

CURIOSITIES AND LAW OF WILLS.

forest to the monster of the deep, from the subtlety of the serpent to the innocence of the dove, from the celastic embrace of the mountain kalmia to the descending fructification of the lily of the plain; all nature bows submissively to this primeval law; even the flowers which perfume the air with their fragrance, and decorate the forests and fields with their hues are but curtains to the nuptial bed. The principles of morality, the policy of the nation, the doctrines of the common law, the law of nature and the law of God unite in condemning it, and the condition attempted to be imposed by this testator upon his widow:” *Commonwealth v. Stauffer*, 10 Penn. 350.

Mr. James Robbins and Mr. Edward Concanen, both of whom died in London in the last decade, held very opposite views as to the proper dress for their widows; the former by his will directed “that in the event of my dear wife not complying with my request to wear a widows’ cap after my decease, and in the event of her marrying again, that then, and in both cases, the annuity payable to her shall be £20 per annum and not £30.” Mr. Concanen on the other hand, says, “And I do hereby bind my wife that she do not after my decease offend artistic taste, or blazon the sacred feelings of her most sweet and gentle nature by the exhibition of a widows’ cap.”

A legatee in New York, and some of the other states, has the happiness of being able to demand payment of his legacy before the expiration of the year upon giving the executors a bond with two securities to refund in case of deficiency.

An interesting account is given of a bequest made in 1736 by one Henry Ranie, a London brewer, to provide for the marriage of poor maids; through its instrumentality some three hundred girls have received marriage portions. Com-

modore Uriah J. Levy, who left a large estate, real and personal to the people of the U. S., or such persons as Congress should appoint to receive it, in trust for for the establishment and support of an agricultural school, directed by his will “that no professorships be established in said school, or professors employed in the institution, for in proportion to the smallness of the number of the teachers so will industry prevail.” The courts, however, held that the people of the United States could not take as trustees, that such indefinite trusts were invalid, and that the English law on such points was not the law of the State of New York (34 N. Y. 584). Strange as it may appear the judiciary of New York seems unwilling to allow the commonwealth to obtain any of these rich prizes, for lately when a man made a demise “to the Government of the United States, at Washington, for the purpose of assisting to discharge the debt contracted by the war for the subjugation of the rebellious Confederate States,” the judges frustrated the patriotic intention by declaring that the the government had no power to take: *People v. Fox*, 52 N. Y. 530. Mr. Proffat, however, tells us that the law as decided in New York is not in harmony with the decisions in a large majority of States.

The particulars of the celebrated Theluson devise are recounted. It was calculated at the time, that when the day came for the division of this fund there would be an income of nearly two millions sterling; the information that the expenses of management for seventeen years exceeded \$613,500 leads us to wish devoutly that we had been and still were the solicitors and managers of the estate. We are surprised to see it asserted that when the name of a child is omitted in a will the law presumes that the name of that child has been overlooked by the testator, and the court exercising its equit-