have let in new light on the subject, and going back to first principles he has come to the conclusion that a restraint on alienation limited to the life of another grafted on a devise in fee, is void for repugnancy. He considers the statement of the law which has got into the text-books and has even received the sanction of so learned a Judge as the late Sir Geo. Jessel, to the effect that a restraint on alienation is good if limited to a reasonable time, arises from a misconception of the effect of *Large's Case*, 3 Leon 182, which appears to have been first pointed out in the American case of *Mandlebaum* v. *McDonell*, 18 Am. Rep. 61, 80. The devise in *Large's Case* is stated as follows: "A. seized of lands in fee, devised the same to his wife till William, his younger son, should come to the age of twenty-two years, the remainder when the said William should come to such age, of his lands in D. to his two sons, Alexander and John, the remainder of his lands in C. to two other of his sons, upon condition, *quod si aliquis dictorum filiorum suorum circumibit vendere terram suam* before his said son William should attain his said age of twenty-two years, *in perpetuum perderet eam.*" From which it appears as pointed out by Mr. Justice Christiancy, in the American case, that there was no devise of the fee simple subject to a condition not to alien, but on the contrary only the limitation of a contingent remainder to the sons upon condition that if before they came in possession, (*i.e.*, on William coming to the age of twenty-two) either of them should attempt to sell his land he should lose it; one of the sons having sold before that time it was held he could not qualify himself to take the contingent remainder, and, therefore, that it failed altogether. The case of *re Rosher*, *Rosher* v. *Rosher*, is one in which the property at stake is of large value, and no doubt the opinion of a Court of Appeal will be asked upon the question and we shall watch with interest the future stages of the case.

OUR ENGLISH LETTER.

(From our own Correspondent.)

My silence has not been due to want of application, but to an unprecedented dearth of material. Legal gossip has for some months been an unknown quantity; the law reports in the *Times* have been detailed accounts of the commonest of bankruptcy cases; the judges have been keeping holiday. Never, perhaps, within the memory of the oldest inhabitant of the Temple or Lincoln's inn has vacation business been so weak and rare as in the summer of 1884. One or two leading juniors, men who, as John Bright would say, can almost hear the silk gown rustling upon their backs, tell me that if they had been content to stay up in town throughout August they would have had a good deal of work, but the briefless army are certainly little encouraged by business to face the heat and dust of the autumn. This was formerly their gleaning time, in which they gathered into their bosom the straws which the great men left behind them when they bound up their sheaves. Now great men leave nothing behind, and the highest among the stuff-gownsmen are quite ready to undertake the smallest business. These good gentlemen are passing through an anxious crisis at the present moment. It was, I think, in May or June last that a considerable number of them applied for silk. Very few of the applications, if any, were made by men who had not the best right possible to expect their wishes to be immediately fulfilled. But the Lord Chancellor, good man, has the most rooted objection to creating new silks and prefers to keep all these men in ruinous suspense. For such suspense is ruinous, seeing that solicitors are doubtful whether, when they