

ART. II.—*Authorship of Junius.*

1. *Memoirs of JOHN HORNE TOOKE, together with his valuable Speeches and Writings; also, containing Proof, identifying him as the AUTHOR of the celebrated Letters of Junius.* By JOHN A. GRAHAM, LL. D.
2. *The Posthumous Works of JUNIUS, to which is prefixed an Inquiry respecting the Author, and a Sketch of the Life of John Horne Tooke.*
3. *Junius Unmasked, or Lord GEORGE SACKVILLE proved to be JUNIUS, with an Appendix showing that the Author of the Letters of Junius was also the Author of the History of the Reign of George III., and Author of the North Briton, ascribed to Mr. Wilkes.*
4. *An Essay on Junius and his Letters, embracing a Sketch of the Life and Character of WILLIAM PITT, Earl of Chatham, and Memoirs of certain other distinguished Individuals, with Reflections, Historical, Personal, and Political, relating to the Affairs of Great Britain and America, from 1763 to 1785.* By BENJAMIN WATERHOUSE, Member of several Medical, Philosophical, and Literary Societies in Europe and America.
5. *Letters of Junius, addressed to John Pickering, Esq. showing that the Author of that celebrated Work was EARL TEMPLE.* By ISAAC NEWHALL.

An attentive examination of the theories and arguments, which have been put forth on the subject of the authorship of Junius, will detect certain prevailing fallacies, which have run through nearly all of them. If the true theory have ever been advanced, it wears the same colors of sophistry as the false, and is not at present distinguishable from them. It remains to be proved, as much as it did when Junius ceased or began to write, and when men were watching for external indications of the author, instead of studying his works and searching contemporary writings for resemblances.

Most of the examiners of this question have thought it necessary to place an implicit reliance on each of the assertions, which Junius made touching himself. But in doing this they have violated a rule of evidence, which requires that the confessions of a party be all taken together. Each writer has usually selected those, which were favorable to his theory,

and without attempting to discredit the remainder, has omitted them in the discussion.

It will not be difficult to show, that many of the assertions of Junius respecting his own character and connexions, are to be taken with considerable qualifications; and that others are to be totally rejected. In his Private Letter No. 8, addressed to Woodfall, he requests the printer to impose a fiction upon the public. Of the same character were all the innocent deceptions of writing under various signatures in defence and aid of Junius, and especially under that of *Philo-Junius*. He calls it 'a fraud,' but adds that it was 'innocent,' and that he 'always meant to explain it.' In the Miscellaneous Letter signed *Anti-Fox*, there is an instance of artifice, a little more peculiar. He says, 'I know nothing of Junius.' Again, notwithstanding his habitual contempt and abuse of the Scotch, he attacks Lord Barrington under the signature of *Scotus*, commencing with, 'I am a Scotchman;' and vindicates the national character of his fictitious brethren, with as much zeal as that with which he usually abused them. It is evident, that Junius did and naturally would practise every harmless deception in relation to his circumstances, associations and character, which was adapted to give effect to his writings, and security to his person.

We give full credit to his declaration in the Dedication to the English nation, 'I am the sole depository of my own secret, and it shall perish with me.' There is an earnestness and solemnity in these words, which convey a strong impression of their truth. It may be said, that if we believe all that Junius asserts respecting himself and his works, we shall believe contradictions. This proposition is true, and forms an essential part of our theory, but a distinction is to be made between spontaneous and voluntary statements, and those extorted by fear or interest. 'There is a great difference between what is said without our being urged to it, and what is said from a kind of compulsion.' This was the remark of Dr. Johnson in relation to the inquiry now before us. It may be further remarked, that the motive which urges to an avowal or confirmation of a fact is not always without, but quite as often within ourselves. Thus vanity, when unrestrained by fear, might admit the charge, or voluntarily claim the credit, of writing the Letters of Junius. So the recklessness of one who had nothing to lose, and to whom chances were rare blessings, would be likely to produce the same result; with this modification, the

principle of Dr. Johnson will be found of great service, when applied to declarations of or concerning Junius. A confession, to be of any value, must be voluntary, the confessor being at perfect liberty to make it or not, and uninfluenced by motives of hope, fear, or interest.

The only passage of Junius, which has been cited to prove the privity of other persons to the composition of the letters, occurs in his private correspondence with Woodfall, though there is one in his public letters, which seems to imply the same fact. The first which we shall quote is in his Private Letter No. 8, to Woodfall. 'The last letter which you printed, was idle and improper, and I assure you printed against my own opinion. The truth is, *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 to see him at all.' If this confession be voluntary and disinterested, then by our rule it must be true, and if true it is decisive on the point before us. What was the motive for recalling and partially disclaiming the public letter, to which the private note refers? It was an apprehension in the mind of Junius, that he had impaired his credit with the public, by offending them with a publication which was coarse and trifling; or, as he himself says, 'idle and improper.' When we consider what a strict regard Junius generally paid to the public sense of decorum, and the masterly tact and skill with which he struck every chord of English feeling, and sounded every note of English passion, it is truly surprising, that he should ever have erred as he did on this occasion. It was, however, a mistake, from which the most sensible and prudent are not always exempted. He was misled by a witty conceit, and followed it up, though it left him in the mire. In these circumstances, it was necessary that he should make the best retreat he could from a situation incompatible with the grave and austere character and authoritative tone, which he had assumed. He therefore in the first place, requests Woodfall to state an untruth to the public. With this request Woodfall readily complies; and thus the *faux pas* was remedied so far as respected the public. The only other person to be operated upon was Woodfall himself, and those familiar friends and advisers to whom he might show the private correspondence of Junius. The confession then of the privity of other persons to the writings of Junius, was intended to affect Woodfall. Why, and in what way? In the

same way and for the same object, that several other declarations and promises were scattered through the private letters, viz. to encourage the printer to perseverance, to discourage a dangerous curiosity, and to secure more completely his fidelity. He was taught to believe, that the great secret of the time was not always to be concealed, that it was not even then withheld from the author's intimate friends, and would one day be imparted to himself, whom Junius always addressed as if he had a great regard for him, and would one day take pleasure in enrolling him in that select troop, by which it might naturally be supposed that such a man was surrounded.

In addition to this, we may see throughout Junius's intercourse with Woodfall a determination to stand particularly well with him, because he had resolved to make Woodfall the reflector of all the light, which the public were to receive immediately or perhaps for ever on the subject of Junius's moral character, so far as that character depended on actions instead of words. To have somewhat of a personal character, and to have that, however little, so free from reproach, as to authorize the most flattering inferences as to the whole, was an important point with Junius, and evidently auxiliary to his great design. The same motive, then, which induced him to wish the letter to *Junia* 'recalled,' would make him seek to clear himself as far as possible in the eyes of Woodfall, from the acknowledged weakness of having published it. Junius had then a double, and certainly an important purpose in view, in deceiving Woodfall. He wished to flatter his hopes of knowing 'the Great Unknown,' and to impress upon him and propagate through him the most favorable opinion of his character as a man and a gentleman.

There is another passage, which contains a feebler implication, of the same kind as that in the private letter. In Letter No. 36, to the Duke of Grafton, he says, 'But in the relation you have borne to the country, you have no title to indulgence; and if I had followed the dictates of my own opinion, I never should have allowed you the respite of a moment. In your public character, you have injured every subject of the empire; and though an individual is not authorized to forgive the injuries done to society, he is called upon to assert his separate share in the public resentment. I submitted however to the judgment of men more moderate, perhaps more candid than myself.' This we conceive does not necessarily imply

that 'the judgment' to which Junius 'submitted,' was given to him as Junius. In his real character, he might, and must have propounded questions, and listened to facts and opinions, which he made use of as Junius, without being known or suspected from that cause to be the writer. The political and personal opinions of a party are common property, and when one adds anything to the store, it immediately vests in all concerned. A new fact, or a new idea, will generally in twenty-four hours, or in half that time, have been so widely spread among ardent politicians, at an excited period, that it may appear in a gazette the next morning, without the originator having the slightest knowledge of the channel through which it got there. This consideration shows how Junius may have received in his real character, suggestions which he used in his fictitious one, without furnishing thereby any clue to lead to his detection. In this manner the last passage may be explained, and reconciled with the passage from the 'Dedication.' Perhaps, also, that contained in Private Letter No. 8, may be explained in the same way; we have sometimes thought so; but it is not very important.

Let then these passages, so explained, be compared with the following: 'I have faithfully served the public, without the possibility of personal advantage. As JUNIUS, I can *never* be rewarded. The secret is too important to be committed to any great man's discretion. If views of interest or ambition could tempt me to betray my own secret, how could I flatter myself, that the man I trusted would not act upon the same principles, and sacrifice me at once to the King's curiosity and resentment. Speaking therefore as a disinterested man, I have a claim to your attention.' This is in a private letter to Wilkes. In another private letter to Woodfall he says, 'Be assured that it is not in the nature of things that they, or you, or any body else should *ever* know me, unless I make myself known. All arts or inquiries or rewards will be equally ineffectual.' In another private letter to Wilkes he says, 'I willingly accept as much of your friendship, as you can impart to a man whom you will assuredly *never know*;' and to Sir William Draper; 'motives very different from any apprehension of your resentment make it impossible you should *ever* know me.' 'I should be exposed to the resentment of the worst and most powerful men in this country, though I may be indifferent to yours. Though *you* would fight, there are others who would assassinate.'

We conclude this topic with the asseveration, with which we started, that Junius *was* 'the sole depositary of his own secret,' and that it *has* 'perished with him,' and perished for ever; unless time and a better understanding of the methods of argument and the weight of evidence shall effect the discovery by means not yet known, and by facts which Junius could not disguise; for as far as in *him* lay, he has provided that all traces of himself should be concealed while he lived, and be buried with him when he was dead.

It is sometimes asked, why Junius should have wished for a continued concealment after his death, and when it could affect none connected with him, unless it were to invest them with a portion of the honor of all that was great and good in him, while all that derogated from either would be charitably 'interred with his bones.' We believe that he has answered the question himself. *One* of the reasons he assigned for taking and maintaining his *incognito* at first, has now, and will ever have the same force as then. He says to Wilkes, 'Besides every personal consideration, if I were known I could no longer be a useful servant to the public. At present there is something oracular in the delivery of my opinions. I speak from a recess which no human curiosity can penetrate, and darkness we are told is one source of the sublime.—The mystery of JUNIUS increases his importance.' The interest arising from the concealment of Junius is an interest superadded, and even superior to that which the intrinsic importance of his works would command. It keeps up a more lasting and lively attention to these letters, than that which any didactic compositions, without the aid of something extraneous, could ever sustain. In adopting therefore a stern and soul-subduing purpose of self-denial in regard to the harvest of fame, Junius showed a deep knowledge of mankind, who have never placed among their consecrated things, aught which had not mystery about it,—aught which limited entirely the imagination, and set bounds to 'thoughts that wander through eternity.' Thus did Mahomet and Numa sanctify the revelations of genius, and make them as universal and lasting as the nations, whom they wished to influence and to serve. The great writer, whose era is called 'the Reign of Junius,' left a sort of sanction to his doctrines, in the mystery with which he enveloped their origin.

'The *more* to raise our reverence she chose,
The *less* the sacred Sybil did disclose.'

Such was one of the original reasons of secrecy. Junius has declared it, and any man would have presumed it, if he had not. This reason remains in all its force, perhaps with accumulated force. For the allusions to local, personal, and party feelings and facts, though calculated to produce the most intense interest at the time, would soon not only cease to be interesting, but would even detract from other merit. Instead of wings to bear him up, they would be weights to drag him down. Whatever interest could be retained or inspired by secrecy, would therefore become more necessary, in proportion as ephemeral circumstances and passions passed away. Junius delivered a system of political ethics, and constitutional liberty, primarily intended for his own nation, but applicable and now applied in all nations, who possess or seek rational, impartial, and just systems of administration and government. With admirable wisdom and forecast he provided, that as one source of curiosity and attention should be diminished or lost, another should supply its place, and rivet the eyes and minds of beholders. The 'Dedication' says, 'When kings and ministers are forgotten, when the force and direction of personal satire are no longer understood, and measures are only felt in their remotest consequences, this book will, I believe, be found to contain principles worthy to be transmitted to posterity.'

There is no doubt that the first and most necessary object of secrecy was personal safety, and liberty to write and lay before the country and the king,—to use the language of Mr. Burke upon this subject,—'many truths, many bold truths, by which a wise prince might profit.' In a private letter to Woodfall, Junius says, 'I must be more cautious. I am sure I should not survive a discovery three days. If I did, they would attain me by bill. Change to the Somerset Coffee House.' Again, 'When you consider to what excessive enmities I may be exposed, you will not wonder at my caution.' Sir William Draper challenged Junius, and other antagonists left their names with the printer, and called upon Junius to come forth, and try the questions between them by mortal combat.

To show, that Junius did not over-rate the importance of his secret, we produce the following contemporary testimony. Mr. Whitefoord, one of Junius's antagonists, says, September, 1769, when but twenty-two out of sixty-nine letters had been published, 'Various have been the conjectures formed on the

question, "Who is Junius?" I have heard at least twenty persons named, whom suspicion points the finger at. Nay, I have been assured at different times, that each of them was the author in question. They could not all be the writer, perhaps none of them.' Wilkes says, in the private correspondence with Junius, 'I do not mean to indulge the impertinent curiosity of finding out the most important secret of our times, the author of Junius. *I will not attempt with profane hands, to tear the veil of the sanctuary. I am disposed, with the inhabitants of Attica, to erect an altar to the unknown God of our political idolatry, and will be content to worship him in clouds and darkness.*' Burke said in the House of Commons, 'the myrmidons of the Court have been long and are still pursuing him in vain. They will not spend their time upon me, or you, or you. No, they disdain such vermin, when the mighty boar of the forest, that has broke all their toils, is before them.' Lord North, in the same debate, said, 'Why should we wonder that this great boar of the wood, this mighty Junius, has broke through the toils and foiled the hunters? Though there may be at present no spear that will reach him, yet he may be some time or other caught.'

These were the mixed motives which first prompted Junius to secrecy. But when he found by experience, if he did not fully foresee, how much his 'mystery increased his importance,' and when, by his knowledge of the philosophy and history of man, he foresaw that the same effect would not only continue, but be increased as the stream of time rolled on, there cannot, we think, be a doubt that he resolved in the solitary recesses of his heart, that his secret should be eternal. That he had a prophetic insight into the future, is manifested in the sentiment, which we have quoted from the 'Dedication.' In one of his letters to Horne he says, 'Without meaning an indecent comparison, I may venture to foretell that the Bible and Junius will be read, when the commentaries of the Jesuits are forgotten.'

If all these expressions, and they are all the important ones of their kind contained in the work, be taken together, the impression upon the whole will be, that Junius was known and intended to be known to none. To suppose that when the danger of discovery was nearly over, or greatly diminished, when his machinery had been tried, and found safe and adequate to its purpose, and when there was no need of multiply-

ing precautions, to suppose that Junius would sit down to his 'Dedication,' and falsely make to the people of England that solemn asseveration, is to suppose what is inconsistent not only with the sagacity, wariness, and practical good sense of Junius, but with the common sense of mankind. No motive, apart from its truth, can be assigned for the declaration. It could no longer contribute to the safety or liberty of writing and publishing. The work was done and bequeathed to Woodfall, as one of the last acts of the author. On the other hand, could Junius be so absurd, so suicidal, so ineffably stupid, as to place on the frontispiece of his great work, *ever to remain there*, a declaration which he knew, and intended to be false, gratuitously and unprofitably false? To suppose this is inconsistent with the smallest modicum of intellect which nature in her most niggardly mood ever vouchsafed to a rational being. It must have been obvious, that it would forever impair the respectability and popularity of the work, if it were tainted with wanton trick and deceit, of which it would be difficult to say, whether the silliness or the disinterested knavery were most conspicuous. To cry out in the market place, 'I am Junius, but none of you shall ever know it,' is a madness, which must be reconciled with the deep subtilty and strong sense of Junius, by those who maintain that the implication of the privacy of other persons contained in the letter to Woodfall, is to be believed in preference to the opposite declaration in the Dedication and elsewhere. In the former case, there was an obvious and reasonable object, in the latter no imaginable one; there, it was convenient and useful, here gratuitous; there it was to do him good, here it was to do his writings harm; there it was private, here public. It might well be demanded of Junius, 'was not the secret your own, to impart or conceal at your pleasure? Then why have you, intending to tell it, surrounded it with trumpery and falsehood? Why, by an empty parade of self-denial, of which you knew that you were incapable,—by an affectation of a superiority to vanity, which was in itself egregiously vain,—have you impaired the credit of principles, and brought ridicule upon labors, which otherwise would always have been respectable, coming from any source, known or unknown? This is a question, which we apprehend to be unanswerable. At all events there is no answer to it, except the actual production of the author. That it was his design never to be known, we fully believe; that he provided wisely and se-

curely, as far as possible, for its accomplishment, we also believe; that he did so effectually, must always be self-evident, until he is discovered.

Those who recollect how much use has been made of the circumstance of the supposed privity of other persons to the composition of the letters, in almost all the discussions of this subject, and how important the solution of the question is to the settlement of various claims to the honors of Junius, will not think that we have occupied an undue space for presenting it fully and fairly to our readers.

Several persons have said that they knew the author. Others, when charged with being the author, have denied it evasively, or have blushingly submitted to have 'greatness forced upon them;' and one has affirmed, that he was himself the veritable Junius. Dr. Parr was in the habit of saying that he knew the author of Junius, and he one day invited a gentleman to his house to meet the son of Junius, or in his classical nomenclature, *Juniades*, meaning thereby a natural son of Charles Lloyd, private secretary of George Grenville.

Sir Nathaniel Wraxall states in his Memoirs, that the late king George III. declared that he knew the author; and that he would write no more. This was not said at the time when Garrick had communicated such a story, and could not have been founded upon it; for Junius had meantime continued to write. Probably the king like many others thought he knew, and announced as a fact, what was merely an opinion. Upon the principle, which we have endeavored to establish, to know the author is equivalent to being the author, unless the knowledge were the result of study and investigation, or of other means in which *he* had no agency.

Alexander Stephens, in his Memoirs of John Horne Tooke, informs us, that in answer to the interrogatory, 'do you know the author of Junius?' Mr. Tooke said, in presence of his biographer, and with a peculiar look and emphasis, 'I do.' Mr. Graham, whose work is at the head of this article, testifies, that 'one day in his presence a mutual and reverend friend put the question directly to Mr. Tooke; 'do you know the author of Junius?' 'Yes,' replied he, 'I do know him better than any man in England.' 'Pray, is he now living?' 'Yes, he is yet alive.' 'He must then be an old man. Do you know his age?' Mr. Tooke replied, 'strange as it may seem,

I can assure you, that Parson Horne and Junius were born on the same day in the city of Westminster.'

Reverend Philip Rosenhagen is said to have imposed upon Lord North a story that he was the author, in order to induce his Lordship to buy him in with a pension.

The present Duke of Buckingham, and his uncle, Lord Grenville, are said to have severally declared that they know the author.

Another class of persons connected in a more important manner with this question are those, who being accused, have tacitly admitted or have evaded the charge of the authorship. The earliest of them, we believe, was Hugh Macauley Boyd. Almon, the bookseller and publisher, states, that he got sight of part of a letter of Junius, in the hands of Woodfall, and knew that it was in Boyd's hand-writing; whereupon he charged Boyd with being the writer. Boyd *instantly changed color*, and after a short pause, said, 'similitude of hand-writing is not a conclusive fact.' Almon, it seems, was convinced that his suspicion was correct; and ever after maintained his theory with zeal and constancy.

Lord George Sackville was early accused, and does not appear to have directly denied the charge. On one occasion, his Lordship is said to have replied to a friend, 'I should be proud to be thought capable of writing as Junius has done, but there are many passages in his letters, I should be very sorry to have written.' A few days before his death he told Richard Cumberland, his private secretary, in a laughing way, that he had been accused of writing the Letters. It does not appear, that on this occasion he added any other observation.

William Gerard Hamilton, who was generally known to be among the reputed authors, is not known to have denied it, otherwise than by criticising with some rigor one of Junius's metaphors; and by observing one day to a friend in a tone between seriousness and pleasantry, 'you know that I could have written better papers.' Mr. Malone, editor of his speeches and parliamentary logic, states, however, that he denied on his death-bed that he was Junius.

The most remarkable confession, which has been made upon this subject, was that of General Charles Lee. In this, as in other things, he was a being *sui generis*. In the fall of the year 1773, Mr. T. Rodney was in company with him in America, and the Letters of Junius were mentioned. Mr.

Rodney expressed the opinion, that no other person than Lord Chatham could have been the author. General Lee immediately replied with considerable animation, affirming that 'to his certain knowledge, Lord Chatham was not the author; neither did he know who was the author any more than I did; that there was not a man in the world, no, not even Woodfall, who knew who the author was; that the secret rested solely with himself, and would forever remain with him. Feeling in some degree surprised at this unexpected declaration, after pausing a little, I replied, 'No, General Lee, if you certainly know what you have affirmed, it can no longer remain solely with him, for certainly no one could know what you have affirmed, but the author himself.' Recollecting himself, he replied, 'I have unguardedly committed myself, *and it would be but folly to deny to you, that I am the author*; but I must request that you will not reveal it during my life; for it never was, and never will be revealed by me to any other man.'

Sir Philip Francis, when directly inquired of by Sir Richard Phillips, replied in a manner which has been variously interpreted. It is certainly not quite satisfactory, and as Sir Philip lived some years afterwards, and saw that his reply was in effect ambiguous, and omitted to make it certain, we may conclude beyond a doubt, that he was willing to be thought the author. We know of no others, who were accused or interrogated in such a manner as to elicit a reply. If there were, we presume that their replies have not been preserved. The only person, who appears to have given a prompt and categorical denial, was Edmund Burke. He denied it to Dr. Johnson, in a manner which satisfied him; and to Dean, afterwards Bishop Morley, he said, 'I could not write like Junius, and if I could, I would not.'

From these facts, it is manifest, that if confessions, direct, tacit, or implied, of knowing or being the author, prove any thing, they prove too much, and instead of one, would give us twenty Juniuses, and as Mr. Whitefoord said, sixty years ago, 'they could not *all* be the writer.' Yet we are far from affirming that expressions may not have been dropped by the real Junius, which, together with other facts and circumstances, may tend to show who he was. This, however, we think is certain, that they must be expressions, which do not necessarily and of themselves direct or tend to that result. They would involve Junius in the folly and absurdity, which we have pointed

out, and of which the *niaiserie* of General Lee furnishes a good illustration. It is probable, also, that if he ever did utter any such expressions, it must have been after the public had become so familiar with this kind of evidence, as to think little of it, and when to add any thing to it would not be a distinction. Upon such fallacious confessions and admissions, various theories have been constructed with great labor and sometimes with ingenuity, and presented to the public with great expense. We have read fifteen volumes, written expressly to establish the authorship, and many incidental discussions in other works. There are several, which we know only by their titles; and in addition to these, various claims have been brought forward in magazines and other periodicals, which never emerged into an independent volume. These discussions are at least amusing; they are not without their use in a historical point of view, and they go to increase the great sum total of literary taste and liberal study. Above all, they have had the effect, which Junius probably foresaw, of keeping up and increasing to a singular intensity, the interest in his works; which, in and of themselves, masterly and perfect as they are, would not have been half, perhaps not a hundredth part as much read, if the author had been known. Thus much for confessions.

We now proceed to a second species of fallacy, more extensive and important than the foregoing. This consists in taking up a coincidence or two, perhaps in some cases striking ones, between the situation, life, personal enmities, or something else of the claimant, with the like circumstances of Junius. A single coincidence has sometimes been enough to convince a reader that he had made the great discovery, and he has thereupon become a writer, and made a book. Five candidates have been set up, because they were clerks in some ministerial department, or secretaries to some eminent statesmen, and therefore had facilities for obtaining Junius's prompt, important, and authentic private information. In our opinion, the information which Junius obtained in so remarkable a degree, was not that which the small clerks at their desks would be much more likely to have, than any other citizen of London. Some have been brought forward, because they esteemed a man or men whom Junius praised; others, because they hated men whom Junius hated; others, because Junius defended their personal rights or interests on some occasion, where those rights or interests involved public principles.

Among all these, the real Junius *may be embraced*; but if he be, this partial and narrow method of proof does not establish, but rather obscures his claims, and sinks him to a level with a multitude of vain pretenders. The same remark is applicable to this, as to the preceding species of fallacy. It gives us too many Juniuses. This fallacy, in its proper place, and with sufficient induction of facts, might be legitimate and valuable proof; but when isolated and elevated to an undue importance, it has deplorably misled the investigators of this question. Possessed with one master notion, they have closed their eyes and minds to facts, which they should have carefully considered. They have not sought the author of Junius, but plausible arguments to support the pride of pre-conceived opinion. The favorite, and almost the only means, which have been employed for this purpose, has been the collating of parallel phrases, and identical words and ideas; and in this consists the third and most dangerous fallacy on this subject.

Dr. Paley has remarked, that 'every party, in every country, has a vocabulary.' Wherever there is a free press, and consequently discussions and parties, there are words, phrases, and doctrines, which circulate in the respective parties, and in fact, are mutually exchanged in the intercourse of opposite ones, as commonly as the coin which they carry in their pockets. In the political pamphlets, speeches, and newspapers of our country at the present moment, who does not know, that the words 'tariff,' '*judicious* tariff,' 'free trade,' 'protection,' 'restriction,' 'American system,' 'home industry,' 'domestic manufactures,' 'reform,' 'freedom of elections,' and the leading ideas and arguments which the respective parties connect with them, are so familiar, that any political writer would have to make them a particular study, and would find considerable difficulty in avoiding them? It would be unnatural, if not impossible, for any two persons, even of different sides, to address the public without using a great many similar, and some identical words and phrases; and any two or more persons, of the same side would, for a stronger reason, have a great many ideas and opinions as well as terms in common; otherwise they would not be of the same party. Thus it was in England, in the time of Junius, and so it will ever be there and here. There was not a distinguished writer or orator of the whig party, who may not be proved by this sort of reasoning to be Junius. Indeed, we have sometimes thought that there was no political writer, distinguished or

not, of whom this might not be proved; and that a recipe for making a good Junius might be given in some such form as this;—take any writer of ‘Junius’s reign,’ who published a pamphlet, or any man, who was suspected of having talent enough to write one; if you can find nothing under his name, take the best anonymous pamphlet you can find, and assume that it was his. Sort the words well, and pick out some dozen or twenty, which are also in Junius, a circumstance which is as remarkable as that they are in the dictionary. Pick out four or five phrases from both works, or if there are not so many at hand, one or two will answer; place them side by side, and *underscore*. Locate your candidate in London, though it will do if he make a few trips to Paris and Spaa, provided it cannot be *proved* that he was in those places at the very time when Junius must have been in London, replying to attacks on the next morning, or next but one, after their appearance. Connect him with an under clerk or a great man in the Government; let him receive an affront from the Duke of Grafton’s fifth cousin, and you have a Junius made “good cheap” as any of my Lord Coke’s “gentlemen of England.”

The following are set down as parallels between Sir Philip Francis and Junius, in the work called Junius Identified, by Mr. Taylor.

‘*Junius*. As it is, whenever he changes his servants, he is sure to have the people in that instance, of *his side*.

‘*Francis*. But he who knows that he has the law of *his side*, will never think of appealing to necessity, for a defence of the legality of his measures.

‘*Junius*. *So far forth* as it operates, it constitutes a House of Commons, which does not represent the people.

‘*Francis*. *So far forth*, I also meet the opinion of the Governor General and Mr. Boswell.

‘*Junius*. I am sorry to tell you, Sir William, that in this article your *fact is false*.

‘*Francis*. This part of the motion, I say, implies a *false fact*.’

The next examples are from Mr. Coventry’s book in favor of Lord Sackville.

‘In his private letter to Mr. Woodfall, he says, “that Swinney is a *wretched*, but dangerous fool.” In the instance before us, Lord George publicly remarked, “that he despised that honorable member, but would level himself with his *wretched* character and malice.”’

‘The freedom of election is the sacred *palladium* of English liberty.’ To this passage from Sackville’s speech on the Middlesex election, the following observation is subjoined in a note by Mr. Coventry.

‘This speech was made long before Junius’s “Dedication” of the Letters to the English nation, wherein he says, “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.’

‘*Junius*. We see the prophecy verified in every particular, and if *this great and good man* was mistaken in any one instance, it was perhaps that he did not expect his predictions to be fulfilled so soon as they have been.’

‘*Sackville*. The author of this bill, Mr. Grenville, had preserved a *good* name, while in office, and when out. And he sincerely hoped the noble Lord would endeavor *to have his name handed down to posterity with the same honor as Mr. Grenville had*.’

We take one example from a work in support of the claims of Richard Glover, as follows: ‘In the preliminary part of his address, *Glover* expresses his acknowledgments to the Livery in general, “for their candor, *decency* and indulgence.” In the memoir, he attributes to Pitt, “hot and unguarded expressions in Parliament, the most *indecent* of which was a needless encomium on the late Sir Robert Walpole.” These words are frequently used in this sense by *Junius*, and I do not remember their being used in any other. “The man I have described, would never prostrate his dignity in Parliament by an *indecent* violence, either by opposing or defending a minister.”’

We take the following from the first work at the head of this article.

‘*Horne*. Sermons, petitions, books against plays,—saying that money will corrupt men,—nothing but barely mentioning the effects of money;—all have been prosecuted and punished, and ears cut off, and those things for libel.

‘*Junius*. Cutting off ears and noses, might still be inflicted by a resolute Judge.

‘*Horne*. I have laid before you a sacred principle, with which I am much better acquainted than with any precedents, and for one of which I would willingly give up all the precedents that ever existed.

‘*Junius*. It is not that precedents have any weight with me

in opposition to principles, but I know they weigh with the multitude.'

The third work at the head of this article furnishes the following, among other comparisons, between the writings of Junius and a pamphlet, entitled 'Considerations on the German War,' supposed by the author to be written by Sackville.

'*Considerations.* If from *reason* we recur to *facts*.

'*Junius.* It depends upon a combination of *facts* and *reasoning*.

'*Considerations.* It is not now the business of France to *erect* its *whole force*.

'*Junius.* He must now *erect the whole power* of his capacity.

'*Considerations.* "Many persons *I know* will think it strange." "*I know* it is said we have money enough." "*I know* that it has been said that England paid." "*I know* that it has been said that our allies."

'*Junius.* "My premises *I know* will be denied in argument." "*I know* it has been alleged in your favor." "A courtier, *I know*, will be ready to maintain the affirmative."

In addition to the resemblances, which Mr. Taylor, the advocate of Sir Philip Francis, finds between the speeches and writings of Sir Philip and Junius, he discovers that the former, who is also the latter, reported two speeches of Chatham, delivered in the House of Lords on the 9th and 22d January, 1770; and taking it for granted, that the *Reporter* gave to his report his own spirit and style rather than those of the orator, he proceeds to institute comparisons between Chatham's speeches and Junius, to prove that Sir Philip was the latter. The author of the fourth work at the head of this article takes these comparisons from Taylor, but applies them to prove that the *orator*, and not the *reporter*, was Junius. We think that they prove one as much as they do the other. We take the following example.

'*Francis's Report of Chatham.* He owned his natural partiality for America, and was inclined to make allowance even for their excesses. That they ought to be treated with tenderness, for in his sense *they were ebullitions of liberty that broke out in the skin*, and were the sign, if not of a perfect, at least of a *vigorous constitution*; and must not be driven in too suddenly, lest they should strike to the heart.'

'*Junius.* No man regards *an eruption upon the surface*, when the vital parts are invaded, and he feels a *mortification* approach-

ing his heart.' '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*.'

'*Francis's Report of Chatham. The rights of the greatest and meanest subjects now stand upon the same foundation,—the security of law, common to all.*'

'*Junius. However distinguished by rank or property, in the rights of freedom we are all equal. As we are Englishmen, the least considerable man among us has an interest equal to the proudest nobleman, in the laws and constitution of his country.*'

The author of the Letters on Junius, addressed to Mr. Pickering, in support of Lord Temple's pretensions, produces a pamphlet, which is anonymous, but which he supposes to have been written by his candidate. On this corner-stone he places the main pillar of his theory. The pamphlet is entitled 'An Enquiry into the conduct of a late Right Honorable Commoner.'

'*Junius. Until they thunder at our gate.*'

'*Enquiry. He thundered against Hanover.*'

'*Junius. The incapacity of their [the administration] leaders to promote any other without widening their bottom.*

'*Enquiry. In order to widen and strengthen the bottom of his administration.*'

We might proceed to fill a volume with couplets of this sort, which every writer upon the authorship has collected from Junius, and from some acknowledged or supposed production of his favorite candidate. Gen. Lee, Burke, Boyd, Lloyd, Wilkes, and many others, have been proved to be Junius by similar evidence, and we shall presently show, if the above examples have not shown already, that any writer might by the same means be proved to be Junius. It is true that there is a distinction, which however has seldom been made, between the cases of claimants whose writings were published *before*, and those whose writings were published *after* Junius; for the resemblances in the latter may be the effect of mere imitation. We think they are of very little value in any case, for they are witnesses which can be called, and will answer equally well for any case; like those standing in the purlieu of the courts at Naples, who, if asked what their business is, answer 'I swear.'

Thus much for parallel expressions of political writers of Junius's era and country. We will now proceed a step further, and show that similar coincidences may be found in writers of different eras, different countries, and different walks of literature.

The work which we shall take to illustrate the two first points, is an American pamphlet, which made some sensation in its day, and although erroneous, as it appears to us, in some of its views, is written with considerable ability.

'*Pamphlet.* A statement which the writer undoubtedly believed to be true, but which comes *only from one side of the question.*' — 'They must have been compelled either to act upon the views of this representation, without hearing the counter statement of *the other side*, or seemingly to disregard the pressing interests of their constituents.'

'*Junius.* One would think that all the fools were of the *other side of the question.*'

'*Pamphlet.* However *differing* in my conclusions upon questions of the highest moment, from any other man of *whatever party*, I have never upon suspicion imputed his conduct to corruption.'

'*Junius.* To write for profit without taxing the press, to write for fame and to be unknown, to support the intrigues of faction and be *disowned* as a dangerous auxiliary by *every party*, are contradictions, which the minister must reconcile before I forfeit my credit with the public.'

'*Pamphlet.* This open-hearted imputation of *honest intentions* is the only adamant, which can bear all the *thunder* of foreign hostility.'

'*Junius.* I should be sorry to injure any man, who may be *honest* in his *intentions.*'

American politicians of 1807-8 may recollect the pamphlet which we have quoted, and have proved to be written by the author of Junius by just as good an argument, as any which has been used to prove Francis, or Sackville, or Chat-ham, or Temple, or any other of a score of candidates, to be the author of Junius. The above examples are taken from the first *seven* pages of the pamphlet in question. From this a judgment may be formed, of what we might present upon an examination of the whole with the same view. Politicians and others who were not on the stage in 1808 may need to be informed, that our new candidate for Junius is none other

than President John Quincy Adams; and the above pamphlet, which proves the validity of his claims, is his reply to senator Timothy Pickering's letter to his constituents on the Embargo.

We present one more example of this sort of coincidence, which is quite as remarkable as the above, and it is the more valuable, because it is found between Junius and the first and only author in a totally different walk, and of a totally different character from Junius, whom we took up with a view to note similitudes, if any appeared. For the present, we shall designate the work to which we refer as a *book* simply.

'*Book.* I felt some *reluctance* at parting.'

'*Junius.* I write to you with *reluctance.*'

'*Book.* I can say no more for Mr. Pope (for what you keep in reserve may be worse than all the rest). It is natural to wish the finest writer, at least one of them, we ever had, should be an *honest man.*

'*Junius.* If any *honest man* should still be inclined to leave the construction of libels to the Court, I would entreat him to consider what a dreadful complication of hardships he imposes upon his fellow-subjects.'

'*Book.* The unhappy news I have just received from you equally *surprises and afflicts me.*'

'*Junius.* It is the conduct of our friends that *surprises and afflicts me.*'

Those who have been accustomed to regard such coincidences of expressions as proof of identity of authorship, will be '*surprised,*' and possibly some of them '*afflicted*' to learn, that the *book* is Gray's Letters; and they will be further surprised to hear, that we examined but three of the letters to obtain the above couplets. There is no doubt that they might be greatly extended. In short, we should as soon think of proving that Johnson was Junius, by finding the words of the letters in the Dictionary, as by selecting and yoking together words and phrases from Junius and any author, to prove that author and him the same. One of the Petitions of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Livery of the city of London, presented to his Majesty George III, in 1770, in allusion to the supposed power and intrigues of the Princess Dowager of Wales, and her faction, a set of irresponsible persons '*behind the throne,*' called in the phrase of the day '*the King's friends,*' uses precisely the term *MALIGN INFLUENCE.* But we are not

therefore to conclude, that Mr. Secretary Branch wrote the London Petition.

To present a final and still more surprising example of the fallacy, which we have been endeavoring to expose, we shall present passages from three documents, one of which is among the most known and celebrated in the world. The others are less known, but in point of composition are not less entitled to celebrity. For the present, we shall designate them by the letters A, B, and C.

'A. They [the ministers] have wantonly and wickedly *sacrificed the lives of your Majesty's innocent subjects.*'

'C. He [the king] *has destroyed the lives of our people.*'

'A. After having insulted and *defeated the law, * * ** they have at length completed their design, by wresting from the *people* the last sacred *right* of election' [of representatives.]

'C. He has *obstructed the administration of justice.* He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions of the *rights of the people.*'

'A. They avow and endeavor to establish a maxim absolutely inconsistent with our Constitution, that an occasion for effectually employing a *military force* always presents itself, when the *civil power* is trifled with or insulted.'

'C. He has *affected* to render the *military power* independent of, and superior to the *civil.*'

'A. They have established numberless *unconstitutional regulations* and *taxations* in our *colonies.* They have caused a *revenue to be raised* in some of them *by prerogative.* They have appointed *civil law Judges* to try *revenue* causes, and *to be paid out of the condemnation money.*'

'C. He has combined with others to subject us to a *jurisdiction, foreign from our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws;* giving his assent to their pretended acts of legislation ;

'For imposing *taxes on us without our consent;*

'He has made *Judges dependent on his will* alone for the tenure of their offices, and the *amount and payment of their salaries.*'

We now give some comparisons from the documents B and C.

'B. Wicked attempts to increase and establish *a standing army.*'

'C. He has kept among us in times of peace *standing armies.*'

'B. The *military* introduced at every opportunity, unnecessarily and unlawfully *patrolling the streets,* to the alarm of the inhabitants.'

‘C. For quartering large bodies of *armed troops among us.*’

‘B. *Unjust treatment of petitions.*’

‘C. Our repeated *petitions* have been answered only by repeated *injury.*’

‘B. Unwilling to interrupt your royal repose, though ready to lay down *our lives and fortunes* for your Majesty’s service, and *for the constitution*, as by law established, we have *waited patiently*, expecting a constitutional remedy. We see ourselves left without hopes or means of redress, but from your Majesty or *God.*’

‘C. Such has been the *patient* sufferance of these colonies.’

* * ‘And *for the support of this declaration*, with a firm reliance on the protection of *Divine Providence*, we mutually pledge to each other our *lives*, our *fortunes*, and our sacred honor.’

In passing we remark, that fine scholars have considered the last clause as a blemish in a composition, which for the most part is highly finished and perfect.

We now present some coincidences from the documents A, B, and C, *together.*

‘A. They have *screened* more than one *murderer from punishment.*’

‘C. For *protecting* them [the military] by a mock trial, *from punishment* for any *murders* they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.’

‘B. *Murder abetted, encouraged, and rewarded.*’

‘A. They have *purposely furnished a pretence* for calling in the aid of *military power.*’

‘C. He has *excited domestic insurrections* amongst us.’

‘B. *Mobs and riots, hired and raised* by the ministers in order to *justify* and *recommend* their own illegal proceedings.’

‘A. Your ministers have * * *invaded* our invaluable and unalienable *right of trial by jury.*’

‘C. For *depriving* us in many cases of the *benefits of trial by jury.*’

‘B. *Trial by jury discountenanced.*’

‘A. All this they have been able to effect, by a *shameless prostitution of public honors and emoluments.*

‘C. He has erected a multitude of *new offices*, sent hither *swarms of officers* to *harass* our people, and to *eat out their substance.*’

‘B. *Prostitution of public honors and rewards to men*, who can neither plead public virtue nor services.’

These are verbal, phraseological, and mental resemblances, which would prove a vast deal, if it had happened to be neces-

sary to any theory of ours, to prove that the three documents were from one and the same hand.

But there is another and higher species of internal evidence, than any which we have mentioned, or any which coincidences of mere words, phrases, or even of sentiment, can ever afford. This is general resemblance of style, or as Dr. Parr calls it, 'general *lexis*' of writings. It is the compendious result of all particular resemblances. It is that which the mind intuitively detects, because it feels itself in the presence of something known and familiar. In men, it is that by which we recognize them without hearing their voice or examining their features. We will therefore present extracts from the above documents, of sufficient length to prove a similitude of *style* in its largest sense.

'A. Your ministers, from corrupt principles, and in violation of every duty, have by various enumerated means, invaded our invaluable and unalienable right of trial by jury.

'They have with impunity issued general warrants, and violently seized persons and private papers.

'They have rendered the laws non-effective to our security by evading the *Habeas Corpus*.

'They have caused punishments and even perpetual imprisonments to be inflicted, without trial, conviction, or sentence.

'They have brought into disrepute the civil magistracy, by the appointment of persons, who are in many respects unqualified for that important trust, and have thereby purposely furnished a pretence for calling in the military power.'

'C. He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the repository of their records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into a compliance with his measures.

'He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing, with manly firmness, his invasions on the rights of the people.

'He has refused for a long time after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise, the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasions from without and convulsions within.

'He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.'

From a subsequent part of the same document, we give an extract, in which the sentences are constructed in a manner quite peculiar.

‘C. He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction, foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws, giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation,—

‘For quartering large bodies of armed troops amongst us.

‘For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.

‘For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

‘For imposing taxes upon us without our consent.

‘For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury.

‘For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended crimes.’

A similar peculiarity of construction may be seen in the following from document B.

‘B. Under the pretence of this discretion, or as it was formerly, and has been lately called,—law of State,—we have seen,

‘English subjects, and even a member of the British Legislature, arrested by a general warrant, issued by a Secretary of State, contrary to the law of the land.

‘Their houses rifled and plundered; their papers seized and used as evidence on trial.

‘Their bodies committed to close confinement.

‘The *Habeas Corpus* eluded.

‘Trial by jury discountenanced; and the first law officer of the crown publicly insinuating that juries are not to be trusted.

‘Printers punished by the ministry in the Supreme Court, without a trial by their equals,—without any trial at all.

‘The remedy of the law for false imprisonment debarred and defeated, &c.’

A represents the Petition of the Livery of London, presented to the king July 5, 1769; B represents a Petition of the Freeholders of Middlesex, presented to the king about the same time; and C represents the American Declaration of Independence, adopted and signed just *seven* years and *one* day after the first of the above petitions was presented. That these could all have been written by the same hand, or in the same country, is of course out of the question. The example shows the extreme liability of writers to deceive themselves, and

mislead others, by relying upon similitudes of thought, diction, or even of style, to prove identity of authorship. It may be alleged, that the above resemblances are not accidental, but the result of imitation. Jefferson might, and probably did read these English documents, which were published in the London, and not improbably in the American papers; and he was then a young lawyer and an old politician. As a whig, he must have approved their principles, and as a man of sense and taste, he must have admired the concise, nervous and eloquent style, in which they were drawn up. If they made that impression, which they were calculated to make, upon such a mind as his, he might, and probably would insensibly slide into the same method and style of stating the rights and wrongs of a great nation. Be this as it may, the resemblances are undeniable and striking. If they be accidental, then they show that there is no need of supposing or inferring the same mind and the same hand, where they occur; if they be imitation, then they show conclusively the fallacy of the pretensions of any writer, who wrote subsequently to Junius. But in truth, the argument is worth very little in any case, and in the one last supposed, it is an *ignis fatuus*, which is as likely to lead any where else as to truth. In an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, in 1826, attributed to Sir James Mackintosh, it is observed, that for twenty years Junius was the model of almost every political writer. We may add that he is still so, oftener than readers or writers are always aware of.

We believe that the argument from internal evidence of style, in a comprehensive sense, though often deceitful and rarely conclusive, is the best that can be employed in solving a literary problem like the one before us. It is precisely the one which has been employed least. Undoubtedly it is the one, which demands the greatest familiarity with the respective writings which are to be compared. It is a high and refined exercise of intellect, and requires a vigorous application of the powers of logic, rhetoric and criticism. We know from daily experience, how widely men differ in judgment, in cases where they have only to exercise the physical senses of sight and taste. Of course the difficulty and uncertainty must be greatly increased, where the analogous faculties of mind are to be employed, in the same manner as our reasonings on moral subjects are more loose and unsatisfactory, than in the physical and mathematical sciences. How often do the greatest epicures differ in their opinions of

the quality, age and even the kind of wines ; Cervantes relates a story in point. Two delicate tasters were asked their opinions of a certain butt of wine ; one thought there was a disagreeable taste of *iron* in it, and the other that it had the flavor of old *leather*. In fact, when the wine was drawn off, a *key* with a *leathern* thong attached, was found in the bottom of the cask. This is probably the *nec plus ultra* of *connoisseurship* in the article of wine.

Erasmus wrote a tract entitled *Ciceronianus*. It was answered anonymously. Erasmus perused the reply and fixed it upon Hieronimus Aleander, as the author of the whole or the greater part. The words of Erasmus on the occasion were very remarkable. ‘From the *phraseology*, the *style* and *diction*, and a great many other things, I am persuaded that this, or at least the greater part of it, is the work of Hieronimus Aleander. Because his genius has become so thoroughly known to me from our domestic intercourse, that he is not better known to himself.’ And yet Erasmus was mistaken. Julius Scaliger was the author of the piece. There cannot be a stronger case than this. Greater learning, judgment and sagacity cannot be expected, nor a fairer occasion for their application : yet they failed of attaining to truth ; they deceived their possessor, and he deceived others. The authorship of the Dialogue *de Claris Oratoribus sive de Causis Corruptæ Eloquentiæ* has been ascribed to Tacitus, Quinctilian, and Pliny. Learned men have advocated the claims of each, and do so still, and will for ages to come.

But to show that the internal evidence of style is not without great value, we mention the following anecdote of Ruhnken. He was reading Apsines, one of the minor Greek rhetoricians, when he suddenly perceived that he had passed into another style, resembling that of Longinus, with which he was very familiar. As he proceeded, he detected new traces of the same author, and he felt certain, that he had found a piece from some work of Longinus. To confirm the acuteness of Ruhnken, a passage of Longinus, cited by an old commentator, was found word for word in the piece which he was reading. In short, the incident proved to be a discovery of a part of a lost work of Longinus on rhetoric. The questions of the authorship of Eikon Basilike, Gil Blas, Phalaris’s Epistles, and The Whole Duty of Man, have exercised without satisfying the critical learning and curiosity of the greatest scholars.

There is one case more modern, and more remarkable than any of the above. Edmund Burke was the author of an ingenious stratagem to discredit the writings of Bolingbroke, then greatly in vogue, and very generally thought to be inimitable in his style and sound in his philosophy. Burke's design was to mimic the style, to seem to adopt the principles, and then to run them out boldly, but with apparent sincerity, to their remote consequences; and thus to demonstrate their dangerous tendency. Bolingbroke's philosophy was 'the newest pattern of the day,' and both on account of its style and as the posthumous work of a distinguished politician, excited great attention; a direct attack upon it would probably have failed. Burke's treacherous torpedo was sent out in 1756, and while it was floating under the enemy's bows to blow him out of the water, was taken for his own buoy. 'The imitation was so perfect, as to constitute identity rather than resemblance.' Lord Chesterfield and Bishop Warburton for a short time believed it to be genuine. Mallet, 'the beggarly Scotchman,' as Dr. Johnson called him, whom 'the scoundrel' that 'loaded a blunderbuss against Christianity hired to pull the trigger' after he was dead,—went to Dodsley's, when filled with *literati*, purposely to disavow for his deceased Lordship, Burke's work. Dr. Joseph Warton observes, that 'Bolingbroke's manner of reasoning and philosophizing 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 master-piece 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.'

Hand-writing has been produced as one of the most certain and satisfactory criterions for determining the authorship of Junius. The zeal, confidence, and pains with which several claims have been placed and urged, on the ground of identity of hand-writing, shows (if it prove nothing else), how men will differ, even about things which are subjected to their natural senses, *oculis fidelibus subjecta*. To show the fallaciousness of this test, we state the following cases.

Judge Johnstone of Ireland was convicted of a libel published in Cobbett's Register about twenty years ago. Two witnesses swore positively that it was the Judge's hand-writing. The case was never called up for judgment, and the defendant

retired from the bench upon a pension. Eighteen years after, namely, in 1827, he assured his friend and guest, Gen. Cockburne, that he never wrote a word or line of it, and explained the manner in which the affair happened. Judge J. had kept a diary, in which he had entered political observations during or soon after Emmet's rebellion. A young man on a visit to his house had copied some of them. The young man was afterwards persuaded by a noble lord to write against another lord, and in so doing, he used some hints contained in the diary. When the Judge was prosecuted, the young man came and offered to avow himself, which the Judge refused, thinking it impossible that he should be convicted, and that it would be said that he got his young friend to avow, for the purpose of screening himself.

Another case occurred not long since in the United States. A young man was arraigned and put on trial for passing counterfeit money. Several witnesses, and among them brokers, testified that the bill produced as one passed or attempted to be passed, was counterfeit, and the signatures of the cashier and president forged. On this evidence, the case was about to go off, and of course fatally to the young man. It occurred to the friend, or counsel of the defendant, that it was barely possible that the bill might after all be genuine; and it was requested that the cashier of the bank should be summoned. He was so, and he pronounced the bill a genuine bill. It is unnecessary to multiply examples. As might be expected, a great many Juniuses have been established on this species of proof. No two manuscripts, written by professional or business men can be found, in which resemblances of some letter, line, or junction may not be detected. If this be true, it follows that some plausible coincidences of strokes, turns, or hair-lines, may be found in favor of any claimant whatever, especially when every argument from non-resemblance meets with the ready rebuff, that the hand is disguised, and could not without ceasing to be so, and defeating the object, possess any but slight, and to ordinary observers, imperceptible resemblances.

After what we have said, and the examples we have given under other heads, it is not necessary to take a distinct view of the subject of identical ideas and opinions. These are the common property, and cant words and phrases the circulating medium, of parties; and so far as these are concerned, any whig in England might have written Junius. It is laid down

as a canon in the *Edinburgh Review*, that any pretender to the authorship of *Junius* must unite the support of the stamp-act and taxation of America, with a warm partisanship of *Wilkes*; that these opinions are incongruous, and were to be found only in *George Grenville* and a very few of his adherents; and that therefore *Junius* must be one politically connected with *George Grenville*. This may be true or not. It is of no great importance. It is however strange, that a sagacious and learned critic should never imagine that *Junius* might seem to fall in with a popular doctrine, which he did not approve, but which he saw that nothing would arrest, with a view not to impair the general credit and popularity of his writings to the detriment of other objects, which he deemed of paramount importance.

We know that *Junius* did not hesitate to assume any disguise, to represent himself as of any place, or country, or profession, and to change totally his tone and manner towards individuals, when any of these things could conduce to his main design. At one time *Lords Camden* and *Chatham* are depreciated, at another extolled to the skies: *Wilkes*, when he complains privately of the wounds inflicted upon him in a public letter, is told that it was 'necessary to the plan of that letter.' On the American question, too, *Junius* expressly renounces and denounces all practical use of the power, and merely stickles for the right. To have done less would have set the British public against him, and destroyed or greatly impaired his usefulness; and to do no more was evidently a most lame and impotent support of *Mr. Grenville's* stamp-act. He may however have been a personal, as he was in the main a political friend of *George Grenville*; but we protest against that narrow, niggardly, and grovelling view of *Junius's* high talents, which makes him a mere understrapper or puppet to any great man whomsoever. *Junius* was made to give, not to receive the impulses of opinion; to command, not to obey. Whenever discovered, he will be seen dictating to other minds.

Having thus exposed some of the leading fallacies that have appeared in the reasonings which we have met with on this subject, it would not be difficult to lay down certain rules, according to which, in our opinion, the investigation of this question must be conducted, and a solution obtained, if it be susceptible of a solution. Our space would not now permit us to adduce the proofs necessary to establish the authority of such

rules, and without proof they would be esteemed mere dogmas, presumptuous in us, and unprofitable to others. Still less will the present occasion permit us to examine and reject or modify many, perhaps most of the numerous rules, which have been set up by others. We would observe of these rules in general, that some of them are frivolous, some of them positively fallacious, and every set of them which we have seen, defective and redundant, inasmuch as they omit some of the most essential requisites for the author of Junius, and as a natural counterpart, embrace some that are perfectly indifferent. With one exception, they appear to have been framed expressly to suit the pretensions of favorite candidates; as the house-wife whose carpet would not fit her stairs, altered the stairs to fit her carpet.

The persons to whom the letters of Junius have been from time to time attributed, are, so far as we know, as follows: viz. Edmund Burke, John Dunning, Lord Ashburton, Henry Flood, Lord Chesterfield, Samuel Dyer, John Roberts, Thomas Whately, Dr. Butler Bishop of Hereford, William Gerard Hamilton, Richard, otherwise called Leonidas Glover, Charles Lee, Hugh Macauley Boyd, Sir Philip Francis, Charles Lloyd, Edward Gibbon, Sir William Jones, William Greatrakes, J. P. de Lolme, Thomas Hollis, William H. C. Bentinck Duke of Portland, Philip Rosenhagen, Dr. Gilbert Stuart, Lord Shelburne, Horace Walpole Earl of Orford, Colonel Barré, John Wilkes, Dr. Wilmot, John Horne Tooke, Lord George Sackville, Lord Chatham, and Earl Temple.

Burke, Dunning, and Flood, appear to have been named, because they were capable of writing Junius, or rather were supposed capable of writing as well. It would have saved much learned trifling, if capacity, the foundation of all other pretensions, had been ranked among the requisites for the author of Junius; and demanded at the threshold of every inquiry. It is easy however to show, that neither of these gentlemen could have been Junius. Besides the denial to Dean Morley, Dr. Johnson stated that Burke denied it 'spontaneously' to him. Junius refers to Burke as authority, and Burke eulogizes Junius both in and out of Parliament. Dunning, (as Solicitor General) was engaged in professional, official, and parliamentary business during the whole or nearly the whole period, and in the former and latter capacity, for some time afterwards. He was at the height of his fame, and immersed in business. If any rule can be laid down with entire confi-

dence for conducting the inquiry after Junius, it is that the author must have been a man, who could constantly devote the most of his time, and occasionally the whole of it, to the composition of these letters, and the extensive, minute and prompt researches which many of them required. The greatest interruption of Junius's correspondence was three weeks, and much of the time he must have written more or less every day. His published letters amount to two hundred and forty; an average of one a week. Many of them could not have been written without many days of preparation; and accordingly he says in a private letter to Woodfall, 'this [the first letter to Mansfield] though begun within these *few days*, has been greatly labored.' It is twenty-three pages in length, and the labor alluded to must have been chiefly that of composition, as the plan required little or no reference to books, being chiefly employed upon the topics of the day. It is very keen, pointed and elegant. There are many other letters, which must have required more time for examining and copying authorities, than for composition. Such letters must have occupied him twice a 'few days:' take for example the one to Lord Mansfield on the Law of Bail. It begins with the statute of Westminster passed in the year 1275, and traces the current of legislation through weeds and rubbish down to the time of writing, and then takes up the judicial authorities, which it treats in like manner. The letter contains thirty-six printed pages. About fifty statutes and law authorities are copied or abridged, and the references given. It appears by the law reports of the time, that at the date of the first letter to Mansfield so 'greatly labored,' and for nine days preceding, Dunning was engaged in every cause, which was argued in the Court of King's Bench at Westminster. One of these was the novel and famous case of the 'appeal of blood,' of the Widow Bigby against the Kennedys for the murder of her husband. This occupied five days, from the 6th to the 11th of November, 1770. The next case occupied four days, from the 11th to the 14th, including Sunday, 13th, and the third and last the 15th; on the 14th the letter to Mansfield was dated. These facts are irreconcilable with the supposition that Dunning wrote this letter. We believe that a great number of the letters might be proved by the same infallible test, not to have been written by him. And if we possessed equal evidence of the occupations, and residences of other claimants, as the law reports furnish of Dunning's, it cannot be doubted

that the claims of a multitude would vanish once for all. Mr. Barker justly states, and he is the first who has done it, that '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, striking the object of its wrath with the divine force of lightning, rending the knotted oak, and scattering its honors in the dust.' We may obtain further light as to the labor and time bestowed by Junius, by observing the dates of his replies to his principal antagonists, Draper and Horne. The shortest of them, being four pages, followed Sir William's after an interval of four days; the least elaboraté of the longer ones after six days, and the rest from eleven to thirteen days, averaging about ten days each. The longest and most labored of these replies are among the minor letters. The inference then, is, that such letters as that to the king, those to Lord Mansfield, those on the Middlesex election, several to the Duke of Grafton, one to the Duke of Bedford, and some dozen addressed to the printer, must have occupied Junius from fifteen to twenty days each. Dunning was a whig, but a man of 'high and unblemished honor,' and he would not have employed his leisure, if he had had any, in attacking the king, from whom he was receiving the highest favors. He left nothing but speeches and legal arguments; and that he could write as well as Junius, is matter of inference, not of fact. The disclaimer of Junius that he was a lawyer is the ordinary objection to Dunning's claim, but we attach no importance to that; though we believe that Junius was not a lawyer, but we believe it for other reasons.

Henry Flood was a great and noble-minded man, and a distinguished but not polished writer; he was in Ireland during the whole summer of 1768, during which Junius was constantly writing. One of his letters, dated May 12th, is in answer to one which appeared on the morning of that day. Such facts could be multiplied; one of them is decisive.

The claims of Chesterfield, Dyer, Roberts, and Whately, are easily disposed of. They all died before Junius had done writing. We know of no particular reason for their being brought forward, except that Chesterfield was a celebrated

writer; and the others, except Dyer, who was a literary man, were clerks in the ministerial departments, and supposed to have had facilities for obtaining the secret intelligence of Junius. Dr. Butler was suspected by Wilkes, but it is not distinctly known on what ground. He had formerly been private Secretary to Right Hon. Henry Bilson Legge, Chancellor of the Exchequer, during Pitt's ministry. William Gerard Hamilton seems to have been supposed to be Junius, from the singular fact, that he was reported to have told to a friend the contents of one of Junius's letters, as though it had already appeared, when in fact it did not appear until the next day. This is easily accounted for, by supposing that Hamilton had seen the manuscript at Woodfall's office. The claims of Glover were based on some coincidences of language, and a general conformity of political sentiment with Junius. We do not deem Glover's pretensions worthy of a serious reply. The same remark is applicable to Lee, the origin of whose claims we have already mentioned. Hugh Macauley Boyd is supported by verbal and sentimental resemblances, and by blushes,—nothing more. He was an indefatigable imitator of Junius.

The case of Sir Philip Francis has been one of the most imposing, and yet we think that there is none more easily refuted. Sir Philip never wrote a word for the public, until eight or ten years after Junius ceased to write. Whatever resemblances he may exhibit to Junius, may be accounted for from imitation; but they do not require such explanation. They may be found in all writers of the same era, the same side, and even as we have shown, in writers of different eras and different literary pursuits. To adduce such phrases as 'on my side,' 'on your side,' as proof of the identity of two authors, is as absurd as to say, that breathing the same air or speaking English, constitutes personal identity. Sir Philip was a clerk in the war-office, when Junius began to write, and continued so 'until the beginning of the year 1772.' Junius's last publication is dated May 10th, 1772. In the last but two, Mr. Francis is incidentally mentioned as having resigned, and Lord Barrington is reproached with the fact, on account of Francis's excellent character. It was this introduction of his name by Junius, which led to the extravagant, but extremely delusive theory of Mr. Taylor. There are many and overwhelming objections to Sir Philip, but it is enough, that he was a young man, sitting during the five years of Junius at a recording clerk's desk, a

dependant on Government patronage, and bound by every tie of gratitude and honor to Lord Chatham and Welbore Ellis, the former of whom Junius loaded, for a long time, with his fiercest invectives, and the latter of whom he treats with sovereign contempt and unmitigated scorn, throughout his work. Sir Philip Francis acknowledges, that he owed to Mr. Pitt his early advancement in life, and two or three honorable and lucrative posts; and ten years afterwards, he repeatedly eulogized his deceased benefactor, declaring that he had left nothing, which resembled him, behind. Can it be believed, that this man, whom we are taught to believe honorable, applied to Chatham, even while enjoying the fruit of his favor, such appellations, as 'traitor,' and 'black villain?' Again, no adequate motive can be assigned, why Francis should assail Lord Mansfield so furiously as Junius has done. Again, Francis was never in Paris, until the year 1772, nine years after the Jesuits were expelled and *their books burnt*; which last act, Junius says he *saw*, and he is to be believed; for no reason but its truth can be given, why he should have stated that fact. There are numerous other objections. We do not pretend to exhaust any of these topics. One alone is sufficient. Francis had not time to write these letters, in addition to his daily duties in the war-office. He *may* have possessed the necessary knowledge, though there is not the slightest proof of it; but if that be admitted, he had no time to use it. Lastly, his style is as inferior to that of Junius, as the movement of a Dutch dray-horse to that of the Arab steed. He was comparatively a man of heavy and moderate faculties. He was not capable of writing Junius. He died without admitting or denying the authorship. All who knew him agree, and any one who has read his letter on the regency question, in 1810, will agree, that his vanity would not have permitted him to conceal the fact, if it had been true. To this point, we have the testimony of Dr. Parr and others, who knew him well. The Doctor also pronounces 'the *general lexis*' of Francis an essentially different one from that of Junius. If it be said in vindication of Sir Philip's character, that he did deny the authorship, we reply, that he lived several years to see men contending and shedding ink, to prove that it was *not* a denial, but an evasion,—and virtually an admission. Any man, who permits an important ambiguity to rest upon his words, year after year, is little better than a falsifier. Mr. Barker, in the work to which we have so often referred, has

completely demolished the light oriental fabric of Mr. Taylor, in which he had placed Sir Philip as the deity. We add a single remark, in relation to the hand-writing, upon which Mr. Taylor lays uncommon stress; and that is, that cases equally strong have been made out for Lee, Sackville, Tooke, Burke, and Boyd.

After refuting the claims of Francis, Mr. Barker concludes in favor of Charles Lloyd. His treatise, or rather tracts, on this subject, are mere collections of *on dits* and opinions. There are no facts or arguments, which strike the reader with any new light. We are totally incredulous as to Lloyd's claim. There is no proof that he was capable of writing the book. He was one of those writers, who were early mentioned among the conjectural authors; and his pretensions were considerably patronized. So far as we have been able to learn, the supposition and rumor in regard to him, were based wholly upon the fact that he was private secretary to George Grenville, and hence might have possessed the secret information, and the necessary attachment to Grenville. This was the single slender pillar, upon which a towering fabric has been raised, which cannot stand. Lloyd was afterwards private secretary to Lord North.* If Junius's praise of Grenville be proof that he was Lloyd, his satire and invective against Lord North are, by parity of reasoning, proof that he was not Lloyd. One fact neutralizes the other.

Butler remarks in his *Reminiscences*, that Lloyd died, and Junius ceased to write at the same time, and that this fact furnishes a strong presumption in his favor. It was a coincidence, which, if true, and united with acknowledged capacity, and other coincidences, sufficient to furnish a fair logical induction, would pass for something. But Great Britain at that time had a population, from which the average deaths were at least four hundred a day. Could not any one of those, who died in the same week or month with Junius's disappearance, be with equal propriety brought forward, on the strength of that circumstance? But this alleged coincidence is not proved, but disproved, for the purpose for which it is here used. Junius wrote his last letter to Woodfall, long enough to cover a page or page and a half of letter paper, with the same steady, elastic,

* Letter of Rev. Thomas Kidd, published in 'Barker's Authorship of Junius's Letters.'

rapid, and vigorous pen and spirit, as usual. No difference is discernible. But Lloyd died on the third day after the date of that letter. In addition to this, we are told, and it is not contradicted, that he was in declining health during the whole period of Junius,—was more or less absent in France, for his health, (some say all the time,) and his friends admit, that if *he* were the author, then Junius is a prodigy of physical as well as intellectual effort. Dr. J. M. Good, the reputed editor of Woodfall's Junius, says that Lloyd was on his death-bed, when Junius penned his last letter, upon city and other politics; yet some men, and great men, still contend, that this fact, instead of destroying, lays a foundation for his claim. The fact, whether he was really in a condition to write, might probably be ascertained in England, if it were thought worth the while. We have no life of Lloyd; he has not even found a place in the biographical dictionaries; but it is probable that the revival of his claim, on authority so various and respectable, may lead to a more minute inquiry into the circumstances of his life and death.

Of the cases of Gibbon, Jones, Greatrakes, de Lolme, Hollis, the Duke of Portland, Rosenhagen, Stuart, Shelburne, Walpole, Barré, Wilkes, and Wilmot, we have only to remark, that we know of nothing that has been alleged in their favor, of sufficient importance to require a formal refutation or further notice. The remainder of this article we shall devote to our own countrymen, who have very considerable claims to attention on this subject.

The first in the order of time is Mr. Graham. He supports Horne Tooke. The book is a respectable one, but three fourths of its contents consist of extracts from the letters of Junius, and the political writings and speeches of Tooke. There is a great similarity of opinion between Tooke and Junius; so there is between Junius and Glover. There are verbal and phraseological resemblances; so there are in twenty other cases. Tooke is said to have declared that he knew who Junius was; so have several others, and a number have openly or impliedly avowed the work. Besides, Junius abused Horne Tooke, attributing to him 'the solitary vindictive malice of a monk, brooding over his friend's infirmities, and feeding with a rancorous rapture, upon the sordid catalogue of his distresses.' It is true, that according to Graham's reasoning, this abuse of Horne is an argument in favor of his identity with the abuser;

it being a stratagem, resorted to the more effectually to conceal the author; an argument which was broached by an anonymous writer in Boston, about three years before Mr. Graham's book appeared. According to this theory, no one is so likely to have written Junius as Lord Mansfield, the Duke of Bedford or the Duke of Grafton, the King, or Lord Barrington. It is unfortunate for Mr. Graham's case, that the stratagem deemed so important was not resorted to until the last *six months* of Junius's existence. After the controversy with Horne, he writes but *nine* letters under the signature of Junius, and but *thirteen* under others,—*twenty-two* out of *two hundred and forty*! One would suppose that Tooke, if he were Junius, having got along comfortably to the two hundred and eighteenth letter, without 'dividing himself and going to buffets,' would have been content to go on upon the same friendly footing with himself, until he arrived at the two hundred and fortieth. No proof is adduced of immediate and particular danger of detection at that juncture. Mr. Graham's book is however worthy of perusal, as a tribute, if nothing else, to a great man, whom none can know without admiring for his abilities, respecting for his honest, magnanimous and intrepid character, and for his services in the cause of English and American liberty, and loving for the generosity and benevolence of his heart.

The next work at the head of this article supports the same theory. It was issued anonymously in the same city. It consists:—1. Of examinations of the claims of several candidates, particularly of Francis and Lloyd. The whole of this part is taken from Dr. Good's Essay, and Barker's work. 2. Of a sketch of the Life of Tooke, extracted and abridged from Stephens's Memoirs of Tooke. 3. Of a portion of the controversial letters of Tooke and Wilkes. 4. Of some of the miscellaneous letters of Junius, in which those written by an apparent opponent under the signature of *Cleophas*, in defence of the Earl of Hillsborough, are assumed to be written by Junius, and adduced as a new and corroboratory instance of Junius, *i. e.* Horne Tooke attacking himself. This was in 1768. The motive could not be the same as in the other case, because Cleophas attacks *Junius*, and loads him with opprobrious epithets. This could contribute nothing to the concealment of Junius, or to any other valuable purpose. The remaining portion of this work consists of all the private correspondence of Junius with Woodfall and Wilkes, and some short and

miscellaneous extracts and pieces in an Appendix. We have read the work with pleasure, as we should any one made up of these materials. The title, the propriety of which, as the compiler seems to admit, remains to be proved, (and the same remark is applicable in a little less degree to others,) contributes nothing towards effecting his purpose. It begs the question, and seems an invasion of our mental independence. Much of the matter and arrangement is identical with the preceding, and we imagine that the compiler of both is one and the same person. Some omissions in the earlier work are supplied. The coincidences in political sentiment between Junius and Horne Tooke are set forth as before, and an attempt is made to reconcile a notorious discrepancy between Horne and Junius, on the subject of the rights of America. Junius constantly maintains that Parliament had the *right* to tax us, and he supported the stamp-tax, but admitted the inexpediency of exercising the right, and condemned the tea-tax. Horne Tooke, on the contrary, so far as his sentiments are known, denied the right, and maintained essentially the doctrines of our Declaration of Independence, and of those petitions which we have compared with it, and of which we believe him to have been the author. The compiler of the 'Posthumous Writings' makes a rather disingenuous attempt to show, that at one time Horne held the same opinions as Junius. This may be true, but it is not proved. The evidence adduced is a statement of Stephens, that Horne taxed Wilkes with inconsistency, when, in consequence of 'a flattering letter from the Bostonians, accompanied by a valuable present, the Representative for Middlesex, who had always expressed hatred and contempt for the Americans, changed his mind, and transmitted a flaming reply, in which he maintained that the colonies were the *propugnacula imperii*.' The mistake of the compiler consists in assuming, that a simple reproof of the inconsistency, ridiculous self-love, and vanity of Wilkes, which were calculated to injure his party in England without benefiting America, was a reproof of the principles of America. Upon the whole, although we place Horne in the front rank of conjectural Juniiuses, we do not perceive, that these two works have established any *identity*, except that of the avowed compiler of the one, with the anonymous compiler of the other. The claims of Horne Tooke were brought forward as early as 1789, in a work by Philip Thicknesse. Another work in his favor has

recently appeared in England, but we have seen neither of them. He has been occasionally mentioned elsewhere, and particularly in the newspapers of this city.

Junius Unmasked is a Boston work, not wholly destitute of merit. It supports the pretensions of Sackville. The writer tells us, that some years before its publication, he became convinced by 'internal evidence' that Sackville was Junius; that 'the comparison of a short piece, written by him before the letters were published, exhibited such striking coincidences of style, as left with him no doubt on the subject.' After the proofs which we have given of the extreme uncertainty of the highest results of this sort of reasoning, the reader will no doubt think, that he has encountered a sanguine and off-hand investigator. The details of the work, though written with creditable talent, will confirm this impression. For example; he thinks that Taylor's argument drawn from similarity of handwriting, 'amounts to nothing,' and immediately after adds, 'Sackville's writing, though twenty-five years earlier, has a strong resemblance to that of Junius. In my judgment, they are the same.' Now of the two, we think Francis's writing rather more like Junius's than Sackville's is. Both however present some evident resemblances, and if the argument founded on it do not help either, it certainly serves to destroy the claim of the other. A portion of this work is substantially the same as that of Mr. Coventry, published in England in 1825. But in addition to Coventry's views, the author has presented new matter, curious in itself, however little it may bear on his design. He supposes that Junius was the writer of the 'North Briton,' of the 'History of the reign of George III. to the end of the session of Parliament in May 1770,' and of the 'Political Register,' published in London from 1767 to 1771; a work attributed to Wilkes and Lloyd, but which he says could not have been theirs, because Wilkes was an outlaw at Paris, and Lloyd was dead. This is an error. We have seen that Lloyd died in January, 1773.

The new arguments, which the author claims to have added to those of Coventry, rest entirely on the supposition that Sackville was the author of a pamphlet, entitled 'Considerations on the present German War.' The only proof of this, with which we are favored, is, that 'the work presents such views as Sackville would be likely to entertain;' and that in the answers to the work, the author is addressed as 'Mr., or My

Lord Considerer,' and that the Critical Review attributes it to a man, who has 'withstood *the blasts* of popular clamor.' Not much reliance can be placed upon reasoning, where the premises are conjectural. There were so many 'Masters and My Lords' in England, who had 'withstood' those 'blasts,' that we must presume so far as to withhold our assent from the inference, even as such; and still more from adopting it as a basis of argument. Our author having thus fixed the pamphlet upon Sackville, proceeds to collate passages from it and Junius, as has been seen in our extracts, and he arrives at his conclusion with as much regularity, and states it with as much confidence, as the best of his predecessors. And because he finds coincidences of language and sentiment between the pamphlet, Junius, and the History aforesaid, he incontinently concludes, and certifies, that Sackville is the author of the History. The argument has two defects. The premises are uncertain, and the reasoning false. A Reply to General Burgoyne's 'Letter to his Constituents' is also assumed to be the work of Sackville, because the style resembles that of the 'Considerations,' and because the author assumes again, that Sackville was the most interested to answer Burgoyne, who revenged himself for his bad luck in America, by attacking the Ministry at home. Why Sackville was more interested than Barrington, the Secretary at War, we are not informed. A triumphant comparison is next instituted between words and phrases, of the pamphlet and Junius. There is no lack of ingenuity in this curious operation, but there is 'a plentiful lack' of utility and common sense.

The old argument in favor of Sackville, a soldier, from Junius's use of military terms, is renewed, but in the same way any clergyman, lawyer, chemist, surgeon, or stock-jobber, may be proved to be Junius.

No motive is assigned for the vehement personal attacks, except Sackville's misfortune and disgrace in Germany, *ten years* before the Letters, a sufficient time for the most choleric to cool, and the most vindictive to forget. Why should he have waited so long? No reason is assigned. Besides, Lord Mansfield was his friend and legal adviser in that very business, while Chatham was among his proscribers. Yet Junius is uniformly hostile to Mansfield, but ultimately the panegyrist of Chatham. The Duke of Grafton, what had he done to Sackville? Why, his brother, Colonel Fitzroy, had been a

witness at the court martial, which convicted Sackville of disobedience of orders, and hence all those tremendous philippics, not against Fitzroy, but against the Duke! This is too puerile. It degrades both Junius and Sackville. We cannot think, that the sublime and enduring energy of Junius proceeded from such an ephemeral and base motive. His steady and brilliant light burned on no such unhallowed altar. Besides, Junius sneers in the most cutting manner at Sackville, on the most tender point, his misfortune and alleged cowardice at Minden, for which he was stripped of all his honors and emoluments. Junius alludes to him as indulging a particular *penchant* for being in 'the rear,' italicising the word, so as to render it in the highest degree offensive to his Lordship; and the whole passage, the only one in which Sackville is mentioned, is supremely sarcastic and insulting. Finally, although Sackville had talent, he was at an immeasurable distance from Junius. The only writings which we have of his, known to be genuine, are some letters which Coventry publishes. These are so clumsily and affectedly written, as to be quite beneath criticism. They present Lord George's talents in too unfavorable a light. We admit with pleasure, that they are altogether beneath his speeches, or even his *actions*. But it is as a *writer*, that we are called upon to view him.

The fourth American work which we are to notice, is that of Dr. Waterhouse. This is an amusing *mélange*, but as an argument, merits less consideration than the preceding one. The title would be more appropriate, if it were Historical and Biographical Illustrations of the Ministry and Times of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. It is as an argument on the authorship of Junius, that we are concerned with it at this time, and as such we can have no hesitation in pronouncing it a total failure. He sets out with affirming, that he was first convinced that Chatham was Junius, by the well-known panegyric of Junius, (*i. e.* of Chatham) upon Chatham. If we believed that a character which we respected, and wished others to respect, at least while they were reading our encomiums, could be guilty of a folly so degrading, as that of puffing himself in the newspapers, we should certainly wish to conceal our belief, until the last sentence of the last chapter of the book in which it was expressed.

But if Lord Chatham were Junius, he did not content himself with the dishonest and unworthy trick of praising himself,

in a strain however so noble and eloquent, that a false designing knave could never have risen to it; but he also flies, and as before without any assigned or assignable motive, into the other extremity of folly, to call it by a gentle name, and abuses and execrates himself. Does this comport with the character of the proud and dignified lord, or of the grave and fastidious Junius?

We shall quote some of the invectives of Junius against Lord Chatham, and leave the question to our readers. In the first of the *Miscellaneous Letters*, which is signed *Poplicola*, he calls him 'a man purely and perfectly bad,' 'a traitor,' 'an advocate for rebellion,' 'a black villain;' 'guilty of crimes,' 'of artifices, intrigues, hypocrisy and impudence,' 'of prostrate humility in the closet,' 'lordly dictation to the people by whose interest he has been supported,' ingratitude to his friends, truckling to his enemies, and 'the upstart insolence of a dictator;'—concluding as follows: 'though we have no Tarpeian rock for the immediate punishment of treason, yet we have impeachments; and a gibbet is not too honorable a situation, for the carcase of a traitor.'

In the second *Miscellaneous Letter*, of May, 1767, under the same signature, he says, that because 'Mr. Pitt was respected and honored, it does not follow that the Earl of Chatham should be so too; that 'a very honest Commoner may become a very corrupt Peer;' again accuses him of 'a daring attack upon the Constitution' in 'suspending a law by proclamation;' says that the people ought never to forgive him; and that 'his conduct and that of his miserable understrappers deserved nothing but contempt and detestation.'

In the fourth *Miscellaneous Letter*, of June 24, he says: 'It was his [Lord Bute's] good fortune to corrupt one man, from whom we least expected so base an apostacy. 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 had himself 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 shake hands with a Scotchman; 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 beneath contempt. But it seems this unhappy country had long been distracted by their divisions; in this last instance it was to be oppressed by their union.'

In the fifth Miscellaneous Letter, he calls him 'a lunatic brandishing a crutch, or bawling through a grate, or writing with desperate charcoal a letter to North America.' In the tenth of the same letters, 'a lunatic,' who 'sacrificed honor, conscience and country to carry a point of party;' 'the frantic high priest, who offered up his bleeding country a victim to America;' and accuses him of 'treachery' in co-operating with 'designing, seditious spirits in that country.' In the eleventh Miscellaneous Letter, Dec. 22, 1767, he says, sarcastically, in reply to an opponent who talked of the country's 'owing to Lord Chatham more than it could ever repay,'—'the country *does* owe to him the greater part of the national debt, and *that* he is sure it can never repay.' In the twelfth, Feb. 16, 1768, he says, 'Why the Earl of Chatham should continue to hold an employment of this importance [Lord Privy Seal], while he is unable to perform the duties of it, is at least a curious question.' In the thirty-fifth Miscellaneous Letter, Aug. 29, 1768, he says, 'His [Chatham's] infirmities have forced him into a retirement, where I presume he is ready to suffer with a sullen submission, every insult and disgrace, which can be heaped upon a miserable, decrepid, worn-out old man.' * * 'He is, indeed, a compound of contradictions.' And in the forty-eighth, of Oct. 19, 1768, he says, 'The Earl of Chatham,—I had much to say; but it were inhuman to persecute, when Providence has marked out the example to mankind.'

In the first letter under the signature of Junius, Jan. 21, 1769, he says, 'Unfortunately for this country, Mr. Grenville was to be distressed because he was a minister, and Mr. Pitt and Lord Camden were to be patrons of America because they were in the opposition.' And to fill up the picture of selfish ambition, he adds, that 'to accomplish the ruin of a minister, they in effect divided one half of the empire from the other.' In the twelfth letter, under the signature of Junius, of May 30, 1769, he says, 'In America, we trace you [the Duke of Grafton] from the first opposition to the stamp-act, on principles of convenience, to Mr. Pitt's surrender of the right.' Lastly, in Private Letter No. 23, to Woodfall, Oct. 19, 1770, he says: 'I neither admire your correspondent *nor his idol*' [Lord Chatham]. The *italics* are Junius's.

These are not all the examples of the harsh and painful invective of Junius against Lord Chatham. It is suggested in a neighboring work, which undertakes the defence of this book, that the two letters signed *Poplicola* are not genuine; and that Woodfall, who had the best and only direct evidence on the subject, was mistaken in attributing them to Junius. Be it so, (which it is not;) what will be said to twenty others of a similar character, scattered promiscuously through the work? Will the writer deny the genuineness of these also, though bearing the proper signature of Junius? He must do so, or his defence fails. It is true that Junius at length begins to change his tone towards Chatham, after Chatham had retrieved his reputation by acknowledging the illegality of 'the proclamation' dispensing with the law, and by leading in several powerful attacks upon the Administration, on the subject of the Middlesex election, and other great grievances of which Junius and the people complained. It is true, also, that Junius finally passed into panegyric upon Chatham; but if Chatham were what we are willing to believe, and did not indeed deserve the harshest denunciations of Junius; if he were a man of any delicacy, conscience or honor, the praises of Junius constitute as strong an objection to the theory before us, as his invectives. Severe as the language of Junius was for a long time, and unjust as it upon the whole is felt to be now, though it was otherwise then, it constitutes a conclusive proof of Junius's integrity; for Chatham's conduct unquestionably afforded great cause for it, and Junius's changing when the man changed, is a proof that he was no hireling, no personal politician, but a patriot; and it is no slight objection to the hypothesis in question, that it destroys the most beautiful proofs of the disinterestedness and integrity of Junius.

There is another thing to be considered. Chatham was the victim of an afflicting disease, and in the closest retirement at Hayes, twelve miles from London, during about three years of the period of Junius, viz. from 1767 to 1770. During this interval, he was for the most part confined to his house, and much of the time to his bed. Dr. Waterhouse describes his condition some time between October 19th, 1768, more than a year after his confinement had begun, and in 1770, when his health was restored, as follows; 'Lord Chatham's disordered body and distempered mind needed tranquillity, to recruit both.' 'Disease forbade him the benefit of travelling, prohibited hunt-

ing, and the easier gestures of ordinary horseback exercise, and, what makes his bodily decrepitude still stronger, he was *unable to perform on any musical instrument*, so cruelly had the gout fed *on his extremities.*' In June, 1769, Junius speaks of 'the age and incapacity of Lord Chatham.' We have already for another purpose quoted several passages to the same point, to which the reader, if he think proper, may recur.

The fifth and last American work on Junius is Mr. Newhall's. This is at least an original performance. It is evidently the work of an industrious and thinking man; but it is nearly destitute of method, and in a considerable degree, of comprehensiveness of views. The writer is an enthusiast in his theory, and perceives few facts or arguments, except those which appear to be on his side. He claims to have discovered, twenty years ago, that Lord Temple was the author of Junius. He was first impressed with this opinion, by the fact, that Earl Temple's portrait fronts the title page in Heron's Junius, though he is not once mentioned in the text. He afterwards discovered a pamphlet written against Mr. Pitt, which he attributes to Lord Temple, not only without, but against positive evidence; for he quotes a statement of Almon, that Humphrey Coates* was the author;—but then our author supposes that Temple furnished some of the materials, dictated a portion of it, and in short was the author. This is a more immoderate demand upon our credulity, than that in favor of Lord Sackville's supposed 'Considerations.' A comparison is then instituted between Junius and Mr. Coates's pamphlet, and as they are found to agree 'excellent well' in sundry words and phrases,—being both written in the King's English,—the conclusion follows as regularly and naturally, as the 'argal' of the philosophic gravedigger.

We will state another point which the author treats as his strong one, and then his theory will be all told. It is, that Lord Temple, who had quarrelled with his brother, Lord Chatham, on account of the latter taking office with the Duke of Grafton and the Bute party in 1766, was reconciled to him at the *same time* that Junius changed his tone towards Chatham. This was not a singular coincidence. A great many changed their tone and treatment towards Chatham, when he

retired, driven by infirmity, from a ministry, which he had joined in violation of his political and personal pledges, apparently for the sake of a title and a pension, and greatly to the injury of the country. If Chatham had held firmly to his friends and his principles, the Government must have gone to him, instead of his going to the Government; so great were his popularity and power. In that case, the American war would probably have been averted, at least for many years. Lord Chatham resigned Oct. 19, 1768, and his brothers, G. Grenville and Earl Temple, were immediately reconciled to him. 'From that period,' says Mr. Newhall, 'Chatham gradually becomes the subject of Junius's praises.' 'He grows upon his esteem.' ' "From that moment I began to like him." '

There is an anachronism in this arrangement of the above quotations from Junius. The first of these sentences occurs in Letter fifty-four, dated Aug. 3, 1771,* nearly *three years* after the reconciliation. The second occurs in a private letter to Wilkes, of Oct. 16, 1771,† *three whole years* after the epoch with which it is here connected. The whole context of those letters shows, that these favorable expressions are bestowed upon Chatham for his noble defence of the people's cause in the debates on the Middlesex Election, and Parliamentary Reform. Of course there is no need of referring them to any such cause, as the personal reconciliation of Chatham with his brother. It would be unphilosophical in argument, and we are moreover expressly precluded from it by Junius's own avowals. Even at the last date, Junius, to guard his consistency, apologizes to Wilkes for praising Chatham. Sept. 7, 1771, he says, 'I think it good policy to pay these compliments to Lord Chatham, which in truth he has nobly deserved.' We refer the reader back to the bitter passages against Lord Chatham, which we had occasion to quote in our notice of Dr. Waterhouse's work. It will be seen, that as late as Oct. 1770, *two* full years after the reconciliation, Junius still speaks very disparagingly of Chatham. The coincidence, therefore, which Mr. Newhall relies upon, does not exist. There is another more important point, on which Mr. Newhall's theory is very deficient. He furnishes no evidence, that Temple was capable of writing the letters. He does furnish some, that he was not. The pamphlet, if proved to be Temple's, would not do it. It is very inferior to the letters; but the weight of evidence, as

* W. J. 2310.

† *Ib.* 1,321.

stated by the author himself, is against his inference that the pamphlet was Temple's. He quotes the opinion of Lord Chesterfield, a man of exquisite literary taste and acumen, that Temple was not capable of composing the pamphlet. We have great respect for the character and talents of Earl Temple, but we have no proof that he was capable of writing the Letters of Junius. Mr. Newhall exalts his ability at the expense of his honor and sincerity, when he represents him as reconciled to his brother, and makes him persevere for two years afterwards, in publicly abusing him.

We are not aware, that any farther fact or argument in this work requires particular notice. The position of Earl Temple's portrait in Heron's Junius, is not of much importance. It was probably the result of accident or caprice, or of a slight preference, because he was a handsome man. At any rate, when the author will tell us why Chatham, and Wilkes, and Fox, and Onslow, and Oliver, and Beckford, though mentioned so often in the letters, are placed nowhere, we will tell him why Lord Temple is placed where he is, though not mentioned at all. If he will clear up Mr. Graham's difficulty, and tell him why a *fac simile* of Horne Tooke's writing is attached to Woodfall's Junius, and yet his name and claims are not mentioned in the discussion or list of claimants, Mr. Graham will probably reciprocate the favor, by a satisfactory elucidation of the arrangement of the portraits. Mr. Graham sees in this singular circumstance proof positive that Horne Tooke was Junius, and that Good and Woodfall, knowing that he was so, avoided mentioning him at all, because they could not do so with truth, without betraying the secret. If it were so, they were very unfortunate, for it seems that this stroke of policy, instead of concealing, has actually disclosed it to Mr. Graham. If these men had entertained such a design, and had known what they were about, it is to be presumed that they would have suppressed also the *fac simile*. So in regard to the portrait. If the secret had been intended to be shadowed forth in types, as Mr. Newhall supposes, why should it not have been told at once? If, on the contrary, it were to be concealed, why should a hint be given, by thus distinguishing the author? Mr. Newhall appears to us a little too acute in this affair.

If the view we have taken of the intentions of Junius, the view which he himself gives, be correct, then the secret will never be known by any external evidence, unless it shall be of a kind, which eluded the knowledge and forecast of Junius.

In regard to the rumor of papers being discovered at Eaton, disclosing the secret, we are for the same reason totally incredulous. Lord Grenville, at whose request they are said to be kept back from the world, though it does not appear that he has been spoken to about it, was not an actor on the public stage in Junius's time: he was but eight or ten years old. His father George Grenville has been dead sixty years. If he aided Junius, or even had himself been Junius, the fact could do no harm to his memory or to his descendants. Two kings have since gone down to the tomb. In short, no statesman or politician of that day is yet alive, so far as we know. We see no necessity for supposing any peculiar connexion between Junius and George Grenville. He praised and never censured him; so it was with Littleton, and Temple, (who is repeatedly mentioned in the *Miscellaneous Letters*) and Rockingham, and Sawbridge, and Sir Geoffrey Amherst. Yet we see no improbability in it, notwithstanding Junius's assertion that he was unknown to George Grenville. The fact is, that George Grenville was an industrious, efficient, and honest statesman, ready at all times to unite with enemies, or to separate from friends, for promoting what he conceived to be the good of his country. It would have been a contradiction, for Junius to have been hostile to such a man. How Mr. Newhall got the idea that he was not in fact the author of the stamp-act, we cannot imagine. We find no confirmation of it. In fact, in a letter signed by himself, which we have seen, he claims the credit of the policy. We should be happy if it were otherwise. We have no doubt, however, that his intentions were honest and patriotic, and that he sincerely believed that Britain had a right to tax us, and that it was our duty to pay. His eldest son succeeded Earl Temple, who died without issue, and was afterwards created Marquis of Buckingham. His son, Richard Plantagenet, is the present Duke of Buckingham. William Wyndham Grenville, Lord Grenville, is the third son of George Grenville and uncle to the Duke. Both of these persons are said to know the author of Junius. But such knowledge is no novelty. Lord Grenville was 72 years old on the 18th day of July last. Of course, if the gratification of the public curiosity depend on his demise, it will not be a great while longer delayed.