

opposition, is a very great mistake; for the motives of her opponents, undoubtedly, were to prevent the future appearance of any more such trash in the *MEDLEY*, tho' the effect of their opposition has proved very different from what they could have wished, yea it is like raising three demons by an attempt to lay one. In regard to their saying I know nothing about the friends of Miss FEMES; I would inform them that by friends I mean her sex in general, therefore, were I disposed to apply the *worms* of the Post again in the present case, they must redouble their force. They, with a considerable degree of confidence, affirm that I am no Bachelor: a belief of this, I conclude is the reason of their treating me with so little politeness. It appears a little extraordinary that they should suppose the public would pay so much difference to their critical authority as to consider "*arresting & branding*," in various terms. It likewise appears equally extraordinary, that they should assert that they "*expected to see the word had immediately precede the word ought*"—In answer to this, I would inform them (if the language be intelligible) that "*ought*" is in the indicative mode present tense; and therefore, as "*had*" belongs to the past tense, it could not have preceded it with propriety. But since they are such sticklers for propriety, I would ask them what they mean by saying, they "*expected to see*," &c. Had they heard what my sentence was before they saw it? Then they knew that "*had*" did not precede "*ought*"—If not, when they read it they most certainly knew it did not.

Furthermore, they seem to complain of my imposing "*so many hard epithets upon the ears of a female*," viz: "*Martial field, yawning gulf, frowning precipice, cruel tiger, bloody panther, ravenous lion*—specially the three last, where either adjective would apply with equal propriety to each beast of prey." This I deny; but that either of these adjectives would apply to each beast of prey with propriety, I readily acknowledge. It is not a little surprising, that Ladies, who profess to be such great novel readers should object to these adjectives as being harsh and grating to the ear.

For how frequently do these novel writers depict the distress of the sailor, when the heavens gather blackness, the forked lightnings dart, and the foaming billows roar; and not only so, but how often do they likewise, even relate duels and suicide.—It is very surprising that Ladies, who pretend to carry delicacy to such an extraordinary aim, should have the daring insolence to treat the public in such an abominable indelicate manner; as they have by their commenting upon two particular words, which Miss FEMES used, and which from complaisance to the public, I shall not particularly point out. Now I will appeal to an impartial public, whether this comports with the extreme bustle, which they have made about delicacy?—Or does it not evidently imply that the shadow is thus insisted upon because the substance is wanting? For Ladies of true delicacy would sooner brook an indelicate expression than even repeat, much more expatiate upon it. Here I might so enlarge as, perhaps, to throw very considerable light on the subject, but as I am unwilling to hurt their feelings in so tender a point, I shall suspend it unless I hear from them again. I shall now proceed to note, and point out some improprieties and grammatical errors, which I shall charge upon them; in which should any say that I quibble, the answer is, I am after quibbling creatures. The first which I shall mention are in Miss FEMES production, and which I consider may justly be imputed to them, as they have pronounced it "*UNEXCEPTIONABLE*" aside from those errors, which they have pointed out. I begin with this—"*Which never can be changed in a state of mutability*." "*What a distracting emphasis to behold*." "*Now I would wish to know how any thing can, with propriety, be said to be perfectly unchangeable in a state of changeableness*." I grant that it is possible it never will be changed, yet if so, it does not come within our cognizance. Again—The true meaning of emphasis is a particular, or remarkable stress upon a word, which may be heard, but how it can be seen is a little unaccountable. Further—She uses "*THEIR*," which is a pronominal adjective in the plural number, in connexion with "*HAND*," which is a noun in the singular number.—But no wonder they did not see this, as it is consistent with their own grammar, where they say—"*Pitch upon some ONE of their acquaintance, tell private stories of THEM*," &c. Finally, I will appeal both to the literati, and public in general, whether these *Bookworms* have by their criticisms, done any honor to themselves, or the female sex in general. I must confess when I saw—"*Report of a select committee from the Belle Assemblée*," &c. &c. &c.

expectations were considerably raised, and therefore, perused it with eagerness; upon which I could not but exclaim—*Montes parturiant et nascitur ridiculus mus*.—The mountain labored and brought forth a ridiculous mouse. ALONZO.



For the *MEDLEY*, &c.

"*Wit, widew'd of good sense, is worse than naught; It hoists more sails to run against a rock. Thus, a half-CHESTERFIELD is quite a fool; Whom dull fools scorn, and bless their want of wit.*"

Mr. SPOONER,

THE select committee of the Belle Assemblée having been so polite to you, and beneficently indulgent to me, as to vouchsafe the privilege of my writing again; I shall consequently proceed to make a few remarks upon their chaotic production. The first step, in this stupendous work, is an attempt to prove the validity and legitimacy of their mission; which most be considered as a plain proof of its illegitimacy.—For an honest man will never attempt to prove his title to a thing, previously to its being disputed; but it is peculiarly characteristic of a knave that he will endeavor to bring the most incontestible evidence of his title, tho' none dispute it.—Whoever knew a newly created Justice to issue his first warrant with a long preamble to prove the legitimacy of his commission? Another very corroborative evidence, that their title to this Censorship is not just, is their affirming it to be "*founded on the nature and fitness of things*," or in other words, founded on reason.—Now was this a truth, the effects would be rational; for a pure fountain cannot send forth dirty water. A still further proof that they are impostors, is their endeavor to blend the *terms, truth and falsehood*—which appears from their using this phrase, "*Tells serious truths in a lying manner*." This I imagine must be done from a sense that their whole fabric of consistency depends entirely on the single point, of making *truth and falsehood* convertible terms.—But what puts the matter beyond all doubt, is their open and public attack upon me, whom they consider as belonging to a *kingdom* with which the United States are at peace; for this is directly contrary to the laws of the land, which deposit the power of proclaiming war and making peace, solely in the hands of Congress. Hence I think it is evident, even to a demonstration, that they are the *profelytes* of Mr. Genet; and therefore ought to be reprobated by every true Republican. But I shall now attend more particularly to some of those philological animadversions, which these impertinent connoisseurs have made on me. They begin with saying, that I "*mounted the rostrum as gravely, metaphysically*," &c.—Now I wish to know what propriety there is in laying that I mounted the *MEDLEY* metaphysically, &c.—They likewise say that Miss FEMES "*has proved to the world that the sex can write*." If by writing is meant nothing more than to form legible characters with a pen; it is readily granted that she has proved it; and so likewise have they, and may therefore in the strictest justice claim an equal share of the honor, which it has reflected on the sex. Respecting the merit of her performance, being the cause of so much