

**THE LETTERS OF
JUNIUS: IN TWO
VOLUMES, VOL. II**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9781760578985

The letters of Junius: in two volumes, Vol. II by Junius

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

JUNIUS

**THE LETTERS OF
JUNIUS: IN TWO
VOLUMES, VOL. II**

THE
LETTERS OF JUNIUS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

A NEW EDITION, WITH PLATES.

STAT NOMINIS UMBRA.

London :

PRINTED FOR VERNOR, HOOD, AND SHARPE; J. WALKER;
J. CUTHELL; LONGMAN, HURST, REES, AND ORME;
J. AND J. RICHARDSON; LACKINGTON, ALLEN, AND
CO.; OTRIDGE AND SON; J. FAULDER; J. MURRAY;
W. STEWART; AND R. SCHOLEY.

1810.

CONTENTS.

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Page</i>
33. TO the Printer of the Public Advertiser	1
39. To the Printer of the Public Advertiser	10
40. To Lord North	25
41. To the Right Hon. Lord Mansfield	29
42. To the Printer of the Public Advertiser	44
43. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	55
44. Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser . . .	59
45. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	73
46. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	75
47. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	79
48. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	81
49. Junius to the Duke of Grafton	85
50. To his Grace the Duke of Grafton	91
51. From the Rev. Mr. Horne to Junius	97
52. Junius to the Rev. Mr. Horne	100
53. From the Rev. Mr. Horne to Junius	104
54. Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser . . .	121
55. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	133
56. The Rev. Mr. Horne to Junius	136
57. Junius to his Grace the Duke of Grafton	138
58. Addressed to the Livery of London	145
59. To the Printer of the Public Advertiser	149
60. Philo Junius to the Printer of the Public Advertiser	161
61. Philo Junius to Zeno	164
62. Philo Junius to an Advocate in the cause of the People	171
63. Observations by a Friend of Junius in answer to a Barrister at Law	173

<i>Letter</i>	<i>Page</i>
64. Declarations in behalf of Junius - - - - -	176
65. Junius to Lord Chief Justice Mansfield - - - - -	180
66. Junius engages to make good his Charge against Lord Mansfield - - - - -	181
67. Junius to the Duke of Grafton - - - - -	182
68. To Lord Chief Justice Mansfield - - - - -	187
69. To the Right Hon. Lord Camden - - - - -	219

THE
LETTERS OF JUNIUS.

LETTER XXXVIII.

TO THE
PRINTER OF THE PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

SIR,

April 3, 1770.

IN my last letter I offered you my opinion of the truth and propriety of his Majesty's answer to the City of London, considering it merely as the speech of a Minister, drawn up for his own defence, and delivered, as usual, by the Chief Magistrate. I would separate, as much as possible, the King's personal character and behaviour from the acts of the present government. I wish it to be understood that his Majesty had, in effect, no more concern in the substance of what he said, than Sir James Hodges had in the remonstrance; and that as Sir James, in virtue of his office, was obliged to speak the senti-

ments of the people, his Majesty might think himself bound, by the same official obligation, to give a graceful utterance to the sentiments of his Minister. The cold formality of a well-repeated lesson is widely distant from the animated expression of the heart.

This distinction, however, is only true with respect to the measure itself. The consequences of it reach beyond the Minister, and materially affect his Majesty's honour. In their own nature, they are formidable enough to alarm a man of prudence, and disgraceful enough to afflict a man of spirit. A subject, whose sincere attachment to his Majesty's person and family is founded upon rational principles, will not, in the present conjuncture, be scrupulous of alarming, or even of afflicting, his Sovereign. I know there is another sort of loyalty, of which his Majesty has had plenty of experience. When the loyalty of Tories, Jacobites, and Scotchmen, has once taken possession of an unhappy Prince, it seldom leaves him without accomplishing his destruction. When the poison of their doctrines has tainted the natural benevolence of his disposition, when their insidious counsels have corrupted the *stamina* of his government, what antidote can restore him to his political health and honour, but the firm sincerity of his English subjects?

It has not been usual, in this country, at least since the days of Charles the First, to see the Sovereign

personally at variance, or engaged in a direct altercation with his subjects. Acts of grace and indulgence are wisely appropriated to him, and should constantly be performed by himself. He never should appear but in an amiable light to his subjects. Even in France, as long as any ideas of a limited monarchy were thought worth preserving, it was a maxim that no man should leave the royal presence discontented. They have lost or renounced the moderate principles of their government; and now, when their parliaments venture to remonstrate, the tyrant comes forward, and answers absolutely for himself. The spirit of their present constitution requires that the King should be feared; and the principle, I believe, is tolerably supported by the fact. But, in our political system, the theory is at variance with the practice; for the King should be beloved. Measures of greater severity may, indeed, in some circumstances, be necessary: but the Minister who advises, should take the execution and odium of them entirely upon himself. He not only betrays his master, but violates the spirit of the English constitution, when he exposes the chief magistrate to the personal hatred or contempt of his subjects. When we speak of the firmness of government, we mean an uniform system of measures, deliberately adopted, and resolutely maintained, by the Servants of the Crown; not a peevish asperity in the language and behaviour of the Sovereign. The government of a weak and irresolute monarch, may be wise, moderate, and firm; that of

an obstinate, capricious prince, on the contrary, may be feeble, undetermined, and relaxed. The reputation of public measures depends upon the Minister, who is responsible; not upon the King, whose private opinions are not supposed to have any weight against the advice of his council, and whose personal authority should, therefore, never be interposed in public affairs. This, I believe, is true, constitutional doctrine. But for a moment let us suppose it false. Let it be taken for granted, that an occasion may arise, in which a King of England shall be compelled to take upon himself the ungrateful office of rejecting the petitions, and censuring the conduct, of his subjects; and let the City remonstrance be supposed to have created so extraordinary an occasion. On this principle, which I presume no friend of Administration will dispute, let the wisdom and spirit of the Ministry be examined. They advise the King to hazard his dignity, by a positive declaration of his own sentiments: they suggest to him a language full of severity and reproach. What follows? When his Majesty had taken so decisive a part in support of his Ministry and Parliament, he had a right to expect from them a reciprocal demonstration of firmness in their own cause, and of their zeal for his honour. He had reason to expect (and such, I doubt not, were the blustering promises of Lord North) that the persons whom he had been advised to charge with having failed in their respect to him, with having injured Parliament, and violated the principles of the consti-