

"Juxtaposition," a prize riddle, is thus solved: "Where upon trial for murder the evidence shewed that the defendant was in such *juxtaposition to the homicide* as to exclude any other issue than that of positive testimony, a charge upon circumstantial evidence was not required." By the way, in volume 56, Texas Criminal Reports, the index title "Murder" covers forty-four paragraphs and twenty-seven cross-references to other titles. "Manslaughter," a mollicoddle offence in Texas, carries only six paragraphs and two cross-references. In a guessing bee based on that index the man who adopts the answer "homicide" as a "system" is likely to defeat all competitors in the long run. But he would score a cipher if asked what is the second word of a title consisting of two words, the first of which is "Shooting," for it is not a homicide case. Is it the name of a kind of animal? Why, no; it is "Craps." How many lawyers can state exactly what is meant by the reporter's title, "Doctrine of Carving"? Is it antonymous of the familiar "doctrine of tacking" of incumbrances? We are pretty sure that Bishop, Wharton, and other text-writers on criminal law would be startled to learn that "carving" had become a word of art or attained to the dignity of a doctrine. In the case cited it was held that, under the Texas statute, "the State can only carve one offence of opening a theatre on Sunday"—that is on a single Sunday. A strenuous and virile word in the Texas reporter's lexicon is "Want." It does him this yeoman service: "Want of Authority," "Want of Chastity," "Want of Consent," "Want of Diligence," "Want of Fraudulent Intent," and "Want of Knowledge"—of proper titles for a creditable index to a law report?

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.

A point in professional ethics which has troubled a few lawyers and a great many laymen for centuries past is thus discussed:—

Paragraph 5 of the Code of Professional Ethics promulgated by the American Bar Association reads as follows: "A