A VOICE FROM 'OLE VIRGINNY.'—There is a sufficient connection between the foregoing and what Tucker. J. has to say in *Rowton* v. *Rowton*, I. H. & M. (Va.) 96, in behalf of sustaining the positive evidence of a single witness against a number of adverse witnesses, whose testimony is entirely negative, to justify an extract here from the opinion of the learned judge:

" I consider it an undeniable position, both at law and in equity, that one witness, whose credibility is not impeached, who deposes clearly and positively in affirmation of any fact to which that witness was privy, is entitled to more belief than a dozen witnesses who merely depose to their own ignorance of that particular fact, though by possibility they might have been in such a situation as to have seen or heard the same, if their attention had been called to the acts or words of the parties at the ime. As if a question were made upon the plea of nil debet, at law, whether the supposed endorser of a bill of exchange actually did write his name on the back of it, if one witness, present in a coffee-house should swear that he saw the party write his name upon the bill, such evidence, if the credit of the witness be unimpeached, ought to weigh more than the testimony of a dozen persons, present in the same coffeehouse at the same time, who should swear that they did not see him write his name on the bill, though all of them were in such situations, as that, by possibility, they might have seen him do so, or might have remembered that he did so, had their attention been equally drawn that way, as that of the witness affirming the fact. And such testimony ought moreover to countervail that of fifty witnesses declaring that they heard the supposed endorser declare that he never endorsed a bill of exchange in his life, nor ever would as long as he should live."

AN ORTHOGRAPHICAL ISSUE.—The Green Bag has published what it alleges to be a recently discovered latter of Chancellor Kent to one of his friends, which has as rate an orthographical flavor about it as the masterpieces of Artemus Ward, Orpheus C. Kerr and Josh Billings—shining lights as they are in the American literary firmament. The Albany Law Journal scornfully rejects the claim of this treasure-trove to be placed among the ana of the famous Chancellor. It deems it beyond conception that he could have been guilty of such shameful illiteracy as to write "Salust" for Sallust, "Quinctillion" for Quintilian, "Bynkersheek" for Bynkershoek, and "Mackiavell" for Machiavelli. But if he really did so miscall them, fancy his charlatanry in claiming any