

is a paper upon the "Wage of Law Teachers," by Professor Gregory, of Wisconsin University. Mr. Griffith discourses upon the fascinating topic of "Wills in Ancient Egypt," a department of archæology which, although the materials for research are still scanty, promises to furnish much entertainment hereafter to students of legal history. Mr. Labatt, (to whom our readers are indebted for an article which appeared in our last volume on certain phases of actions of tort, ante vol. 33, p. 713) analyses in an article headed "Preferential Debts of Railway Receivers," the remarkable series of decisions in which the courts in the United States have by judicial legislation introduced into the law of mortgages a new body of rules, the effect of which, in certain cases, is to postpone secured to unsecured creditors in the disquisition of assets of railway companies, whose property is placed in the hands of a receiver pending foreclosure proceedings. This is an excellent article, and decidedly the most useful one in the number to the practising lawyer. We strongly commend this, the best of all law reviews, to the attention of our readers.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

During the days of duelling in the South a certain distinguished lawyer, who was a rapid shot and successful duellist, was said by his friends to have "shot into" celebrity. He evidently was also quite a wit, for, being a small man, he was engaged for a duel with a very large man, whereupon he insisted that, to make the match even, the size of his own figure should be chalked on the body of his adversary, and that any shots striking outside the chalked lines should not count.

A judgment of much interest on both sides of the water, because it constitutes a precedent in the law of railway seats, was recently delivered in London. It appears that a gentleman travelling from London to Hastings had occasion to leave the carriage at Tunbridge Wells, and took the usual precaution to reserve his seat by leaving therein his umbrella and newspapers. While he was absent another passenger seized his place and refused to vacate it until forcibly ejected. The ejected passenger brought an action against the original owner of the seat, and the latter entered a counterclaim for similar damages. The claim for damages for ejection was dismissed and the counterclaim allowed, the Court holding, in effect, that the universal mode of retaining a seat in a railway carriage is a most reasonable and convenient one. By no means the least important point in the judgment referred to is the Court's assertion that the holder of a seat is privileged to use reasonable force to eject an intruder.—*Albany L.J.*