

he considered the essential character of the signature of an attesting witness, but the tearing of any, the most immaterial part, of a will, if done *animo revocandi*, would clearly amount to a revocation, while an erasure without further "destruction" of the most essential portion would have no effect in revoking, although done with that intention.

In *Hobbs v. Knight*, 1 Curt. 780; *Birkhead v. Bowdoin*, 2 N.C. 66, and *Evans v. Dallow*, 31 L.J. (P.M. & A.) 128, the signatures had been either torn or cut off; "tearing" in the Act must include "cutting," and in any case there was a destruction. Sir H. Jenner, indeed, said, if any such case should occur, he thought "that if the names of the attesting witnesses were erased by the testator *animo revocandi*, it would be a sufficient revocation," but this was quite unnecessary for the decision; see 1 Curt. at p. 781. So in *the will of Barrett*, 2 V.L.R. (I.P. & M.) 98, Molesworth, J., held that passing a pen through the signature of the testator and the attesting witness was not a sufficient destruction of the will, because they were not obliterated; it was unnecessary to decide what the effect would have been if they had been. The point was directly raised in England in 1887; a will was found with all the three signatures scratched out as with a pen-knife; counsel in moving for administration as upon an intestacy admitted there was no case in point, but the judge held that the will was revoked, observing that there had been a "lateral cutting out," *In the goods of Morton*, 12 P.D. 141. The word "cutting," however, is not used in the Wills Act, and notwithstanding this decision it is submitted that the question is still open.—*Australian Law Times*.

Reviews and Notices of Books.

The Law of Electric Wires in Streets and Highways. By Edward Quinton Keasbey, of the New Jersey Bar. Chicago: Callaghan & Co., 1892.

This valuable and timely addition to legal literature is referred to at length ante p. 513. The typographical part of the work is well done, and reflects much credit upon the publishers.

A Manual of Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology. By Henry C. Chapman, M.D., Professor of Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence in the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, etc. With thirty-six illustrations. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1892.

The standing of the author of this manual is a sufficient guarantee of the merits of the work, which is well written and to the point. The abbreviated form of the work adds to rather than detracts from its merits as a book of ready reference. The chapters upon insanity and toxicology are especially worthy of mention, and the whole work is one of practical utility to the lawyer.