

of the answer of the student to the question: "What is an incorporeal hereditament?" He replied: "It is a right issuing out of real property, e.g. a tree."

The Dictionary might advantageously be shortened by the omission of considerable irrelevant information. The purpose of a law dictionary is to define legal terms, and such a section as the following should be omitted: "Bicycles are now 'carriages' within the meaning of the various Highway Acts, by virtue of s. 85 of the Local Government Act, 1888. By the same section they are compelled to carry lights between one hour after sunset and one hour before sunrise, and to sound a bell, or whistle, etc., on overtaking carriages, etc., or foot-passengers."

On the other hand, certain essential words are omitted, e.g., "Ownership"; and the word "Owner" is merely defined as follows: "Owner has a statutory meaning under the Public Health Act, 1875 (see s. 4), and under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901 (see s. 156 (1))."

At the end, the book contains a valuable list of the law reports with their abbreviations.

A. L. G.

*Cases on the Common Law.* By the late ERNEST COCKLE and W. NEMBARD HIBBERT, LL.D. (Lond.). London: Sweet & Maxwell, Lim. 1921. xxxiv and 991 pp. (£2 2s. net.)

THIS book will be found of great value by students and practitioners of the law. It contains almost every important case on the common law, and can be used for reference when there is not sufficient time to go to the Law Reports direct.

The editors' notes, while excellent summaries of the law, are less valuable, as a case book should not attempt to be also a text-book. The black type which is freely used to emphasize the various points made by the Judges might well be omitted in the next edition, as it tends to prevent the student from using his own intelligence in reading the cases.

In including such a vast number of cases in a single volume, the editors have been forced to cut down the amount of quotation from the judgments, and in some cases this is unfortunate. Thus, in their report of the famous case of *Coggs v. Bernard*, Lord Holt's enumeration of the six sorts of bailments has been so abbreviated that it is of slight value to the student. Only eight lines are given to the case of *Merry v. Green*, and the facts as stated in the headnote do not sufficiently emphasize the point at issue. In the next edition the learned editors might be well advised to leave out some of the less important cases, and to put greater emphasis on the essential ones. By trying to include too much, they may find themselves in the position of the circus proprietor who advertised that he was exhibiting the smallest giant in existence. The citations may be too short to be of real value in a book primarily designed as a collection of authorities.

A. L. G.