while others are made to turn upon the use. It has been said that burglary may be committed by breaking into a dairy or laundry standing near enough to the dwelling-house to be used as appurtenant to it, or into such outbuildings as are necessary to it as a dwelling. *State* v. *Langford*, 1 Dev. 253. Also by breaking into a smoke-house opening into the yard of the dwelling-house and used for its ordinary purposes. And cases are to be found holding that if an outhouse be so near the dwelling proper that it is used with it as appurtenant to it, although not within the same inclosure even, yet burglary may be committed in it. *State* v. *Twitty*, 1 Hayw. (N. C.) 102. It need have no internal communication with the dwelling proper to give it this character. In *Rex.* v. *Lithgo*, Russ. & R. 357, the breaking was into a warehouse. There was no internal communication between it and the dwelling of the owner, but they were contiguous, inclosed in the same yard and under the same roof, and it was held to be burglary. Mr. East says: 'It is clear that any outhouse within the curtilage or same common fence as the mansion itself must be considered as parcel of the mansion. . . . If the outhouses be adjoining to the dwelling-house and occupied as parcel thereof, though there be no common inclosure or curtilage, they may still be considered as parts of the mansion.' 2 East P. C. 493. It is difficult to lay down any general rule upon the subject, owing to the nice distinctions to be found in some of the cases. It seems to us, however, that both the use and the situation should be considered. Can the place which has been entered, considering both its situation and use, be fairly considered as appurtenant to and a parcel of the dwelling-house, or as the older writers say, 'a parcel of the messuage?' If so, then burglary may be committed by breaking into it. The dwelling-house of a man has peculiar sanctity at common law. It is his castle. The law intends its protection, because it is the family abode. The object is to secure its peace and quiet, and therefore the burglar has always been liable to severe punishment. The law throws around it its protecting mantle, because it is the place of family repose. It is therefore proper, not only to secure the quiet and peace of the house in which they sleep, but also any and all outbuildings which are properly appurtenant thereto, and which, as one whole, contribute directly to the comfort and convenience of the place as a habitation. If this reasoning be correct, then any which are not so situated, or are not so used, should not be regarded as a part of the dwelling, although they may in fact be within the curtilage. If there for other distinct purposes, as for instance, a store-house for the vending of goods or a shop for blacksmithing, and the dwelling is equally convenient and comfortable without them, and they are not in fact a part of it as by being under the same roof, so that the breaking into them will disturb the peace and quiet of the household, then they should not be regarded as a part of it in considering the crime of burglary or the offence named in the statute. *Armour* v. *State*, 3 Humph. 379. If, however, an outhouse, having no internal communication with the dwelling proper, may be considered as so appurtenant to it that burglary may be committed therein, surely it would seem it should be so held as to a cellar under the dwelling, although there may be no means of internal communication between them. It is under the same roof. It is a part of the house in which the occupant and his family sleep. It is essentially part and parcel of the habitation. It is manifest, however, that the statute above cited includes it. It says: 'Or shall feloniously break any dwelling-house, or any part thereof, or any outhouse belonging to or used with any dwelling-house.' The language is quite sweeping; and it is clear it was the legislative intention, in enacting it, to embrace not only every part of the dwelling but every outhouse properly a parcel of and appurtenant to it. It at once strikes the ordinary observer that it was not intended the cellar of a dwelling-house should be excluded from its operation, and to so hold would not only be in the face of the language used but unreasonable."

GENERAL NOTES.

PRICE OF A BOOK.—The *Bulletin de l'Imprimerie* contains the following query, which I think (says the Paris correspondent of the *Bookseller*) likely to interest