

ples of human society and the great and efficient causes which conduct to national affluence and happiness." To this, as might have been expected, succeeds a paragraph, opening with all the richness, "splendour" of thought, and "magnificence" of diction, of unsullied bathos—and fathomless profound.

"For after all what was the character of ancient conquests—a cruel and brutal butchery—wars of extermination, followed by the iron reign of tyranny. Their wars [another stray relative] dissimilar to those of the middle ages, had no sanctifying purpose like the emancipation of a Holy Land,—to rescue the hallowed birth-place of a Saviour from the impious rule of Saracens and infidels,—nor did they pave the way as in modern times, to the spread and introduction of the arts of peace—civilization—religion. The vanquished became slaves, their property the common spoil of their cohorts and legions."

This is what we have already termed unsullied bathos and fathomless profound. Had the Lecturer intended to have written in English, we would feel at liberty to say, that these two sentences are composed of nine lines, which exemplify false punctuation, false grammar, false diction; and the last sentence, such dark and impenetrable bathos, as to be beyond all hope of a translation into our language. We have first, then, a question asked without a mark of interrogation; we have, in the second place, a relative without an antecedent; we have, in the third place, the word *sanctifying* for *fanatical*; in the fourth place, "the arts of peace—civilization—religion." The art of religion! this is materialism with a vengeance. And in the fifth, and last place, we have "the vanquished became slaves, their property the common spoil of their cohorts and legions." Though this cannot be translated into intelligible English, yet let us try how it would read by a literal transposition of the little English it contains. It would run thus: The vanquished became slaves, the slaves property the common spoil of the slaves cohorts and legions!

If Blackstone had ever met with a sentence of this description in law, we think it would have puzzled him to have interpreted it. Yet though the law says "*proprietas verborum est salus proprietatum*" or, that, the safety of property depends upon propriety in the use of words, yet, this sentence was written, and prepared for the press, by a young member of the law! A single couplet which this suggests, expresses all we wish to say.

"Jacob the scourge of grammar, mark with awe
Nor less revere him, blunderbus of law."

It would extend our critique to an unjustifiable length, to make further extracts from the "field of general remark" before us. Particularly as we find the illustrious Lecturer once more at his