

*Alteration, etc.*—Where the date of a document has been changed, that will not, of itself, vitiate the paper, but it will be treated as of its original date, if that can be shewn. This is true, even where there is nothing in the present appearance of a note to indicate that there had been an alteration in the date, if such alteration be in fact established by evidence. And where different parts of a paper are written at different times, this will not constitute evidence of alteration, unless there be testimony to shew that some part was written after the signatures were appended by way of executing the document. Furthermore, where several persons join in making a note for the benefit of one of themselves to whom they intrust it with the date specified as "July —," and where such beneficiary does not use the note till Sept. 1st, to which date he then changes the original date, such change is not a technical alteration, he having implied authority to make it.

*Mis-dating.*—Where a note in suit was dated January 4, 1904, and plaintiff claimed it should have been 1905, instead of 1904, the mistake being made because the writer was not yet accustomed to writing the new year, and where defendant's pleadings did not raise any issue of intentional alteration, evidence of the mistake was admissible.

Where the statute required a written will to be dated, and the date was set forth in the instrument as the 1st day of June in the year "One thousand," while the evidence shewed the paper to have been written in the year 1910, it was held invalid; yet, in the same State, where a will was *fully* dated 1859, and contained a gift to one who was not born till 1861, it was admitted to probate, no question being raised, or explanation given, as to the date discrepancy.

Where there was no question as to genuineness, and the alleged error in the date of a will only affected questions of *distribution* thereunder, and the will was dated with the year 1911, and so probated, neither the register of wills, nor the Orphans' Court on appeal from his probate, had power to inquire into its true date, or to receive evidence to shew that it was really executed in 1912; such question could only be gone into on distribution, by the tribunal making the distribution, if it were a matter of any consequence as affecting such distribution.