

he might not have been under his *immediate* command. Thus much for the military brother:—now for the civilian. On the 24th of March, in the same year, the Right Honorable Charles Townshend was appointed Secretary at War; and as, to a certain extent, and in a general sense, the whole army may be said to be under the direction of—and, consequently, to *serve under* the Secretary at War; so each individual of the army may, in a general sense, be held to *serve under* him, although he may be, like Charles Townshend, *only a civilian*. The civilian Governor Pownall then, as comptroller-general, in Germany, while the civilian Charles Townshend was Secretary at War, in England, might, without any great stretch of conscience, say—and in a military sense too—that he had *served under* Charles Townshend, although neither the one nor the other of them, was, in a strict sense, a soldier:—the former was *of*—but not *in*—the army,—and the latter was neither *of*—nor *in*—but *over* the army; and both were non-combatants.

‘A consequence of the treaty of Paris, of Feb. 10, 1763, was, the breaking up of the office in the army, in Germany, held by Governor Pownall, and his return to England; soon after which, he took up his residence at RICHMOND, where, it will be recollected, the court of George the Third, was established during the period in which Junius, as chief public political censor, *reigned* in England, unseen, unknown, but not unfelt.’

This, it must be admitted, is somewhat vague and indefinite, for the evidence that should so conclusively prove the “discovery” of Junius; and we rise from the perusal of the volume as a whole, notwithstanding the ingenuity of its line of argument, with an unsatisfactory sense of intangibility in the proof led on behalf of the new claimant for the Junius laurels. Much of this is no doubt inseparable from the very nature of the inquiry, and if some inconceivable discovery, such as it seems too late now to hope for, does not withdraw the mask, it is only by a series of ingenious inferences and analogies that this literary riddle has any chance of being solved. Nevertheless, we must confess to a sense of disappointment at finding our author following the example of previous writers in recognising resemblances between “*peculiarities*” of the Junius letters and of those of their assumed author, which are for the most part only peculiarities of his period; and what shall we say of such logic as this:—

‘Notwithstanding all the *labour* of the author, and the corrections made by the original printer and publisher, “numerous errors of grammar and construction,” says Mr. Butler, in his *Reminiscences*, “are to be discovered in these celebrated letters;” and to the like effect says Dr. Good and Lord Brougham. If such be the case then with writings originally prepared for publication, and subsequently, on republication, corrected, and recorrected, it is scarcely reasonable to look for the elaborated composition of the letters of Junius, in the private letters of Governor Pownall, written as these were without a view of their ever passing beyond the circle of his and his correspondent’s immediate friends. The impartial reader will no doubt bear this in mind, whenever he catches the Governor tripping in his