

THE REPORTERS AND TEXT WRITERS.

tion to legal literature.”—Williams, J., in *Maitland v. Graham*, C. B., 14th November, 1860.

MODERN REPORTS.—“The Modern Reports are a very loose compilation.” Blackburn, J., in *Regina v. Allen*, 8 Jur. N. S. 231. “The book called ‘The Modern Reports’ is not of very high authority.”—Best Ev. 745, 4th ed.

MODERN REPORTS, VOL. VII.—“As to the degree of authority to be ascribed to this volume, there is a very great distinction to be made between the first edition and the last. The former appeared in a most imperfect state, and fully deserved the censures which it received from the lawyers of the period. The last edition, revised from the authentic manuscripts, appeared in 1796, under the supervision of Mr. Leach, and has always enjoyed a high authority.”—Law Magazine and Law Review, November, 1863, p. 139.

MODERN REPORTS, VOL. VIII.—“Notoriously inaccurate and of no authority.”—Bayley, J., in *The King v. Williams*, 3 M. & R. 405.

MODERN REPORTS, VOL. IX.—“The ninth Modern is worse than the tenth.”—Littledale, J., in *Doe v. Asby*, 10 Ad. & El. 73. “A case in 9 Mod. with respect to which I may say that there are no reports upon which less reliance can be placed.”—Dr. Lushington, in *the Goods of C. Spitty*, 16 Jur. 92.

MODERN REPORTS, VOL. XII.—“Not a book of any authority.”—Buller, J., in *The King v. Lyme Regis*, 1 Dougl. 83. Kent, J., in *The People v. Guernsey*, 3 Johns. Cas. 266. “A book of no authority and very small repute, published by an anonymous reporter.”—Savage, C. J., in *Ellsworth v. Thompson*, 13 Wend. 658.

MOORE (SIR FRANCIS) REPORTS.—“Moore is a very accurate reporter.”—Lord Ellenborough in *Whitbread v. Jenney*, 2 J. P. Smith, 126.

NOY’S REPORTS.—“In the first place it is to be observed, that Noy’s Reports are of no credit; they being, according to Mr. Hargrave, only loose notes, compiled from his papers, by Serjeant Size, and imposed upon the world as genuine. But the case itself is solitary and anomalous, and cannot be law.”—Kent, C. J. in *Tillitson v. Cheetham*, 2 Johns. 72.

OLIPHANT ON HORSES.—“An excellent work.”—Willes, J., in *Howard v. Sheward*, L. R. 2 C. P. 151.

ORTOLAN. DIPLOMATIE DE LA MER.—“The work of a French naval officer, but of which a jurist might be proud.”—Willes, J., in *Lloyd v. Guibert*, 35 L. J. N. S. (Q. B.) 79.

PERRER WILLIAMS’S REPORTS.—The edition by Messrs. Morris, Lowndes, and Randall is an “ex-

cellent edition.”—Lord Brougham, 3 House of Lords Cases, 130.

PHILLIPS ON INSURANCE.—“I take Phillips on Insurance to be a masterly book.”—Erle, C. J., in *Carr v. Montefiore*, 5 Best & Smith, 430. “A very able and learned work.”—Willes, J., in *Ionides v. The Universal Marine Insurance Co.* 10 Jur. N. S. 21, 22.

POTHIER. TREATISE ON THE LAW OF CONTRACTS.—“It is remarkable for the accuracy of the principles contained in it, the perspicuity of its arrangement, and the elegance of its style.”—Lord Tenterden. Preface to his Treatise on Shipping.

RAYMOND (ROBERT, LORD) REPORTS.—Fifth edition, by C. J. Gale, Vol. I., 8vo. pp. 568, London, 1832. “An excellent edition.”—1 Smith L. C. 269, 6th London ed.

“A case reported by Lord Raymond himself, and therefore an authentic report.”—Blackburn, J., in *Winsor v. The Queen*, L. R. 1 Q. B. 318.

RUSSELL ON CRIMES, ED. GREAVES.—“The editor of Russell on Crimes is known as a gentleman of great learning, ability, and research.”—Pollock, C. B., in *Regina v. Curgervsen*, L. R. 1 C. C. 3.

SALKELD’S REPORTS, VOL. III.—“The third volume of Salkeld has always been considered apocryphal.”—Willes, J., in *Iderton v. Castrique*, 14 C. B. N. S. 106. 1 Smith, L. C. 56, 5th London ed. Parsons, C. J., 8 Mass. 258.

SAUNDERS’ REPORTS, ED. WILLIAMS.—Martin, B.: “The omission of a case from such a book throws, in my opinion, great doubt upon its authority.” *Dyer v. Best*, 35 L. J. N. S. Exch. p. 106; L. R. 1 Exch. 156.

SEDGWICK ON DAMAGES.—“A most able work.”—Cockburn, C. J., in *Engell v. Fitch*, L. R. 3 Q. B.

SHOWER’S REPORTS.—“A doubtful reporter.”—Lord Abinger, C. B., in *Sunbolf v. Alford*, 3 M. & W. 253.

SIDERFIN’S REPORTS. KEBLE’S REPORTS.—In *Lowe v. Joliffe*, 1 W. Bl. 366 (1763), Lord Mansfield, C. J. is reported to have declared on a trial at bar, that the court “did not then sit there to take its rules of evidence from Siderfin and Keble,” whose reports begin about a century before the time when he was speaking. Best Ev. sec. 109, 5th ed.

SMITH’S LEADING CASES.—Sir Fitzroy Kelly observed, *arguendo*, in the House of Lords, “that he believed that there was not an error to be found in the notes from beginning to end.”—*National Exchange Company of Glasgow v. Dick*, 2 Macqueen, 114, note (1855).