only child, Mary Rogers; that at her death, instead of passing, as had been supposed at the time, by virtue of her will, to her daughter, that will had been wholly without effect upon the estate, which had, in fact, descended to her oldest son, Peter Rogers. Peter Rogers had indeed been disseized in 1800, if not before, by the acts of his sister in taking possession of and conveying away the estate; but, as he was a non-compos during the whole of his long life, the Statute of Limitations did not begin to run against him, and his heir in tail, namely, John Rogers, the oldest son of his then deceased brother, John, was allowed by Mass. Gen. St. c. 254, § 5, ten years after his uncle Peter's death, within which to bring his action. As these ten years did not expire until 1864, this action, brought in 1863, was seasonably commenced; and it was prosecuted with success, judgment in his favour having been recovered by John Rogers in 1865.

The case of *Rogers* v. *Jones* was naturally a subject of remark among the legal profession; and it happened to occur to one of the younger members of that profession that it would be well to improve some of his idle moments by studying up the facts of this case in the Suffolk Registries of Deeds and of Probate. Curiosity prompted this gentleman to extend his investigation beyond the facts directly involved in the case, and to trace the title of Mr. John Buttolph back to an earlier date. He found that Mr. Buttolph had purchased the estate in 1730 of one Hosea Johnson, to whom it had been conveyed in 1710 by Benjamin Parsons. The deed from Parsons to Johnson, however, conveyed the land to Johnson simply, without any mention of his "heirs;" and the young lawyer, having recently read the case of *Buffum* v. *Hutchinson*, 1 Allen 58, perceived that Johnson took under this deed only a life estate in the granted premises, and that at his death the premises reverted to Parsons or to his heirs. The young lawyer, being of an enterprising spirit, thought it would be well to follow out the investigation suggested by his discovery. He found, to his surprise, that Hosea Johnson did not die until 1786, the estate having, in fact, been purchased by him for a residence when he was twenty-one years of age, and about to be married. He had lived upon it for twenty years, but had then moved his residence to another part of the city, and sold the estate, as we have seen, to Mr. Buttolph. When Mr. Johnson died, in 1786, at the age of ninety-seven, it chanced that the sole party entitled to the reversion, as heir of Benjamin Parsons, was a young woman, his granddaughter, aged 18, and just married. This young lady and her husband lived, as sometimes happens, to celebrate their diamond wedding in 1861, but died during that year. As she had been under the legal disability of coverture from the time when her right of entry upon the estate, as heir of Benjamin Parsons, first accrued, at the termination of Johnson's life estate, the provision of the Statute of Limitations, before cited, gave her heirs ten years after her death within which to bring their action. These heirs proved to be three or four people of small means, residing in remote parts of the United States. What arrangements the young lawyer made with these parties and also with a Mr. John Smith, a speculating moneyed man of Boston, who was supposed to have furnished certain necessary funds, he was wise enough to keep carefully to himself. Suffice it to say that in 1869 an action was brought by the heirs of Benjamin Parsons to recover from Rogers the land which he had just recovered from William and Arthur Jones. In this action the plaintiffs were successful, and they had no sooner been put in formal possession of the estate than they conveyed it, now worth a couple of hundred thousand dollars, to the aforesaid Mr. John Smith, who was popularly supposed to have obtained in this case, as he usually did in all financial operations in which he was concerned, the lion's share of the plunder. The Parsons heirs, probably, realised very little from the results of the suit; but the young lawyer obtained sufficient to establish him as a brilliant speculator in suburban lands, second mortgages, and patent rights. Mr. Smith had been but a short time in possession of his new estate when the great fire of November, 1872, swept over it. He was, however, a most energetic citizen, and the ruins were not cold before he was at work rebuilding. He bought an adjoining lot in order to increase the size of his estate, the whole of which was soon covered by an elegant block, conspicuous on the front of which may now be seen his initials, "J. S.," cut in the stone.

While the estate which had once be-