of each decision. These annotations, sometimes known as 'extra annotations,' trace judicial influences, while the others trace and co-ordinate doctrines and rules. They serve different and equally important purposes, though the critical annotation is of greater utility than the extra annotation, and requires more editorial skill in its preparation. Both classes of annotations, as distinguished from those so-called annotations which are merely collections of references, tend to harmonize and unify the common law of all the many jurisdictions, and in some degree to establish their general statutory law on a common basis of principle and reason. They do this by shewing what the law is, and its reason, in the difficult and obscure parts which neither digest nor text-book professes to do. Being narrow in its subject and intensive in its treatment, an annotation is specially designed to supply a process in the evolution of the law wherein all other forms of law books 'by reason of their universality are deficient.' They thus keep the common law of all English speaking people a living and growing law, which neither breaks down into chaos under sheer numerical weight of precedents, nor is thrust aside for some petrifying code of substantive law; and if uniform laws in all the states shall ever be generally enacted they will have been made possible largely by the years of sifting and settling that the patient labours of the annotators of to-day have given the precedents. Their contribution to the common law is in keeping it true and uniform in principle, in freeing it from multifariousness of illustration, in adapting it by analogies to new conditions. That common law, which we believe to be the most excellent of systems, has been kept for us by the writers in the law. Each class of writers has had its part. None has done more than the annotators, and by no other means than annotation could their part have been done."