

accidental looker-on, of the fine for fair play, of that for foul play; it matters much, if one dog is killed, whether they engaged in the fight with the cognizance of both their masters or not, and whether the owners be present or not. It is a question of importance whether the dogs were set on by a sane adult, an infant, or an irresponsible fool. We are told who, under the varying circumstances, is to pay for things spoiled by the fighting dogs scrabbling round with their feet.

As, however, peace now reigns throughout the world, we will not speak of animals that delight to bark and bite, but will talk of cats—peaceful, quiet tabbies.

The book says: "The cat is exempt from liability for eating the food which he finds in the kitchen owing to negligence in taking care of it: but so that it was not taken from the security of a house or vessel, and if it was so taken, the case as regards the food is like that of a profitable worker with a weapon, and the case as regards the cat is like that of an idler without a weapon, and it is safe to kill the cat in the case." "The cat is exempt from liability for injuring an idler in catching mice, when mousing: and half fine is due from him for the profitable worker whom he may injure, and the excitement of his mousing takes the other half off him." All this means that if a cat has done a wrong in eating food or when mousing, the intention of the wrong doer is considered. The cat which steals food is simply a wrong doer so far as that specific act is concerned, and is to be considered as an "idler" (that is, as a person who has no excuse or justification for the act committed.) But if the food stolen has been left in its way through the negligence of the owner, this carelessness is set off against the theft, and no damages given. But if the owner of the food has not been careless, and the cat has stolen it out of a place in which it might reasonably be considered secure, then the owner of the food is to be considered as a profitable worker (that is, one whose conduct entitles him to a full amount of damage) and he can use against the cat and its owner all the rights exercised by the owner of a house against a thief who breaks into his precinct *vi et armis*. In the second case the cat being engaged in its legitimate busi-