* man. He sold a small estate he had in Ireland, but observe, in Ireland we have a Registry-Act, and it has always been stated and believed that, when he sold it, he went immediately to a person, with whom he had been in treaty, to borrow money on mortgage; but he concealed the sale, and got the money either on bond or mortgage — the lender registered before the purchaser, and this latter had eventually to pay, and Burke pocketed from both. I ought to define what I call a *Cornelius Agrippa* man. See Tacitus ch. 6. ‘ There is no State or Government but has been ‘ highly injured by this wicked sect — nothing more ‘ dangerous than this deluding mystery, from whence ‘ all prevaricators, jugglers, shufflers, backsters, ‘ sycophants, and vile-tongued persons derive their ‘ malice and knavery.’

“ A.

“ 1770. Mr. Edmund Burke, a semi-gem of dazzling and showy brightness in certain lights, but not of real hardness for its polish; for, though his ingenuity as a writer, and his talents as a speaker, are acknowledged, the dignity of his character in many points remains dubious. He is a native of Ireland, and born in the county of Cork, where he has a small real estate, I know not how or when acquired; for in 1761. and 1763., during the administration of the Earls of Halifax and Northumberland, he came to Dublin, a retainer of *Single-speech* Hamilton, William Gerard, then first Secretary to those Lord-Lieutenants; who made use of Mr. Burke in the same manner ancient orators did of their rhetors, employing him to polish their performances; for Mr. Hamilton did not speak without

considerable labour and premeditation, although his strength of parts and abilities for composition are unquestionable; and he obtained Mr. Burke 300*l.* a-year pension on the civil establishment of Ireland, which he received from Lady-day, 1763. to Dec. 16, 1765. when quarrelling with Mr. Hamilton, he threw it up, and listed himself under the banners of the Marquis of Rockingham, whose Secretary he was during his Lordship's administration, and since has remained the declaimer of his party in the British House of Commons.

“ 1796. Whilst in Ireland Mr. Hamilton's retainer, he employed himself as a private Popish agent travelling round the kingdom to collect materials for subverting the then constitution, and to solicit subscriptions from the Roman Catholics, towards defraying the expences of an attempt to obtain a repeal of the Popery-Laws, now too effectually accomplished, so as no longer to have left any sort of fence for guarding the lives and properties of the Protestant subjects.

“ The year 1793. has given a fresh proof of Master Edmund's versatility, and shewn that modern loquacity, and the ancient Greek eloquence of Demosthenes are exactly minted from the self-same metal, the present virtuous public character, condescending to hold, through the medium of those he used to stile *a corrupt Ministry*, the following grants:—

“ £1,200. *per annum*, chargeable to the Civil List for the lives of Mr. and Mrs. Burke, and the survivor of them, to commence from Jan. 5, 1793.

“ £1,160. *per annum*, chargeable on the 4½ per Cent Fund for the lives of Edmund Burke, Esq., Lord Royston, and Architel Grey, Esq. the survivor of them, to commence July 24, 1793.

“ £1,340. *per annum*, chargeable on the 4½ per

Cent Fund for the lives of the Princess Amelia, Lord Althorpe, and Wm. Cavendish, Esq., the survivor of them, to commence July 24, 1793.

“ Annually £3,700.

“ Could a ray of gentlemanly sentiment reach the soul of this mock-patriot, how must it be harrowed on signing quarterly his acquittances for such bounty! When during his Majesty’s late calamitous situation he had dared to utter, on the floor of the House of Commons, *that the Almighty had hurled the King from his throne*, and now, to use the words of the sensible Dr. Smith, have Burke’s talents been employed in complimenting his Sovereign by telling him that he came to his crown in contempt of his people by holding up a Messalina for public veneration, and by becoming the calumniator of Rousseau! he yet certainly owes to the nation a defence of a right divine to govern wrong—instanced by the abusive squandering upon himself and his wife, and even extending beyond them, if survived by the other grantees, such large gifts from the revenue, when its application elsewhere is so urgently called for, both by public service and the State’s necessity.

“ The other grantees were named that Mr. Burke might sell the pensions, which were agreed for at the moment the pensions were granted. Mr. Gray was the purchaser of the one, Mr. Cavendish of the other.”

“ B.

“ *True Anecdote.*

“ To elude the persecuting rigour of the Penal Laws in Ireland, a Roman Catholic Family made over their estate in trust to a brother of Mr. E. Burke’s, a practising attorney in Dublin; but he thought proper to avail himself of their confidence, claimed and held the estate for himself, and bequeathed it to his elder brother, which he possesses



at this moment.\* Mr. O'Connor was employed by this unfortunate family to carry on a suit in the Irish Exchequer, to recover this estate. But, as the rigid letter of the law was decidedly against their claims, Mr. O'Connor appealed to Mr. Burke's humanity in their favour. He candidly acknowledged the cruelty and injustice of the Penal Laws, and fairly and liberally owned that he would with most conscientious pleasure restore the estate, if he did not apprehend that his doing so would throw an indelible stain on his brother's memory.

“ The following panegyrical Epigram on Mr. Burke's answer was written at the time, about 1773, by Counsellor Harwood : —

Fraternal love inspires good Edmund's breast,  
Of this dear virtue, hear this glorious test —  
He writes, declaims in mild religion's cause,  
Yet he's enrich'd by fraud and Penal Laws ;  
He 'gainst his conscience beggars a whole race,  
To save a brother's memory from disgrace,  
Rather than blast the generous donor's fame,  
From him he heirs the profit, cheat, and shame ;  
Sarcastic truth with calm contempt he braves,  
And from pure virtue, shines the first of Knaves !

“ Burke's son had a public employment, and was a defaulter, several thousand pounds. One of Burke's pensions was sold to pay Government the debt, and the purchaser's life was substituted for Burke's ; so that *de facto*, the public paid to make good the plunder of themselves !”

The reader may be amused with the following extracts : —

“ To the Editor of the *Public Advertiser*.

“ *Wednesday, Oct. 16.*

“ Sir,

*Anti-Fox's* query answered in your Paper,  
‘ Why Junius spared Lord Holland and family ?’

\* “ This was written in Burke's life-time.”

“Edmund B—ke, when he lived in a garret, got acquainted with Lord Holland, who was civil to him, occasionally gave him a dinner, and a guinea to find another, when he could not admit him from his garb, and exterior figure and situation, to his table.

“Charles keeps in friendship with him, and always defends him in company, (particularly when he knows it will be carried to Edmund,) from being the author of *Junius*, by declaring he has a better heart, and cannot be so bad a man.

“He is engaged in a scheme, or rather conspiracy, with the old fat cub S——, in buying up lands at the Grenades, in order by chicane and tricks to get the lands from the present legal possessors and proprietors.

“P——ll, Lord Holland’s man, and by his directions, assisted the brothers and their cousin, and the rest of the knot of knaves in their deep-laid schemes to raise the India-Stock. That is a history too well known to be entered into.

“I suppose Mr. Woodfall, your correspondent *Anti-Fox* is a retired man, and lives in some obscure corner in the city, (for we in the west know perfectly well who Junius is;) but, if any more of your correspondents in the east doubt, and choose to put their queries, they shall be solved and convinced \*  
by  
PLINY JUN.”

*The Public Advertiser*, Oct. 18, 1771.

“To the Printer of the *Public Advertiser*.

“Sir,

In answer to your *Querist* in Wednesday’s Paper, please to insert the following:—

[\*The reader will observe the curious economical construction of this sentence, by which the words *they shall be solved* refer to *queries*, while the word *convinced* without *they* refers to *correspondents* for its nominative. E. H. B.]

“ When Sir Eardley Wilmot was about to resign his office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Sir Fletcher Norton, though recently made Speaker, insinuated, but at a distance, his wishes of returning to the channel of his old profession. Hints were not understood. He became sulky: even the House saw a change in his former zeal. Opposition thought of making an acquisition of Sir Fletcher; but Lord Chatham was provided with a Chancellor in the person of Camden. Lord Rockingham, should fortune favour his ambition, had no lawyer to assist him in the Cabinet. This drew Edmund to him, and gave him the greatest hopes of him, and a strict friendship immediately commenced between Edmund B—ke and the *gentle Knight*. This circumstance might have remained a secret to this hour, had not Sir Fletcher, in the warmth of his affections, made a parade of his friendship, by pitching upon Mr. Edmund B—ke for the office of moving in the House to address the King to give preferment to the Speaker’s chaplain. As this is never done but by the most intimate friend of the Right Honourable person for the time in the chair, the Treasury-Bench was astonished. Lord North could scarce believe his eyes and ears, and a general whisper went round — Does not this fact sufficiently answer the *Querist’s* question — ‘ Why Junius spares Sir Bullface Doublefee?’

PLINY, JUN.”

*The Public Advertiser, Oct. 25th, 1771.*

“ *To the Printer of the Public Advertiser.*

“ Junius unmasked.


*Oxford, Nov. 2.*

“ Sir,

The more I examine the *Letters of Junius*, the more I am convinced that they are the productions of Edmund, the Jesuit of St. Omer’s.

I discover in them the same phrases I have heard him utter in the House of Commons; I find the same poetical flights and high-flown metaphors; tropes and figures, that always dazzle, but never convince; bold assertions without proofs, and florid declamation without argument; in short, I see evident marks of considerable abilities, attended with an extreme want of judgment. These are the characteristics of Edmund; he possesses indeed a multitude of ideas, and a fluency of speech; but from the petulance of his manner, and his total want of judgment, he excites a general disgust in the hearers, and materially injures the cause he is hired to defend. He is like one, who wantonly scatters flowers on the high-way, which are soon trodden under foot, and become offensive to our nostrils. His parts are flashy indeed, but without conduct or solidity; his abilities are useless to himself, and detrimental to his employers. He is like a vessel manned with a mutinous crew, carrying little ballast, but much canvas, greatly overmasted, and exposed to a tempestuous sea without a rudder or compass: he is a man, with whom it is dangerous to be connected. Every speech he has uttered, has hurt his party, every pamphlet he has published, has injured his cause; he is a *Marplot* in politics, and a *lame Duck in the Alley*.

“Edmund received his education amongst the Jesuits at St. Omer’s, and finished his studies in Ireland. If any one will take the trouble of reading over the *Letters of Junius*, he will find that Edmund, notwithstanding all his ‘care and pains,’ sometimes falls into *Hibernicisms*. In one place he says *make common cause*: this is not English, though, to be sure, the phrase is *common enough* in Dublin. In *Junius’s Letter* of the 13th of August he talks of the *sophistries of a collegian*: this expression is not English, and the word *collegian* is never used in this sense,



except in the College of Dublin, and (perhaps) of St. Omer's. We say indeed *fellow-collegian*; but at the great schools here, those of the college are *collegers*; and at our two Universities the members of a college are called *gownsmen*; at Dublin they are called *collegians*. But to enumerate all the Hibernian phrases or idiotisms, that occur in *Junius's Letters*, would swell this paper beyond all moderate bounds; therefore I shall proceed in my account of the author.

“Edmund, soon after his return to Ireland, began to *persuade* that the *public* profession of Popery was not quite so well calculated for the meridian of Dublin as of St. Omer's. In short, he saw that it stood in the way of his ambition; for which reason he performed the ceremony of *recanting*, and hired himself as oratorical preceptor to Mr. Secretary Hamilton. This gentleman allowed him a pension of £300 a year, and took the credit of all the oratorical flourishes, that were furnished him by Edmund: however the vanity of the latter soon induced him to claim the merit of his tropes and figures, though they certainly were no longer *his*, as he had sold them for a valuable consideration. 'Tis somewhat whimsical too that Edmund has thought proper to drop the youngest child of his brain, his *favourite* Junius, at Mr. Hamilton's door; it was after a doubtful struggle, in which his *fear* got the better of his *vanity*; but in due time vanity will resume her empire, and *father* Edmund will claim his favourite child, whenever he can do it with safety.

“'Tis now almost three years since Edmund began to publish his *Letters* under the signature of *Junius*; during that time he has been most diabolically busy in blackening and defaming the most exalted and most worthy characters in the kingdom. He has exerted every species of falsehood and misrepresen-

tation; he has exhausted every term of scandal, obloquy, and abuse; he has on some occasions even ventured to brandish the torch of sedition; he has endeavoured to alienate the affections of the people of England from their gracious and benevolent Sovereign, and has laboured to plunge the nation into all the horrors of a civil war; but Providence has hitherto frustrated his execrable designs,

“In all his writings, under whatever signature, the cloven foot is seen, and the apparent malignity defeats its own black purpose; his violent and seditious *Letters* have weakened Opposition; his false accusations against the Duke of Grafton and Lord Mansfield have confirmed the public opinion, that there is no just cause of complaint against either; and his virulent attacks on the character of our amiable Sovereign have made all good subjects more eager to express their loyalty and affection.

OXONIENSIS.”

*The Public Advertiser*, Nov. 6, 1771.

“*For the Public Advertiser.*

“EPIGRAM,

*On a report of the political death of Junius, alias Edmund the Jesuit:*

Junius is dead, says common Fame,  
Yes, —dead to Truth, and lost to Shame.

P. Q.”

*The Public Advertiser*,\* Nov. 9, 1771.

\*“*For the Public Advertiser.*

“*A political Parody on CATO. Act 5, Scene 1.*

I.

“CATO *solus*, sitting in a thoughtful posture; in his hand PLATO’S book on the *Immortality of the Soul*. A drawn sword on the table by him:—

It must be so — PLATO, thou reason’st well.  
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,  
This longing after immortality?

“ Were we disposed, in imitation of Plutarch, to draw a parallel, the writer, whose talents those of Junius seem most to resemble, is the late Lord Bolingbroke. It was probably this congeniality of mental abilities, rather than any error in judgment,

Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror  
Of falling into nought? why shrinks the soul  
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?  
'Tis the divinity, that stirs within us,  
'Tis heaven itself, that points out an hereafter,  
And intimates eternity to man.  
Eternity, thou pleasing, dreadful thought!  
Through what variety of untried being,  
Through what new scenes and changes must we pass!  
The wide, th' unbounded prospect lies before me,  
But shadows, clouds, and darkness rest upon it.  
Here will I hold. If there's a power above us,  
(And that there is, all nature cries aloud  
Through all her works,) he must delight in virtue,  
And that, which he delights in, must be happy.  
But when! or where!—this world was made for Cæsar,  
I'm weary of conjectures—This must end 'em.  
(*laying his hand on his sword.*)

Thus am I doubly arm'd: my death and life;  
My bane and antidote are both before me;  
This in a moment brings me to an end;  
But this informs me I shall never die.  
The soul secur'd in her existence smiles  
At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.  
The stars shall fade away, the sun himself  
Grow dim with age, and nature sink in years.  
But thou shalt flourish in immortal youth,  
Unhurt amidst the war of elements,  
The wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds.

## II.

“ GEORGE *solus*, sitting in a thoughtful posture; in his hand JOHNSON'S *False Alarm*; a *Public Advertiser*, containing JUNIUS, on the table by him.

It must be so—JOHNSON, thou reason'st well:  
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,  
This longing after great authority?  
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror  
Of falling into nought? why shrinks my soul  
Back on herself, and startles at *dissolving*?  
'Tis the *divinum jus*, that stirs within us,

that led our author in one of the earliest pieces, with which he obliged the world, to copy the stile and sentiments of that noble writer so exactly, that the performance passed, for some time, even with the critics and connoisseurs, as a posthumous production of his Lordship.

“ This piece was entitled, ‘ *A Vindication of Natural Society ; or a View of the Miseries and Evils arising to Mankind from every Species of Artificial society.*’ If the title of this tract carried with it the air of irony, its contents were perfectly conformable ; experience, however, on this, as on many other occasions, serves sadly to confirm the veracity of that trite, though pertinent proverb, that ‘ Truth is often spoken in jest.’

“ This little performance may be regarded as a *certamen ingenii*, a kind of exercise of his literary and

And intimates supremacy to kings.  
 Supremacy, thou pleasing, dangerous thought !  
 Through what variety of untried ministries,  
 Through what newspapers and pamphlets must we pass !  
 The wide, th’ unbounded prospect lies before me,  
 But factions rage, and dulness rests upon it.  
 Here will I hold. If Englishmen be generous,  
 (And that they are, all London cries aloud  
 Through all her streets,) they must delight in goodness,  
 And he, whom they delight in, must be happy.  
 But how ! or why ! — this noise is made for Wilkes,  
 I’m weary of conjectures. — Let me read then.

(*laying his hand on JUNIUS.*)

Thus am I doubly arm’d : my death and life,  
 My bane and antidote are both before me.  
 This in a moment drives me from my throne ;  
 But this informs me I shall ever reign.  
 A king secur’d in his own conscience, smiles  
 At the keen JUNIUS, and defies his point.  
 The mob shall slink away, CHATHAM himself  
 Grow dim with age, and TEMPLE sink in years ;  
 But I shall flourish in immortal power  
 Unhurt, amidst the war of parliaments,  
 The wreck of boroughs, and the crush of parties.

RAMPAGER.”

*The Public Advertiser* Oct. 26, 1771.




logical abilities; and affords no mean proof of the proficiency he had made in the rhetorical and dialectic arts.

“Of the same kind are those little critiques on political publications, with which our author, about that time, occasionally favoured those well-known farragoes of literary and political criticism, the Reviews: those very heterogeneous works, that during a course of upwards of twenty years, have worn a very different face at different times, and have been very unequally executed by different authors, gentle and simple, whigs and tories, learned and unlearned, sceptical and credulous; composing the most motley groupe of writers, that ever at once informed and infested society. Had Junius the vanity of a certain rival politician, now seated at the Board of Treasury, he would probably wish to have it forgotten that he ever acted the part of an obscure and anonymous reviewer; but when he reflects that they were both labourers in the same vineyard with men, who, like themselves, have since risen to consideration and eminence, both in church and state, he must reflect also, with some complacency, on the means, by which they whetted their wits, to qualify them for the posts and offices they so well do, or so ardently wish to sustain.

“The reputation our author acquired by his ironical vindication of natural society, received a considerable addition by his celebrated treatise on ‘*The Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*,’ a work that made its first appearance with great éclat, and obtained the writer the distinguished appellation of the *English Longinus*. There is, most undoubtedly, great merit in this performance; in which the author’s ingenuity is, however, more conspicuous than either the extent of his knowledge or the profundity of his judgment. The affectation

of treating subjects philosophically, whose philosophical principles he should have first discovered, hath induced him frequently to amuse us with the shadow of an argument instead of its substance. Hence he bewilders his readers in the search after the origin of abstract and abstruse ideas, by directing them to consult their imagination rather than their perceptions — their conceptions, which are ever misleading, instead of their sensations; which, while they are trusted no farther than they can reach, cannot deceive. Had he made Lord Bacon his philosophical guide, instead of imitating Lord Bolingbroke, he would have considered that, like many other modern sophists, he begun at the wrong end of investigation, by running rashly into the maze of metaphysical speculation, without taking with him the clue of physical experiment. Even Locke might have taught him what he did not always practise himself, to distinguish between complex notions and simple ideas, and to admit only those of the latter, which are evidently deducible from sense. The similarity of genius, already observed, which our author possessed, to that of the noble author last mentioned, is, in this tract, peculiarly conspicuous. Splendid in his diction, and specious in his argument, he commanded the attention, and captivated the fancy of the reader; but, more florid than perspicuous, more superficial than solid, however the flowers of his rhetoric might dazzle and persuade, the force of his reasoning was ineffectual either to instruct or convince. In soaring up to the sublime, he soared out of sight, and with the eccentricity of a comet, rushed from a blaze of light into darkness and obscurity. In the pursuit of the beautiful, he carried his refinement to such a degree of delicacy, that it lost its essential quality of pleasing. The form of beauty is no longer amiable than it is palpable to sense.



“ OF JUNIUS, therefore considered in the capacity of a philosopher, it may be said as of his favourite BOLINGBROKE, in the words of a late writer, that ‘ by having endeavoured at too much, he has done ‘ nothing; though, as a political writer, few can equal, and none exceed him.’ His *forte* does not lie in developing the philosophical secrets of nature, and disclosing the mysterious operations of the human mind; but in discovering the political secrets of society, and in exposing the iniquitous machinations of government. And here the comparison between Bolinbroke and Junius ends: the great abilities of the former having been exerted to introduce the tyranny of arbitrary power, and to enslave his country; while to the latter common gratitude induces us to look up, as to a friend and benefactor both of his country and of mankind.

“ It has been objected, indeed, and that with some appearance of reason, against the disinterestedness and integrity of his character, that he has made the public station ever subservient to his private interest; and that he has not only been actuated in his political writings more by a spirit of party than of patriotism, but that private pique hath often aggravated his censure, as personal attachment has animated his applause. In answer to this objection, it may be observed, that, to possess the zeal and disinterestedness of a patriot without the passions of a man, is impossible; and were it possible, is by no means desirable. The cosmopolite, who affects a friendship for all mankind in general, is seldom a friend to any particular individual. He, who has a kindness for *every* body, must have a large stock of benevolence indeed to have much kindness for *any* body. General good-will must flow from a particular source; and, as the stream must be proportional to the fountain, whence it springs, the more exten-

sive its surface, the more shallow will be its depth. In order that a man may be a friend to others, it behoves him to be a constant friend to himself. If Junius, when in office, had not profited by the accustomed and legal perquisites of his post, he would have been imprudently his own enemy. That a man should make his station also, in all other reputable respects, subservient to his interest, who was not born to an affluent fortune, is certainly excusable in an age and country, which countenance the first fortunes in the kingdom, in the shameful practices of place-hunting, stock-jobbing, match-making, and even match-marring, for the sake of gratifying the pitiful passions of avarice and petty ambition in the saving or accumulation of a few thousands, to add profusion to a plentiful patrimony. It is a strong presumption, however, that he cannot be much a knave, who is known to be considerably duped: and that Junius is so little an adept in the tricks of the *alley*, as to have run great risques of being stigmatised, in its cant-phrase, for a *lame duck*, is notorious. But our author, it is said, hath not only constantly opposed administration, when his patrons and himself were out of place, but has affected to despise, and has really neglected his fellow-patriots engaged in the same cause; and hath even espoused the cause, and defended the persons of its enemies. We shall not take upon us very warmly to commend his replies to the several pamphlets and papers written in support of the ministers preceding and succeeding the Rockingham-administration.\* These were un-

\* "Among which the replies to the *Budget*, and the *Considerations of the present State of the Nation*, with others of less note are imputed to our author."—[The tract entitled *The Budget* was written, not by Burke, but by David Hartley, Esq. M.P. for Hull, and it is reprinted as his composition in Debrett's *Collection of Scarce and Interesting Tracts*, 1788. 8vo. V. 1. p. 299-319., where is inserted

doubtedly dictated in some measure by the spirit of party, and were, confessedly, more immediately calculated for the service of his patrons than for that of the nation. It is some extenuation, however, if not a total exculpation, of the criminality of those productions, if our author really thought, as no doubt he professes to do, that the interest of his patrons, and that of his country, are inseparably connected." *Anecdotes of Junius, to which is prefixed the King's Reply*,\* 1771. 8vo. p. 27.

---

### APPENDICULA I.

In p. 207. I have introduced a note on a celebrated passage in Horace, written by Sir Philip Francis. I now add the following remarks by my friend, John Symmons Esq. :—

“ I have received and read with very great pleasure and information your *Junius*. Now, to fill up the page with a

p. 319-365., the reply by Thos. Whately Esq. Secretary to the Treasury. See also Almon's *Biographical, Literary, and Political Anecdotes of Several of the Most Eminent Persons of the Present Age*, 2, 103. 144. E. H. B.]

\* “ As to the extreme severity, with which Junius has occasionally treated some respectable characters, it is to be considered, that in regard to the circumstances, for which they are censured, they are far from being respectable; and that their allowed merit, or accustomed distinction, in other respects, required for the sake of example, a more than ordinary severity of chastisement. The cause of truth, of justice, of his country, demanded the castigation of such superior delinquents, from the hands of him only, who was so well qualified to inflict it. As a mitigation, however, of this severity, and an exculpation of Junius from the rancour of so much personal resentment, it is to be further observed, that though the stile and sentiment of the letters in question may be imputed to one writer, the materials of information with which they abound, were furnished by different hands. Junius is in this view a *junto*, of which *Nos numerus sumus*, might indeed with propriety be the motto of some; but others had not only their suggestions and instructions to offer, but also their piques and disappointments to revenge. If Junius was sometimes influenced by these, he is the more excusable; as, however severe his reprehensions, they appear to have ever been founded on justice and truth. This association, under a single name, appears

little chat, I do not at all approve of Mr. Fowke's and Sir P. Francis's interpretation of *quem vocas*. I am decidedly for

————— *quem vocas*  
*Dilecte, Mæcenas,*

‘Whom thou gavest the title to, of *my dear!*’ The other sense would be a premature and a very awkward anticipation of what afterwards follows, in the fervour of composition. The poet is by no means mounted to that height at the beginning. He begins with matter of fact, his being obscurely born, and yet being a friend of Mæcenas. He then quietly and plainly augurs the immortality of his name, which turned out to be also matter of fact. My dear Sir, he is not mounted on a cloud yet. Gently, gently, good Mr. Fowke! Why should Mæcenas be calling him back? Johnson and Wakefield were surprized into a consent; certainly the *former*; the latter was capable of a serious consent.”

*Extract from a Letter of John Symmons Esq. dated  
Paris, Jan. 8, 1828.*

to have been of some consequence to the personal safety of this writer; who, as he could not take upon him to be the author of all the anecdotes communicated to him, and at the same time was not authorised to disclose the informant, could not be expected to justify in his own person every thing, for which he might be called to account. The communicating parties therefore bound themselves, it seems, reciprocally to support each other; a circumstance, of which the real Junius was wise enough to profit in an altercation, that happened between him and a gentleman of rank in the army, who had been very roughly handled in one of his *Letters*. ‘I am informed, Sir,’ said the officer, ‘that you wrote the *Letter*, which appeared in to-day’s *Public Advertiser*, under the signature of JUNIUS. I shall be obliged to you if you would tell me whether you did or not.’ ‘Really, Sir,’ replied our author, ‘that is a question I cannot be so obliging as to answer, as I see no reason for your asking me the question. If you believe your informer, it is needless, and if you do not, it is rather rude to found your suspicions of me on the information of one you suspect to be a liar.’ ‘Sir,’ retorted the officer warmly, ‘Lord T—challenged Mr. W—on a similar occasion, and I think it is a question a gentleman has a right to ask, and a reason to expect an answer.’—‘You, Sir,’ returned JUNIUS coolly, ‘may adopt the conduct of Lord T—if you please; but I assure you, I shall not make Mr. WILKES’s the standard of mine.’ ‘I am determined

There is a mention of Mr. Joseph Fowke in the following *Letter* from Dr. Samuel Johnson to Francis Fowke, Esq., which is inserted in the *Omnium Gatherum, or Bath, Bristol, and Cheltenham Literary Repository, by Us Two*, No. 2. p. 43. ; for the loan of which book, long out of print, I am indebted to the politeness and friendliness of the Rev. R. Warner: —

“ July 11, 1776.

“ SIR,

I received, some weeks ago, a collection of papers, which contains the Trial of my dear friend, Joseph Fowke ; of whom I cannot easily be induced to think otherwise than well, and who *seems* to have been injured by the prosecution and the sentence. His first desire is that I should prepare his narrative for the press ; his second, that, if I cannot gratify him by publication, I would transmit them to you.

“ To a compliance with his first request, I have this objection, that I live in a reciprocation of civility with Mr. Hastings, and therefore cannot properly diffuse a narrative intended to bring upon him the censure of the public. Of two adversaries, it would be rash to condemn either upon

‘ I will somehow have satisfaction.’ ‘ You are perfectly right, sir, but you have no right to make me determine the *quo modo*.’ ‘ Are not you JUNIUS ? ’ angrily — ‘ If I were, sir, and you were to despatch one JUNIUS to day, you would have another to encounter before the end of the week,’ turning round on his heel and walking away. The military gentleman was ready to burst with rage at the affected *sang-froid* of our author, but not having the keen-killing stomach of a Bobadil, he stifled his resentment, and suffered the matter to drop. A more pleasant instance of this multifarious character of JUNIUS was given the public, in his hasty and inadvertent reply to a *Letter* addressed to him in the Newspapers by a supposed female writer ; to which our author, in his *gaité de cœur*, returned so light and ludicrous an answer, that it was condemned, it seems, in full conclave, by the graver part of the individual units of the junto ; whether because they judged its wit to be incompatible with politics, or that they thought its levity unbecoming the pen of a writer, engaged in the discussion of the important affairs of government. Junius, therefore, was reduced to the disagreeable task of disowning his own hand-writing, and imputing the fault to a mistake of the printer ; who, it was pretended, was deceived by a striking similitude of the penmanship. But could this similitude be accidental ? Or, could a correspondent not in the secret of the junto, copy the hand-writing of Junius so nearly, as to deceive the printer ? *Credat Judæus Apella.*”

the evidence of the other ; and a common friend must keep himself suspended, at least till he has heard both.

“ I am therefore ready to transmit to you the papers, which have been seen only by myself, and beg to be informed how they may be conveyed to you. I see no legal objection to the publication ; and of prudential reasons, Mr. Fowke and you will be allowed to be fitter judges.

“ If you would have me send them, let me have proper directions ; if a messenger is to call for them, give me notice by the post, that they may be ready for delivery.

“ To do my dear Mr. Fowke any good, would give me pleasure ; I hope for some opportunity of performing the duties of friendship to him, without violating them with regard to another.

“ I am, Sir, your most humble servant,  
SAMUEL JOHNSON.”

The word *Fowke* does not appear in the Index to Boswell's *Life of Johnson*.

## APPENDICULA II.

In p. 362. I have introduced a quotation from Sir Philip Francis's *Letter Missive to Lord Holland* about the *Hecatompodon* and the *Parthenon*, about Phidias and ancient statues. I consulted my intelligent and esteemed friend, the Rev. T. S. Hughes, B. D., on the subject, and he favoured me with the following observations in his reply : —

“ With respect to the work *in toto*, it appears to me very like the effort of a man, who did *not* write Junius, but wished it to be thought he *did*. It is clever, and has many pointed passages, but not the raciness of Junius's style. With regard to the part, to which you have particularly drawn my attention, I should say that the remarks of Sir Philip are in general very just and true. Those concerning the gold and ivory statues agree in the main with the great and splendid work of Quatre-Mere de Quincy on the Chryselephantine Statuary. With regard to the *Hecatompodon* (p. 64,) he is right — it was the old Temple burnt and destroyed by the Persians, and a vast many of the stones, which composed it, especially those of the pillars, are at this day to be seen, (according to the conjectures of able antiquaries,) worked up in the walls of the *Acropolis*. As for Stuart, though a fine architect, he was not a very accurate scholar. Sir Philip is wrong, when he says that only the statues of Jupiter were ever represented in a sitting posture :



take the following instance of the contrary from Pausani  
 (*Corinth.* 2,17.) Τὸ δὲ ἀγάλμα τῆς Ἡρας ἐπὶ θρόνῳ  
 κάθηται μεγέθει μέγα, χρυσοῦ μὲν καὶ ἐλέφαντι  
 Πολυκλείτου δὲ ἔργον. His remark in capitals at t  
 bottom of p. 72. seems to me a very happy one. In t  
 words of Sir Philip, *vive et vale!*"





2



UNIVERSITY OF M



3 9015 0637E

