

ENGLISH LAW REPORTS—REVIEWS.

J.,” and all his lands situated at S. G., then or late in the occupation of S. He had three farms situated wholly or partly in the parish of D., two of them in the occupation of J. Of the first, the farm-house and eight closes were in D.; the remaining close was in I., separated by a hedge. Of the second, the farm-house and eight closes were in D.; the remaining three closes were in K., separated from D. by a road. The third was entirely in D. and in the occupation of G. He had two farms at S. G., one in the occupation of S., and the other in the occupation of J. The parish church of D. was within a few feet of the line between D. and K. There was evidence that the farms would be much injured by dividing them on the parish lines. *Held*, that the devise of lands situate at or within D., and in the occupation of J., included the entire farms so occupied, though partly in other parishes, and that the devise of “all” the lands in S. G. in the occupation of S. did not include a farm there in the occupation of J.—*Homer v. Homer*, 8 Ch. D. 758.

6. W. directed his debts to be paid out of his personal estate, and, if that proved insufficient, the real was to be sold. All the rest and residue of his personal estate he bequeathed to his daughters. By a codicil he made some alteration in the disposition of his real estate, and then said: “As to all moneys that may be left after my decease, I give and bequeath the same unto my children, W. J., and M.,” to be invested in a mortgage, the income to be paid them for life, and, “after their decease,” to testator’s grandchildren. *Held*, that this clause in the codicil applied only to cash actually in hand at the testator’s death, and, subject to that, the residuary clause in the will proper conveyed the residue.—*Williams v. Williams*, 8 Ch. D. 789.

7. A testator devised to trustees three freehold houses in trust for his two daughters, either to live in or to let for their joint benefit; and, should either of them die without issue, one of the houses should be sold, and the proceeds divided equally between the other and testator’s surviving sons. But, in case either daughter should have a child, then such child should have its mother’s share of the rents and profits of the three houses after its mother’s decease. One daughter died without issue, and one house was sold, and the proceeds divided as directed in the will. Finally the other daughter died, also with-

out issue. *Held*, that the daughters were joint tenants in fee, subject to executory gifts over in the event of issue. The event having never happened, the survivor was entitled to the whole in fee from the death of her sister.—*Yarrow v. Knightly*, 8 Ch. D. 736.

See DEVISE; TRUST, 1, 2, 3.

WORDS.

“*At or within*.”—See WILL, 5.

“*Gaming*.”—See STATUTE.

“*Moneys that may be left after my Decease*.”

—See WILL, 6.

“*Person*.”—See CORPORATION.

REVIEWS.

THE PRINCIPLES OF EQUITY, intended for the use of Students and the Profession. By Edmund H. T. Snell, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Fourth Edition. To which is added an Epitome of the Equity Practice. By Archibald Brown, M.A. Edin. and Oxon., and B. C. L. Oxon., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London: Stevens & Haynes, Law Publishers, Bell Yard, Temple Bar. 1878.

No words of ours are needed to commend a new edition of “Snell’s Equity” to the profession. The fact that it has passed through four editions within a decade is a sufficient mark of the esteem in which this standard work is held. We believe, too, that we echo the sentiments of every “student,” in the more technical and restricted sense of that term, when we say that no book in the curriculum prescribed by the Law Society has afforded him more pleasant and profitable reading than the work in question. The lamented author seemed throughout to have kept steadily in view the requirements of his former comrades, and thus while the work is undoubtedly of great value to the young practitioner, its lucid arrangement and perspicuous style have given it a character and excellence peculiarly its own in the eyes of those who have not yet been privileged to pass beyond the outer circle of the Temple of Justice.

The changes in equity practice in England introduced by the Judicature Acts