

made by somebody. What is more, not only has it been made, but by some judge whose duty it is to give to real laws the effect of law—the effect of a law, as if it were a real law, has been given to it. The effect? and what effect? exactly the same as if the words which it is composed of were so many words, constituting the whole or a part of some really existing law.

In the words in question, the rule in question, was it then ever declared before? If *not*, then in truth and effect, though not in words, the Judge by whom this rule is declared to be a rule of law, does, in so declaring it, and acting upon it, take upon himself to make a law; to make *a* law; and this is the pretended law he takes upon him to make.

If it *was* declared before, then not having been made by a legislator it must have had for its maker some person, be he who he may, of whom thus much is known, viz: that in the matter in question no right had he to make law; for its maker, either some Judge—that is, a man who does not pretend to have any right to make law, or some other man who was still further from having any such right than a Judge is. At any rate, not having been made by any one of your respective legislatures, this thing then, which, by your Judges and your other lawyers, is passed off upon you as and for *a rule of law*, viz: of English Common Law—if not by a Judge by whom, then, was it made? for *laws* do not make themselves any more than *snare*s or *scourges*.

Of all persons, who, on the making of it, can be supposed to have had a part, the only individual in relation to whom you can have any complete assurance of his having had a part in the making of it is a *printer*: the *printer* by whom the first printed book in which it was to be found was printed.

But, though it is not without example for the man by whom a book is printed to have been himself the author of it, examples of this sort are comparatively rare. In the case, then, here you have *two* persons who have each of