

mean everything; whilst padding and pedantic discursiveness are things to be abhorred.

Having premised so much as to the recognized canons of method in the making of law-books, let me briefly mention some of the instances in which I conceive Mr. Beven to be guilty of heretical practices in relation thereto.

In the first place, he materially and frequently lessens the utility of his book by paying too much attention to principles of law which are sometimes not at all cognate to his subject, and at other times but remotely connected with it. In chapter I. of volume I., which is ostensibly devoted to a definition of negligence in law, he employs a couple of pages in considering, in the abstract, the power of a judge to nonsuit in an action, a matter in respect of which one would naturally seek enlightenment in a work on procedure. In chapter II. of volume II. he strays again from his chosen path to inform his readers, at great length, what constitutes a common carrier, a subject obviously belonging to a treatise on contract. In the same volume he repeats his offence more seriously by devoting no small portion of the eighty odd pages of chapter IV. to a consideration of the doctrine of estoppel apart from its bearing on negligence. Many more instances of errantry of this sort might be given would space permit, but I must now pass on to demonstrate another feature of discursiveness in the book even more unpardonable than the one I have already indicated. Indeed, the work is plethoric with examples of the sort of divagation I am about to mention, but I must content myself with noticing one or two of the more notable instances of it. In chapter II. (volume I., p. 28) our author launches out into a most pedantic dissertation, which fairly bristles with irrelevant matter, in discussing the rule of *diligentia diligentissimi* as applicable to the due performance of a contract. One of the footnotes to the above-mentioned page is so pre-eminently characteristic of the author's style that I cannot forbear quoting it *in extenso* :—"This" (the inexpediency of the rule in question) "may be illustrated by a passage from Lady Holland's 'Life of the Rev. Sydney Smith': 'It requires long apprenticeship to speak well in the House of Commons. It is the most formidable ordeal in the world. Few men have succeeded who entered it late in life: Jeffrey is perhaps the best exception. Bobus used to say that there was more sense and good