

wise *Jarndyce v. Jarndyce*, but only the other day Mr. Justice Chitty had to deal with a case which was started as long ago as 1747! Here is its history as given by a legal journal:

"A petition was presented to Mr. Justice Chitty, in the case of *Greenhill v. Chauncey*, for the payment out of certain shares in the accumulation of a sum of money which was paid into court under an order of the old Court of Chancery in 1747. The original Greenhill and Chauncey appear to have been partners in the Temple Mills Brass Works, and there were also other persons interested in the firm. Squabbles took place over their respective shares in the business, and some time before 1747 they went to the Court of Chancery for a settlement of the dispute, little dreaming that '*Greenhill v. Chauncey*' would still figure in the court list towards the end of the nineteenth century. In the course of the litigation the sum of £1,221 12s. 7d. was paid into court, and invested in South Sea annuities. That sum had grown to the considerable figure of £14,243 6s. 2d., and was claimed by the legal personal representatives of certain of the original partners in the Temple Mills Brass Works, on whose behalf the petition was presented on Saturday. Mr. Justice Chitty intimated that 'Government duties' would absorb a large part of the £14,000, that the claimants would have to prove their title at their own expense, and that it was doubtful what they would receive."

To what extent the prolongation of these ancient and notable suits was due to bribery and corruption will never be known. But certain it is, as before hinted, that in the good old days of the Court of Chancery the long purse could always command a long suit if justice would have been served by a short one. It was quite an understood thing that payment to judges and judicial underlings would either expedite or delay proceedings according to circumstances and the due demands of justice.

The Scotch judges, belonging to a practical people, placed bribery on a plain business footing. By an order of the Court of Session, or Act of Sederunt, particular hours of the day were appointed at which the judges might be "solicited" at their own houses. This, after all, was better than the hypocrisy of Bacon—intellectually, one of the greatest sons of England; morally, one of the most base. For slandering the Lord Chancellor, Wraynham, an unhappy country gentleman, was dragged before