principle of justice; they appear as severe now as in the early days of the Republic, when the Chief Justice of Massachusetts, and his associates, were indicted for Sunday travelling. Charity and necessity alone saved the Sabbath-traveller from punishment. A poor shoemaker, in Massachusetts, was imprisoned for hoeing a few hills of potatoes early one Sunday morning; although he had been unable to finish them the night before, even by working at them by moonlight (*State* v. *Josselyn*, 97 Mass., 411.) The poor wretch ought to have been mindful of the proverb, *ne sutor ultra crepidem.*

Even in Arkansas a man was indicted for cutting his grain on Sunday, although it was suffering from over-ripeness and he had been unable to get a machine before Saturday night (*State* v. *Goff*, 20 Ark., 289.) One can scarcely imagine the Scribes and Pharisees of old being much more stringent in their interpretations of the command, 'Remember the Sabbath day.' Blowing one's own horn is unlawful in Massachusetts on Sunday (*Com.* v. *Knox*, 6 Mass., 76.) The author remarks that this gives one a vivid idea of the amount of self-denial exercised by the Bostonians on that day. The decision reminds one of the unfortunate stranger in Toronto, who was arrested for playing a fiddle in his back room, fined heavily and admonished by the Police Magistrate. (4 U. C. L. J., N. S. 165.)

Visiting one's father is a work of necessity and charity (*Logan* v. *Mathews*, 6 Penn. Lt. 417); whether calling on one's sweetheart is so was discussed, but not decided (*Buffington* v. *Swansy*, 2 Am. Law Rev. 235.) Our author informs us that a will made on Sunday is valid, seemingly on the ground that many good words and pious expressions are therein contained.

Under "The Law of Necessaries" we are told that a wife's necessaries are to be judged not by the real, but by the apparent or assumed position, of the husband: 'The lawful measure of mercantile phlebotomy seems to be what the husband's apparent venous system will afford.' New bonnets have doubtless been necessaries ever since the days of St. Paul; still the courts have been rather severe upon ladies in the matter of millinery. Lord Abinger, in one case, declared that the expenditure of £5,287 on bonnets, laces, feathers and ribbons in less than a year, was extravagant (*Lane* v. *Ironmonger*, 13 M. & W. 368,) and that a husband was not bound to pay £67 for a sea-side suit for his wife, when he had forbidden her going to the watering place (*Atkins* v. *Curwood*, 7 C. & P. 759.) But a lawyer has had to pay £94 for silver fringes to a petticoat and side-saddle, which his spouse considered an essential (Stair, 349).

In Vermont a man was made to pay for his wife's false teeth (*Gilman* v. *Andrews*, 20 Vt. 241.) In the Republic a husband has not to pay for the file wherewith a wife seeks to sever the marriage fetters (*Coffin* v. *Dunham*, 8 Cush. 404). Less happy are the Benedicts of this side of the line, for they have to advance money, and pay the wife's costs in alimony suits. As to infants, "treats" are not necessaries (*Brooker* v. *Scott*, 11 M. & W., 67); nor are betting-books (*Genner* v. *Walker*, 3 Am. Law Rev. 590.) Sergeant Hawkins asserted that for a youth of twenty summers a wife was not a necessary, and that even if she were, a baby was not (*Harrison* v. *Fane*, 1 M. & G. 550.) Nor will the Court allow a tailor's bill of £840, for 19 coats, 45 waistcoats, 38 pairs of pants, &c., purchased within thirteen months (*Barghard* v. *Angerstein*, 6 C. & P. 690).

Mr. Browne discourses pleasantly on the subject of wagers, but his texts are well-known English decisions. In his