

of the Lord Chancellor, the two Chief Justices and the Chief Baron, and such a licence was prefixed to subsequent reports, sometimes with the addition of a testimonial to the learning of the author. The Act was renewed, but allowed to expire in May 1695, for reasons not specially affecting law books (i). A licence and testimonial, however, continued to be used. In 1699, upon a case in 2 Modern Reports being cited, "Holt, C.J., in *ira*, said that no books ought to be cited at the bar but those which were licensed by the judges" (k).

The practice of granting licences ceased about the middle of the eighteenth century, at which period the reporters seem to have been as unwilling to apply for licences as the judges were to grant them (l).

In 1765 a new era began with the Reports of Sir James Burrow, whom Lord Campbell places with Douglas, Cowper, and Durnford and East, and calls them "the very best law reporters that have ever appeared in England" (m). In 1785 commenced the Term Reports of Durnford and East. At this time the current reports were not issued for two or three years after the decisions, a condition of affairs which these reporters undertook to remedy, so far as cases in the King's Bench were concerned, by issuing concise reports regularly after the end of each term. Reports on the same principle were afterwards established for the other courts, viz. by Henry Blackstone in the Common Pleas in 1788, by Francis Vesey in the Court of Chancery in 1789, by Anstruther in the Exchequer in 1796, and by Dow in the House of Lords in 1814. These and their successors acquired, with the sanction of the judges, the exclusive right (so far as regarded contemporary reporters) of citation in their respective Courts, and became known as the "regular" or "authorized" reports. The term "regular" was perhaps first applied to denote the regularity of their issue as distinguished from the more dilatory reports, and the term "authorized" indicated that the judges granted facilities to the reporters by furnishing copies of their judgments or revising the reporters' notes of them. This practice of the judges seems to

(i) See 4 Will. & M. c. 24, s. 14, and 15 Lord's Journals, 545 b and 589.

(k) *Bishop of Salisbury v. Phillips*, 1 Lord Raymond, p. 537.

(l) See Preface to Burrow's Reports, p. v.; Preface to Douglas, p. viii.

(m) *Lives of the Chief Justices*, 2nd ed., II., 405. For a comparison between the record of cases in the Year Books and the modern report, see *Law Quarterly Review*, volume xxii., p. 380.