



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

This book is part of the collection held by the Bodleian Libraries and scanned by Google, Inc. for the Google Books Library Project.

For more information see:

<http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/dbooks>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 UK: England & Wales (CC BY-NC-SA 2.0) licence.

From the Author

**THE CLAIMS OF SIR PHILIP FRANCIS
TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF JUNIUS
DISPROVED:**

In a Letter addressed to Sir James Mackintosh.



I. Sir,—I give to myself the pleasure of addressing to you this Letter on a subject, which cannot amidst your other literary pursuits, and even amidst “the weightier matters of the law,” have failed to attract your notice. Permit me to add that in your excellent understanding, your great acquirements, your ample and minute knowledge of persons and parties and events and facts and circumstances, historical, political, and private, your exquisite taste, your true discernment, your critical *acumen*, your Ciceronian skill in composition, your Aristotelian powers of argument, your professional habits of investigation, and your philosophical spirit of research, I perceive a happy union of those admirable qualities, which should characterise him, who undertakes to decide a point of this intricate nicety. It is a question, Sir, not unworthy of your genius and your talents, and on which I will yet indulge the hope of seeing them successfully displayed. I will not admit that a question,—which has for a series of years been a subject of literary interest among persons of well-cultivated minds, and which will never till it is decided, cease to be a subject of interest, while curiosity is a property of human nature,—which has exercised and baffled the inquiries of the intelligent, and the sagacity of the ingenious, and the researches of the antiquarian, and the penetration of the statesman,—which involves the biography of the greatest men, who have illustrated our age and our nation,—which is identified with the transactions of public Offices, the politics of various Administrations, and the history of our beloved country;—Sir, I will not admit that a question of this sort is a mere fruitless speculation of human inquisitiveness, an idle employment of literary leisure, and a profitless expenditure of human intellect and human learning.

II. “It is commonly reported and believed,” says Mr. Taylor p. 398., “that the King, the late Lord North, and the present Lord Grenville, were at some time or other made acquainted with the real name of Junius. According to the following anecdote in Wraxall’s *Memoirs* 1, 455. the King acquired this knowledge in the year 1772. :—‘I have been assured that the King riding out in the year 1772. accompanied by General Desaguliers, said to him in conversation, *We know who Junius is, and he will write no more.*’ The General, who was too good a courtier to congratulate upon such a piece of intelligence, contented himself with bowing, and the discourse proceeded no farther. Mrs. Shuttleworth, who was General Desaguliers’ daughter, believed in the accuracy of this fact.’ As the report of such a discovery having been made is now very generally credited, we may admit the evidence of this anecdote in deciding at what period it took place. The date assigned is the more entitled to notice, as at that time Lord North was prime Minister, and in that capacity he would most likely become acquainted with the secret. By parity of reasoning it is also probable that Lord Grenville acquired his information at the time he held a similar situation: indeed, without this, it is not easy to conceive how Lord North and Lord Grenville should possess an opportunity of gaining that intelligence, which was denied to others in their sphere.”

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

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

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

III. I had, on July 16, 1826. at the Bell Inn in Thetford a conversation about Junius with an intelligent friend, and a learned Barrister. He once at the Bury Assizes talked with Lord Chief Justice Dallas on the subject. Dallas was a literary man, (though according to the testimony of another friend, not very conversant with literature—) was one of the Counsel for Warren Hastings at the time of his trial—Hastings was himself a literary man, and his table was plentifully supplied with the great literary men of the day. The feeling and the conviction of the company, in which Dallas also participated, were that the matter in Junius was supplied by Charles Lloyd, and that Sir Philip Francis was employed as the amanuensis and perhaps to furnish occasionally the language, subject to the revision of his employer. Lloyd was known to the party to be a man of talent equal to the composition of the *Letters*. One of the reasons assigned by Dallas against Francis's claim to the authorship of Junius, (and he had several,) was this, that a Clerk in the War-Office could not have the requisite leisure for composing those *Letters*; and the argument is so fair, that the advocates of Francis ought to prove the abundance of his leisure at that time. Now Lloyd had the necessary leisure. Not merely leisure was wanted for the composer of the *Letters*, but the consciousness of full leisure, the feeling of a mind at ease, unencumbered by official duties, unexhausted by the performance of them, undistracted, in moments of relaxation, by the remembrance of them;—powers fresh and vigorous and capable of being at the shortest notice waked into active and awful energy, and wielded by a giant's arm with sure effect, and striking the object of its wrath with the divine force of lightning, rending the knotted oak, and scattering its honours in the dust.

IV. The first prose-work of Johnson was *An Abridgment and Translation of Lobo's Voyage to Abyssinia*, published in 1735., when he was twenty-four years old. "This being the first prose-work of Johnson," says Mr. Boswell (1, 59.) "it is a curious object of inquiry how much may be traced in it of that style, which marks his subsequent Writings with such peculiar excellence; with so happy an union of force, vivacity, and perspicuity. I have pe-



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

" But in the Preface the Johnsonian style begins to appear ; and though use had not yet taught his wing a permanent and equal flight, there are parts of it, which exhibit his best manner in full vigour. I had once the pleasure of examining it with Mr. Edmund Burke, who confirmed me in this opinion, by his superior critical sagacity, and was, I remember, much delighted with the following specimen :—' The Portuguese traveller, contrary to the general
' vein of his countrymen, has amused his readers with no roman-
' tick absurdity, or incredible fictions ; whatever he relates,
' whether true or not, is at least probable ; and he, who tells no-
' thing exceeding the bounds of probability, has a right to demand
' that they should believe him, who cannot contradict him. He
' appears by his modest and unaffected narration to have described
' things as he saw them, to have copied nature from life, and to
' have consulted his senses, not his imagination. He meets with
' no basilisks, that destroys with their eyes ; his crocodiles devour
' their prey without tears ; and his cataracts fall from the rocks
' without deafening the neighbouring inhabitants. The reader will
' here find no regions cursed with irremediable barrenness, or
' blessed with spontaneous fecundity ; no perpetual gloom, or un-
' ceasing sunshine ; nor are the nations here described either devoid
' of all sense of humanity, or consummate in all private or social
' virtues. Here are no Hottentots without religious polity or ar-
' ticulate language ; no Chinese perfectly polite, and completely
' skilled in all sciences ; he will discover, what will always be dis-
' covered by a diligent and impartial enquirer, that, wherever
' human nature is to be found, there is a mixture of vice and virtue,

‘ a contest of passion and reason ; and that the Creator doth not appear partial in his distributions, but has balanced, in most countries, their particular inconveniencies by particular favours.’ Here we have an early example of that brilliant and energetick expression, which, upon innumerable occasions in his subsequent life, justly impressed the world with the highest admiration.

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

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

V. “Johnson’s saying, ‘ I have no part in the Paper,’ (*the Adventurer*,) ‘ beyond now and then a motto,’ may seem inconsistent with his being the author of the Papers marked *T*. But he had, at this time, written only one No. ; and besides, even at any after-period, he might have used the same expression, considering it as a point of honour not to own them ; for Mrs. Williams told me that, ‘ as he had given those Essays to Dr. Bathurst who sold them at two guineas each, he never would own them ; but the fact was that he dictated them, while Bathurst wrote.’ I read to him Mrs. Williams’s account ; he smiled, and said nothing.” Boswell 1, 223. In the following page is a Note communicated by Dr. Burney :—“ Dr. Johnson lowered and somewhat disguised his style, in writing *the Adventurers*, in order that his Papers might pass for those of Dr. Bathurst, to whom he consigned the profits. This was Hawkesworth’s opinion.” From the above statement we may safely reason thus, 1. that great Writers do often write Papers, which they never voluntarily acknowledge ; 2. that, if they are asked whether they have written any particular Papers, they may either decline giving any answer, (in which case we can neither justly infer nor safely deny their authorship of them,) or give an

* “ See *Rambler* No. 103.”

evasive answer, neither affirmative nor negative, or give an answer exactly calculated to mislead the inquirer, because given with a mental reservation ; 3. that they often designedly lower their style to avoid the discovery of their pen having been employed to write the Papers. 4. Hence it is possible for *Junius* to have written the Letters of *Veteran*, though they carry about them marks of an inferior mind and of an inferior style.

VI. "In 1773. Dr. Johnson," says Mr. Boswell (2, 206.) "wrote or partly wrote an Epitaph on Mrs. Bell, wife of his friend, John Bell Esq. brother of the Rev. Dr. Bell, Prebendary of Westminster, which is printed in his Works. It is in English prose, and has so little of his manner, that I did not believe he had any hand in it, till I was satisfied of the fact by the authority of Mr. Bell." Then great Writers, possessing a particular turn of thought and particular modes of expression, can occasionally either by art so disguise both, or by carelessness write so much below both, as to deceive the very person most likely to detect the author of the composition.

VII. "This masterly argument (of Johnson, on a question of Scotch law,) after being prefaced and concluded with some sentences of my own, and garnished with the usual formularies, was actually printed and laid before the Lords of Session, but without success. My respected friend, Lord Hailes, however, one of that honourable body, had critical sagacity enough to discover a more than ordinary hand in the *Petition*. I told him Dr. Johnson had favoured me with his pen. His Lordship, with wonderful *acumen*, pointed out exactly where his composition began, and where it ended." Boswell 2, 202. When the same critical sagacity is applied to determine the authorship of *Junius's Letters*, it may have equal success and be entitled to the same praise. And yet of this same Lord Hailes we read a curious story told in the same Work (2, 304.) Mr. Boswell says in a Letter to Dr. Johnson :—"Lord Hailes writes to me, (for we correspond more than we talk together,) 'As to Fingal, I see a controversy arising, and purpose to keep out of its way. There is no doubt that I might mention some circumstances ; but I do not choose to commit them to paper.' What his opinion is, I do not know." In a Note communicated to Mr. Boswell by the Rev. T. B. Blake-way we are told :—"His Lordship, notwithstanding his resolution, did commit his sentiments to paper, and in one of his Notes affixed to his Collection of old Scottish Poetry, he says that 'to doubt the authenticity of those Poems is a refinement in scepticism indeed.'" Now on the supposition that these Poems are the pure inventions of Mr. Macpherson,—a fact, which many intelligent men consider to have been established by Laing in his *History of Scotland*,—the same critical sagacity, which was infallible in the one case, is fallible in the other.

VIII. To shew the caution, which should be used in admitting the declaration of Authors about the originality of compositions

published under their name, and the caution with which we should receive the declarations of persons claiming to be Authors of Junius, we may cite the following memorable instance :—“ There is in this collection (of Miscellanies by Mrs. Anna Williams,) a Poem ‘ on the Death of Stephen Grey, the Electrician,’ which, on reading it, appeared to me to be undoubtedly Johnson’s. I asked Mrs. Williams whether it was not his. ‘ Sir,’ (said she, with some warmth,) ‘ I wrote that Poem before I had the honour of Dr. Johnson’s acquaintance.’ I, however, was so much impressed with my first notion, that I mentioned it to Dr. Johnson, repeating, at the same time, what Mrs. Williams had said. His answer was : ‘ It is true, ‘ Sir, that she wrote it before she was acquainted with me ; but she ‘ has not told you that I wrote it all over again, except two lines.’ ” Boswell 2, 27.

IX. “ Mrs. Piozzi gives the following account of this little composition, (‘ Verses to a Lady, on receiving a Sprig of Myrtle,’ 1734.) from Dr. Johnson’s own relation to her, on her enquiring whether it was rightly attributed to him—‘ I think it is now just ‘ forty years ago, that a young fellow had a sprig of myrtle given ‘ him by a girl he courted, and asked me to write him some verses, ‘ that he might present her in return. I promised, but forgot ; and ‘ when he called for his lines at the time agreed on—Sit still a ‘ moment, (says I,) dear Mund, and I’ll fetch them thee—So stepped aside for five minutes, and wrote the nonsense you now keep ‘ up such a stir about.’ (*Anecdotes* p. 34.) In my first Edition I was induced to doubt the authenticity of this account, by the following circumstantial statement in a Letter to me from Miss Seward of Lichfield :—‘ I know those Verses were addressed to Lucy Porter, when he was enamoured of her in his boyish days, two or ‘ three years before he had seen her mother, his future wife. He ‘ wrote them at my grandfather’s, and gave them to Lucy in the ‘ presence of my mother, to whom he shewed them on the instant. ‘ She used to repeat them to me, when I asked her for *the Verses* ‘ *Dr. Johnson gave her on a Sprig of Myrtle, which he had stolen* ‘ *or begged from her bosom.* We all know honest Lucy Porter to ‘ have been incapable of the mean vanity of applying to herself a ‘ compliment not *intended* for her.’ Such was this Lady’s statement, which I make no doubt she supposed to be correct ; but it shows how dangerous it is to trust too implicitly to traditional testimony and ingenious inference,” [and even positive declarations of personal knowledge ;] “ for Mr. Edmund Hector has lately assured me that Mrs. Piozzi’s account is in this instance accurate, and that he was the person, for whom Johnson wrote those Verses, which have been erroneously ascribed to Mr. Hammond.” Boswell 1, 65. But notwithstanding Mr. Hector’s positive declaration, Miss Anna Seward persisted in the truth of her story, and Mr. Boswell was drawn into a controversy with her in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* Vol. 53. and 54. and it was finally settled by a

Letter from Mr. Hector to Mr. Boswell, detailing the history of the Verses. Let those then who enter into the controversy about Junius, beware how they rely on the truth of facts, even if they are related to them on what may well be considered good authority.

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

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

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

name to it. Upon the fame of this he lived for several months, being entertained at the best tables as 'the ingenious Mr. Rolt.*' His conversation, indeed, did not discover much of the fire of a poet; but it was recollected that both Addison and Thomson were equally dull till excited by wine. Akenside having been informed of this imposition, vindicated his right by publishing the Poem with its real Author's name. Several instances of such literary fraud have been detected. The Rev. Dr. Campbell, of St. Andrew's, wrote *An Enquiry into the Original of Moral Virtue*, the MS. of which he sent to Mr. Innes, a Clergyman in England, who was his countryman and acquaintance. Innes published it with his own name to it; and before the imposition was discovered, obtained considerable promotion, as a reward of his merit.† The celebrated Dr. Hugh Blair, and his cousin Mr. George Bannatine, when students in divinity, wrote a Poem, entitled *The Resurrection*, copies of which were handed about in MS. They were at length very much surprised to see a pompous Edition of it in folio, dedicated to the Princess Dowager of Wales, by a Dr. Douglas, as his own. Some years ago a little Novel, entitled *The Man of Feeling*, was assumed by Mr. Eccles, a young Irish Clergyman, who was afterwards drowned near Bath. He had been at the pains to transcribe the whole book, with blottings, interlineations, and corrections, that it might be shewn to several people as an original. It was in truth the production of Mr. Henry Mackenzie, an attorney in the Exchequer at Edinburgh, who is the author of several ingenious pieces; but the belief with regard to Mr. Eccles became so general, that it was thought necessary for Messrs. Strahan and Cadell to publish an advertisement in the Newspapers, contradicting the report, and mentioning that they purchased the copyright of Mr. Mackenzie. I can conceive this kind of fraud to be very easily practised with successful effrontery. The *filiation* of a literary performance is difficult of proof; seldom is there any witness present at its birth. A man, either in confidence or by improper means, obtains possession of a copy of it in MS., and boldly publishes it as his own. The true Author in many cases may not be able to make his title clear. Johnson indeed, from the peculiar features of his literary offspring, might bid defiance to any attempt to appropriate them to others.

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

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

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

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

XII. "Mr. Taylor p. 96. quotes the following words from a *Letter* of Junius to Mr. Horne, (2, 310.) "And surely it is not in the little censure of Mr. Horne, to deter me from doing signal justice to a man, (Lord Chatham,) who, I confess, has *grown upon my esteem.*" He adds in a Note :—"It is somewhat remarkable that Sir Philip Francis, made use of this same expression in speaking of Mr. Horne himself several years after. *Vide* Erskine's *Speeches* 4, 135. Horne must certainly have 'grown in the esteem' of Junius, before he would speak in favour of his political conduct." But 1. the fact of Sir Philip's having so spoken of Horne places him in such direct opposition to Junius, that we cannot reasonably be persuaded to identify the one with the other: 2. in my first *Letter* I have shewn in what way Lord Chatham 'grew upon the esteem' of Junius: 3. the application of these words by Francis to Mr. Horne many years after Junius had used them, might be either by a pure accident, or by a mere imitation of Junius, or by an unconscious employment of the same words: 4. Mr. Taylor would not be justified in drawing any inference from the fact that Junius and Sir Philip had used the same phrase, unless it were a phrase *peculiar* to themselves. A single instance from any other Writer would at once destroy such an argument. What shall we say to the following passage in Boswell's *Life of Johnson* (1, 224.) first published in 1791. ? "Without meaning, however, to depreciate the *Adventurer*, I must observe that, as the value of the *Rambler* came, in the progress of time, to be better known, *it grew upon the public estimation.*"

XIII. Mr. Coventry p. 102-7., undertakes to prove that Junius was an Englishman, not an Irishman or a Scotchman. He quotes the Dedication of the Letters to the English nation, where Junius speaks of *the rights of an Englishman* and of *our Constitution*. He quotes the Preface, where Junius speaks of *every English gentleman, of English Boroughs and Peerages, of poor England and the King of England*. He quotes Letter 30. Oct. 17, 1769. where Junius speaks of *the English Constitution, of an Englishman, of his countrymen, of our being Englishmen*. He quotes Letter 37. March 19, 1770. where Junius speaks of *our being Englishmen*. He quotes Letter 13. Febr. 24, 1768. where Junius speaks of *the people of England, of native genuine English, and of our countrymen*. He quotes the Dedication of the Letters, where Junius

speaks of them as written by *one of ourselves*. Now the real value of such an argument is this that, if any Irishman or Scotchman, writing in England, has anywhere used the term *Englishman* instead of *Briton*, the hypothesis falls to the ground at one stroke. Take then the following example from a Speech of Burke cited in Woodfall's *Junius* 1, 365. :—"Consult the *History of the Reign of George III.* In that performance, which will be an everlasting monument of the folly, incapacity, and pernicious politics of our late and present Ministers, you will find it demonstrated that the majority of *Englishmen* have petitioned the King, and have consequently expressed their own sentiments by their own mouth, without the intervention of their deputies."

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

"Among the peasantry of Grace's Country many traditionary tales, both in prose and verse, are still preserved, illustrative of scenes of feudal warfare between the Barons of Courtstown and the royal Milesian Septs of the Fitz-Patricks of Ossory, and the O'Mores of Leix (or Leas.) The tales of these exploits are the tales most dear to the descendants of the combatants engaged in these encounters; and, with a filial piety of forgetfulness, they cannot remember one single occasion, upon which they were ever worsted. There are also other Poems still extant in the Irish language, of a more domestic character, commemorating births, deaths, marriages, feasts, hunting, and other occurrences of the Grace family. Several of these traditionary effusions have been transcribed from their

oral sources, and are far from being destitute of merit. The peculiarity of their style is remarkable for that excessive luxuriance of figurative language and hyperbole of expression, which characterize the poetry of Ossian. The peasantry of the Walsh Mountains, in this neighbourhood, could furnish many a weapon to those, who contend that Ireland is the birth-place of the ancient Bard."

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

This may be taken as a further proof of the extraordinary mistake made by Junius in speaking of the Irish as a barbarous people, un-used to the figures of speech. The observation is false in respect to the Irish in particular, and false in respect to the history of the world, because it is perfectly well known to the traveller and the reader of travels that the language of barbarous people abounds with figures of speech, and that oratory is an art much and very successfully studied among them.

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

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

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

I agree with Professor Porson in the propriety of this conclusion: the coincidence could not have been accidental. Dr. Johnson, however, was not able to persuade himself that both these Works emanated from one and the same mind, and let us learn from the fact the necessity of exercising an independent judgment, if we wish to arrive at truth in such cases—let us not bend to the authority of names, however great, nor yield to the force of example, however general, but prove all things and hold fast that which is good:—
"Johnson was in high spirits this evening at the Club, and talked with great animation and success. He attacked Swift, as he used to do upon all occasions. 'The *Tale of a Tub* is so much superior to his other Writings, that one can hardly believe he was the

Author of it:’* there is in it such a vigour of mind, such a swarm of thoughts, so much of nature, and art, and life.’ I wondered to hear him say of *Gulliver’s Travels*: ‘When once you have thought of big men and little men, it is very easy to do all the rest.’ I endeavoured to make a stand for Swift, and tried to rouse those who were much more able to defend him; but in vain. Johnson, at last, of his own accord, allowed very great merit to the inventory of articles found in the pocket of *the Man Mountain*, particularly the description of his watch, which it was conjectured was his God, as he consulted it upon all occasions. He observed ‘that Swift put his name to but two things, (after he had a name to put,) *The Plan for the Improvement of the English Language*, and the last *Drapier’s Letter*.’ Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* 2, 328.

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

“The following Letter, written by Sir Philip Francis to Major

* “This doubt,” says Mr. Boswell in a Note, “has been much agitated on both sides, I think without good reason. See Addison’s *Freeholder* May 4, 1714; *An Apology for the Tale of a Tub*; Dr. Hawkesworth’s *Preface to Swift’s Works*, and Swift’s *Letter to Tooke the Printer*, and *Tooke’s Answer* in that collection; *Sheridan’s Life of Swift*; Mr. Courtenay’s *Note* on p. 3. of his *Poetical Review of the Literary and Moral Character of Dr. Johnson*; and Mr. Cooksey’s *Essay on the Life and Character of John Lord Somers, Baron of Eversham*. Dr. Johnson here speaks only to the *internal evidence* I take leave to differ from him, having a very high estimation of the powers of Dr. Swift. His *Sentiments of a Church-of-England-man*, his *Sermon on the Trinity*, and other serious pieces, prove his learning as well as his acuteness in logick and metaphysics; and his various compositions of a different cast exhibit not only wit, humour, and ridicule, but a knowledge, of nature, and art, and life:’ a combination, therefore, of those powers, when, (as the *Apology* says,) ‘the Author was young, his invention at the height, and his reading fresh in his head,’ might surely produce the *Tale of a Tub*.”

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

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

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

A Panegyric Essay upon the number Three.

A Dissertation upon the Principal Productions of Grub-Street.

Letters upon a Dissection of Human Nature.

A Panegyrick upon the World.

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

A General History of Ears.

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

A Description of the Kingdom of Absurdities.

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

A Critical Essay upon the Art of Canting, Philosophically, Physically, and Musically Considered.’

Matter of this sort affords testimony the least liable to suspicion, and more valuable in itself than any declarations of authorship from Swift himself or any positive assertions of his friends.

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

‘ Dear Sir,

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

‘ April 2, 1811.’ ”

P. FRANCIS.’

The Times May 25, 1826.

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

This extract demands some notice from me.

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

2. It is not fair to say ‘ that Junius owed much of his fame to the trick of keeping up the *unknown.*’ His reputation stands on a so-

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

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

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

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

6. If the maxim of Lord Byron were true, "that a political Writer, and one who descends to personalities such as disgrace Junius, should be immaculate as a public, as well as a private character," the press would never groan under the weight of political Writings, and the Houses of Parliament would have very few speakers, and Lord Erskine and Mr. Fox and many others, who possessed more public than private virtue, should not have championed public rights nor redressed public wrongs.

7. His Lordship remarks that "Mathias's book, *the Pursuits of Literature*, now almost a dead letter, had once a great fame." The nature of the Work, consisting of short sketches of public and private characters, in the shape of Notes to a Poem, was such that its popularity could not be expected to live very long; it is still read by scholars; and would continue to be read, like Junius, with the same avidity by readers of every class, if it had rivalled Junius in merit. His

Lordship declares "that many of the Newspapers of the day are written as well as Junius." He has not referred to one Newspaper, and most certain it is that Junius has survived them all; 'his laurels wear well, for they were dearly earned;' his monument remains, for it was the labour of his own hands; a more permanent glory invests his fictitious name than any political Writer has obtained under a real signature; his Works were admired by his contemporaries, and will continue to command the admiration of the latest posterity, for their intellectual merits and their rhetorical beauties—the whole nation, (except those who had experienced the weight of his pen, or who had earned and expected his public animadversion, with their connections and dependencies,) trumpeted his applause, and even now the sound reverberates in our ears.

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

XIX. "And in *evident mistakes*, wherein they differ from all other people, they still agree with each other. Junius says in the MS., from which our engraved fac-simile is taken, 'You shall endeavor to restore annual Parliaments:' and again, 'I will endeavor, (and if I live, will assuredly attempt it,) to convince the English nation.' If it had not been seen in the original Letter, this peculiarity would have remained unknown; for, being so glaringly improper, it was corrected by the printer in the first Edition. The same cause has prevented it from very frequently appearing in the Works of Sir Philip Francis; but in the *Observations on Mr. Hastings's Narrative*, printed in 1786., we find at p. 15., 'The artifices imputed to him, by which he is said to have endeavored to elude payment,' at p. 20., 'I endeavor to fulfil your orders,' and at p. 58., 'The odium of a vindictive, sanguinary character, which the narrative endeavors to fix' etc. The repetition of the error in all these cases proves that it was not accidental. Again, Junius says to Lord Mansfield, 'I feel for human nature, when I see a man gifted as you are, descend to such vile practise,' Edn. 1772. (l. 230.) Sir Philip Francis on March 7, 1786. in moving an amendment to the India Bill of 1784., says, p. 63. 'Of the present Minister I am ready to admit that so base a practise is not to be suspected'; at p. 70. he mentions 'the practise and the wisdom of England ever since Parliaments had a being,' and in his admirable Speech on the Revenue Charge, published in 1787. he speaks p. 108. of 'a principle the most profligate, the most corrupt, the most dangerous, I will not say that ever was avowed; for no man ever avowed such a principle before; but that ever was admitted into the practise of any Government.' In Writings so correct as those of Junius, and with men so well educated as Sir P. Francis these partial aberrations from the right road are the more singular: and for my own part, I think that *they alone* are sufficient to settle the controversy." Mr. Taylor p. 380.

Mr. T. in p. 137-9. smiles at the advocate for Burke, when the latter says certain 'specimens of inverted construction' in Burke, corresponding to the style of Junius, would be *wholly satisfactory to his mind*. And yet the said advocate might fairly retort on Mr. Taylor, who attaches so much and too much importance to these orthographical mistakes common to Junius and Sir Philip Francis. A single instance of such mistakes occurring in any Writer of the same period is sufficient to overturn Mr. Taylor's argument, and such an instance may, no doubt, be found, if it be worth while to search for it. In the present day indeed

Mr. Valpy uniformly prints 'endeavor' for 'endeavour,' and rejects the *u* in all cases. Mr. Taylor does not seem to be aware that in those early days, when Junius wrote, the same Writer often differs from himself in his orthography even in the same Letter. I found this to be the case in respect to some Letters of General Lee, of which the originals were laid before me through the kindness of a friend.

XX. Had the Author of Junius drawn as much wisdom from life, as he did from books,—had he been accustomed to the busy hum of men,—had he frequented the crowded halls of Nobles,—had he often championed popular rights in multitudinous assemblies, the harsher features of his mind would have been gradually softened; cunning would have taught him the necessity of pretending to feel human sympathies, if his heart had not been opened to generous sensibilities; he would have maintained his opinions, though in a more subdued tone, with the same intellectual energy; he would have still pursued the public criminals, but would not have forgotten what was due to public decorum; the courtesies of society would have been generally observed, and some kind of specious respect would have been habitually shewn to noble rank, and elevated station, and commanding influence, and high reputation, and professional fame, and sacred royalty. Junius is the only well-educated Writer, who seems not in these points to have felt the ordinary feelings of mankind; and how shall we account for this perfect independence of mind and this reckless heart of steel, except by supposing him to have been particularly circumstanced, to have been placed in unavoidable seclusion, or to have indulged in solitary majesty? If, then, there be any force in this argument, it operates against the claims made for Burke and Sir Philip Francis, whilst it strongly favours the pretensions of Lloyd.

XXI. Junius gives to us the notion of a Writer not early trained to habits of composition, not much accustomed to deliver his opinions in public, through the press; and if there be any force in this argument, it militates in some measure against the claims of Sir Philip Francis, and most strongly against the claims of Burke. The understanding of Junius belonged to the highest order of intellect; but it had not been well and constantly exercised by free discussions, in the intimacy of social life, with kindred spirits, and therefore was not capable of exerting its fullest powers. His thoughts were more profound than comprehensive; he could seize a single topic, and handle it with greater effect than any other man, but he could not grasp a vast subject; he could lay his finger on the central point, but could not span the ample circumference; he saw distinctly the column before his eyes, but his vision was not enlarged enough to enable him to form a correct judgment on the fair proportions of an extensive building, surveying with mechanical precision the height and the breadth of every separate part, and with a master's knowledge the harmony of the entire structure. Now, while Burke had, like Junius, a microscopic eye, he at the same time always took a wide and extensive view of the subjects, which came under his discussion, and he in this respect leaves Junius at an immeasurable distance. Burke analyses his topics with the skill of science, pursues them with the penetration of philosophy, details them with the fidelity of history, illustrates them with the diligence of criticism, and impresses the reader with the strongest admiration of his ample and capacious and comprehensive and universal mind. Junius exerts his mightiest efforts, and apparently exhausts himself, like a brilliant flame consumed in its own ebullition: Burke displays his energies without losing his power; like the luminary of day, retiring in golden splendour, his 'globe of light looking larger as he sets.'

I have the honour to be, Sir,
your respectful Servant,
E. H. BARKER.

Thetford, Feb. 1, 1827.

Mills, Printer, Thetford.