

old "hue and cry" and turnout of the neighborhood, anyone having the right to bring down the fleeing thief). The debtor, drawing a knife, stabs Ailward in the arm, binds him as a "thief manifest," and takes him back to the house which he had broken open. A crowd collects, among the number a public summoner or prosecutor named Fulc. This knave, in view of the fact that the things taken were of too small value for a judgment of mutilation, craftily suggests the adding of other things to the theft. This is agreed, and a pack containing skins, a mantle, linen and other things, is put upon Ailward. Next day the prisoner is led forth, with his pack on his back, to receive judgment.

Matters by this time, however, had gone rather far; and it was thought best not to be in haste about passing sentence "de re dubia." Judgment was accordingly deferred for a month, the prisoner remaining in custody. (This, it should be noticed, is a picture of the law which permitted summary punishment, without full and formal trial, in the case of thieves taken in the act.)

Later the prisoner was led to another town, where magistrates had assembled, for trial. He now demands battle with Fulc, or the ordeal of fire. But with the assent of Fulc, who had accepted the bribe of an ox, Ailward is adjudged to undergo the ordeal of water. A month later, having failed in an ordeal which had been so arranged that escape from conviction was impossible, the unfortunate man is led forth to receive final sentence of mutilation, which is duly executed; "oculis effossis et virilibus abscisis mutilatus est, quae multitudine vidente plebis terrae infossa sunt."

The conduct of Fulc in this affair reminds one of the speech of the Summoner, in the *Canterbury Tales* of the next century; from which it appears that that officer was still true, in Chaucer's day, to the old traditions.

"Now, certes," quod this somonour, "so fare I;
I spare nat to taken, God it woot,
But if it be to hevy or to hoot,
What I may gete in conseil prively:
No maner conscience of that have I;
Nere [but for] myn extorcioun I myghte nat lyven,
Nor of swiche japes [such tricks] wol I nat be shryven.
Stomak, ne conscience, ne knowe I noon;
I shrewe [curse] these shrifte-faders everychoon."

—*Cant. Tales. ll. 11476 et seq.*

Melville M. Bigelow, in *Columbia Jurist*,

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

(*Quebec Official Gazette, Feb. 6.*)

Judicial Abandonments.

Charles E. Kennedy and Saval Girard (Kennedy & Girard), tinsmiths, Sherbrooke. Jan. 29.
Mulligan & Moore, district of Ottawa. Jan. 27.
J. Bte. Pagnuelo, trader, St. Hyacinthe. Feb. 3.
Dame Marie Caroline Duval, "J. O. Norman & Cie.," Montreal. Jan. 29.
Louis Gonzague Renouf, wheelright, Trois-Pistoles. Jan. 25.

Curators Appointed.

Joseph Perrier, Montreal.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint curator. Feb. 2.
N. Lavoie & Cie., joiners and contractors, Levis.—Henry A. Bédard, Quebec, curator. Feb. 2.
Dame Eugénie Demers, marchande publique, Chambly Basin.—Angus McKay, Montreal, curator. Jan. 27.

Dividend Sheets.

Re D. H. Rochon, district of Bedford. First div. sheet open to objection until Feb. 23.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re Pierre Déry, Quebec. First and final div. sheet open to objection until Feb. 22.—Ed. Begin, Quebec, curator.

Re Henri Lavallé, Montreal. First and final div. sheet open to objection until Feb. 15.—C. Desmarteau, Montreal, curator.

Re Joseph T. Denis, Montreal.—First div. sheet open to objection until Feb. 18.—L. P. Bruneau, Montreal, curator.

Actions en séparation de biens.

Dame Corinne Collin vs. Charles Normandin, hotel-keeper, Longueuil. Feb. 1.

Dame Marie Mathilde Nobert vs. Maxime Plante, trader, Brompton. Feb. 2.

Dame Philomène Trudeau vs. Anselme Plamondon, trader, St. Marcel. Feb. 2.

Dame Mary Ann Lafond vs. Athanase Douville, trader, St. Casimir. Feb. 3.

GENERAL NOTES.

METAPHORS.—In *Vickers v. The Atlantic, &c. Railway Company* (64 Ga. 306), the Supreme Court of Georgia said: "A nonsuit is a process of legal mechanics. The case is chopped off, and only in a clear gross case is this mechanical treatment proper. Where there is any doubt, another method is to be used—a method involving a sort of mental chemistry; and the chemists of the law are the jury. They are supposed to be able to examine every molecule of evidence and to feel every shock and tremor of its probative force."

LAW BOOKS IN 1885.—The production of law books showed a decrease last year, although there was an increase over the production of 1883. One hundred and fifty-one books were reviewed in these columns last year, of which sixty-nine were new editions, and eighty-two new books. In 1884 one hundred and seventy-two were reviewed, and in 1883 one hundred and forty-four. The decrease is mainly due to the fact that the Session of 1885 was not prolific in legislation, while the contrary was the case in 1884.—*Law Journal*, (London).

A Russian journal gives an account of a curious lawsuit. A rich lady, at her death, placed her pet dog Gypsy in the hands of a friend, with the request to provide for her with the annual interest on a thousand rubles, set aside for that purpose in her testament. The other day Gypsy died, and the lady who had charge of her took it for granted that the money was now her own. Another lady, however, appeared on the scene, who owned a son of Gypsy, and claimed that her dog was heir to the income of the thousand rubles, since nothing was said in the testament regarding the disposal of this money after the death of Gypsy.