with a caution as to its weight: *Mason* v. *Morgan*, 24 U.C.Q.B. 328; *Thomas* v. *Morgan*, 2 Cr. M. & R. 496. A knowledge that a bull would run at anything red, was held to be evidence of knowledge of the dangerous character of the bull, which had attacked the plaintiff wearing a red necktie: *Hudson* v. *Roberts* (1851), 6 Ex. 697. But the mere knowledge that a dog was a fierce one is not sufficient, in the absence of any evidence that he had ever bitten anyone, *per* Lord Ellenborough, in *Beck* v. *Dyson* (1815), 4 Campb. 198, but a knowledge that a dog had the habit of rushing at people, and attempting to bite them, though it may not have actually bitten anyone, was held to be evidence of knowledge of its dangerous character: *Worth* v. *Gilbing* (1866), L.R. 2 C.P. 1, but proof that the dog had a habit of bounding upon and seizing persons, not so as to hurt or injure them, though causing some annoyance and trivial damage to clothing, is not proof of knowledge of its being of a savage or ferocious disposition: *Love* v. *Taylor*, 3 F. & F. 731, and in that case the dog was allowed to be shewn to the jury. The knowledge need not be actually brought home to the owner himself, it is sufficient if his servant who has the charge of the animal has knowledge of its vicious propensities: *Baldwin* v. *Casilla*, L.R. 7 Ex. 325. Proof that the owner had warned a person to beware of the dog lest he should be bitten, was held to be proper to be submitted to a jury in support of the allegation that the dog in question was accustomed to bite mankind: *Judge* v. *Cox*, 1 Stark 285, 18 R.R. 769. Proof that a dog had bitten cattle is not evidence that the owner knew he would bite mankind: *Thomas* v. *Morgan*, 2 C. M. & R. 496.

But an owner of domestic animals may be liable for damage they do owing to his negligence, quite irrespective of any knowledge of their liability to do the injury in question; thus where the owner of two dogs fastened them together and let them run loose in the highway, and they rushed at the plaintiff, and threw him to the ground, and thereby broke his leg, it was held that the owner was liable: *Jones* v. *Owen*, 24 L.T. 587. See also *Baker* v. *Snell*, 1908, 2 K.B. 352, 825, and the comment on that case, ante vol. 45, p. 357.