

destroy the comfortable enjoyment of his home, the law will declare the ladies—or rather their classes—a nuisance, and stretch out its strong arm to prevent the continuance of such injurious acts. We never cared for hammered brass anyway (*Re Ladies' Decorative Art Club of Philadelphia*, 37 Alb. L.J. 447).

One by one the beliefs of childhood's happy hours are dispelled. We used to believe in the reality of St. Nicholas, the shooting skill of Tell, the bluebeard character of Henry VIII., the greatness of Elizabeth, the goodness of Charles I., the beauty of Mary Stuart; but we don't know now. We used to think, moreover, that every woman could put any number of pins in her mouth without inconvenience; now the law papers tell us that at Greenwich (England) County Court a widow sued a baker for damages, medical fees, and loss of time, caused by a pin, which had been negligently left in a bath-bun, sticking in her throat, and the judge said, 'Of course it was an unfortunate accident for both parties, but he must give a verdict for the widow' (37 Albany L.J. 206).

Talking of pins and women, a lady in Detroit fell upon a defective sidewalk, and claimed that her right side was paralysed; on the trial, to demonstrate to the jury the loss of feeling in that side, she allowed her medical man to thrust a pin into her. The city authorities objected to the jury pinning their faith to this sort of evidence, but the Court opined that there was no objection to her showing the extent of the paralysis which had supervened by reason of the accident, and that evidence that her right side was insensible to pain certainly tended to show this paralysed condition. The pin by which the experiment was performed was shown to the jury. There was nothing which tended to show any trickery. Counsel were certainly at liberty to examine the pin, and to ascertain whether in fact it was inserted in the flesh; and having failed to exercise this privilege, the Court's opinion was that after verdict it was too late to raise the objection that the exhibition was incompetent (*Osborne v. Detroit*, 26 Alb. L.J. 343). The judge overlooked the possibility of the city attorney being a modest bachelor, and not accustomed to conduct cases against Phrynes.

Apparently ladies do not like to be called 'cats,' nor even to have their mothers called 'cats.' The funny newspaper reporter published an interview between the plaintiff and himself in which the plain iff is represented as saying that her mother had been bitten by a cat and had hydrophobia, that she dreaded the approach of water. . . . that she acted like a cat, purring and mewling, and assuming the attitude of a cat in the effort to catch rats, and did other like acts, and that a wonderful cure of this disease had been effected by a certain medicine called S.S.S., sold by defendants. It was held that all this was libellous (*Stewart v. Swift Specific Company*, 76 Ga. 280). This seems a strange decision, because our own experience has been that girls like to be called Kitty, Pretty Kitty, Dear Kitty, or even Pussy.

It has been decided in Iowa that a wife has no right to chastise her husband, nor provoke him to retaliation by her own violence, foul abuse, and misconduct (*Knight v. Knight*, 31 Iowa, 451); nor has a husband now the right to correct his wife corporally, even though she be insolent to him or drunk (*Com. v. M'Affee*, 108 Mass. 468). The Iowa decision just mentioned accords with the laws of Manu; here we are told that 'a faithful wife who wishes to attain in heaven to the mansion of her husband must do nothing unkind to him, be he living or dead; she must always live with a cheerful temper, with good management in the affairs of the house, with great care of the household furniture, and with a frugal hand in all her expenses. Though enamoured of another woman, or devoid of good qualities, yet a husband must constantly be revered as a god by virtuous women; nor is a second husband allowed to a virtuous woman (chap. v., ss. 158, 150, 154, 162) It is evident that at some time or other the ladies in Persia must have interfered with the men while saying their prayers, now it is the law that no man may perform his devotions in the presence of any woman, who either at his side or before him is also praying; but it will be all right if there is a curtain between the two, or some object which prevents him seeing her; or if the woman is behind the man at such a distance that in prostrating herself she can-