

**THE HISTORY OF THE LAWS AFFECTING  
THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN IN  
ENGLAND: BEING AN ESSAY WHICH  
OBTAINED THE YORKE PRIZE OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649604197

The History of the Laws Affecting the Property of Married Women in England: Being an Essay Which Obtained the Yorke Prize of the University of Cambridge by Basil Edwin Lawrence

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**BASIL EDWIN LAWRENCE**

**THE HISTORY OF THE LAWS AFFECTING  
THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN IN  
ENGLAND: BEING AN ESSAY WHICH  
OBTAINED THE YORKE PRIZE OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE**



THE  
**History of the Law**  
AFFECTING THE  
PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN  
IN ENGLAND

(BEING AN ESSAY WHICH OBTAINED THE YORKE PRIZE OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE).

BY  
BASIL EDWIN LAWRENCE, M.A., LL.M.,  
*Of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Lincoln's Inn,  
Barrister-at-Law.*

---

"SATIUS EST FERRE PONTES QUAM SECTARI REVULGOS."

---

LONDON:  
REEVES AND TURNER,  
100, CHANCERY LANE AND CAREY STREET,  
Law Booksellers and Publishers.

1884

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### UNITY OF HUSBAND AND WIFE . . . . . PAGE 1—3

“Eadem caro vir et uxor,” the leading principle. Effect of marriage at common law on wife’s persona. In Anglo-Saxon times wife had a persona. Morgengifu.

Norman principle came from doctrine of “mund.” The Germanic doctrine of mund modified by civilizing influences, but not so in case of Normandy. Reasons for this.

Glanvil’s account of doctrine of unity. The idea clearly feudal. Remarks of Mr. Justice Lush in *Phillips v. Barnett*.

---

### CHAPTER II.

#### CHOSES IN POSSESSION . . . . . 4—15

In Saxon times the law as to moveables and immoveables the same.

In Norman and mediæval times personalty of little account. Rule of common law as to wife’s personalty.

*Bracebridge v. Cook, Carr v. Carr, Hill v. Foley, Powes v. Marshall*, Divorce Act, 1857; Married Women’s Property Act, 1870, clause in original bill, provisions of Act as to choses in possession. Sect. 1, *Offley v. Clay, Ashworth v. Outram*. Sect. 2, effect on 26 & 27 Vict. c. 87, s. 31. Sect. 3, extended by Metropolitan Board of Works Act, 1871; *Howard v. Bank of England, Lloyd v. Pughe, Re Hercules Insurance Co.* Sects. 4 and 5, Friendly Societies Act, 1875; *The Queen v. Carnatic Railway Co.* Sect. 7, *Howard v. Bank of England, Lane v. Oakes, Palmer v. Trevor, King v. Voss*. Sect. 10, *Holt v. Everall, Re Mellor’s Policy Trusts*. Sect. 11, *Hancocks v. Lablache*, remarks of L. J. Lindley, *Re Fisher’s Trusts, Moore v. Robinson, Summers v. City Bank*. Married Women’s Property Act, 1882, effect of Act, *Mander v. Harris*, probability as to its success.

## CHAPTER III.

## CHOSES IN ACTION . . . . . PAGE 18—38

Doctrine of unity not applied strictly to choses in action. Husband must reduce his wife's choses in action into possession, *Gaters v. Madeley*, *Prole v. Soady*, *Hutchings v. Smith*, *Palmer v. Trevor*.

Remarks of Sir Thos. Plumer in *Purdew v. Jackson*.

What is and what is not reduction into possession.

Cases where there has been no reduction into possession—*Wildman v. Wildman*, *Ryland v. Smith*, *Harwood v. Fisher*, *Michelmore v. Mudge*, *Coppin v. —*, *Howman v. Corie*, *Aitchison v. Dixon*, *Scrutton v. Pattillo*, *Parker v. Lechmere*.

Cases where there has been reduction into possession—*Re Jenkins*, *Widgery v. Tepper*, *Re Barber*, *Hunley v. Griffith*, *Milner v. Milnes*, *Wills v. Nurse*, *Cecchi v. Powell*.

Wife's bills of exchange and promissory notes are property of a mixed nature, partly choses in action, partly choses in possession—*Barlow v. Bishop*, *M'Neilags v. Holloway*, *Ex parte Barber*, *Howard v. Oakes*, *Gaters v. Madeley*, *Richards v. Richards*, *Sherington v. Yates*.

Effect of judgment in action for reduction into possession, *Heygate v. Aunesley*. Same rule applicable in an award, *Oylander v. Baston*. Husband must obtain possession as husband, *Baker v. Hall*.

Effect of Divorce Act, 1857.

Previous to 1873 legal chose in action not assignable, Judicature Act, s. 25 (6). Equitable chose in action, *Mitford v. Mitford*, *Whittle v. Henning*.

Position of husband's assignee, *Purdew v. Jackson*, *Honor v. Morton*. Remarks of Lord Lyndhurst, three heads.

Cases on first head, *Hutchings v. Smith*, *Ellison v. Etwin*, *Le Vasseur v. Scrutton*.

Case on second head, *Ashby v. Ashby*.

Case on third head, *Duberley v. Day*.

Power of husband and wife to dispose of wife's life interest, *Stiffe v. Everitt*. Husband's power of releasing.

The assignee must reduce the chose into possession, and how, *Hutchings v. Smith*, *Pierce v. Thorney*, *Yates v. Sherrington*.

Wife could not release reversionary interest, *Wade v. Saunders*, *Box v. Box*, *Whittle v. Henning*, Malins' Act.

Husband obtained his wife's choses in action as her administrator, *Re M. A. Harding*. Growth of right of husband to administer. At common law no one had the right, 21 Hen. 8; 22 & 23 Car. 2, c. 10; 29 Car. 2, c. 3.

Married Women's Property Act, 1882.

## CHAPTER IV.

## CHATTELS REAL . . . . . PAGE 39—45

Leaseholds at law. Originally not considered important. Reasons why leaseholds were regarded as personalty. 21 Hen. 8, c. 15. Doctrine of unity applicable but not so strongly as in choses in possession.

Effect of marriage. *Mitford v. Mitford*, *Bates v. Dandy*.

Assignment by husband of part of term. *Sym's case*. Remarks of Lord Coke. Husband could defeat wife's survivorship without alienation. Husband could sell wife's reversionary interest. *Donne v. Hart*, *Pitt v. Pitt*, *Clark v. Burgh*.

Divorce Acts, 1857 and 1858. Married Women's Property Act, 1870. Married Women's Property Act, 1882.

## CHAPTER V.

## REALTY . . . . . 46—70

Effect of marriage. Doctrine of unity formerly applied. Women not able to succeed to proper feuds. Formerly titles of wives communicated to husbands, *Richard Bertie's case*. Husband had two interests in wife's realty. Value of interest increased in 1540. Alienation by husband. 4 Hen. 7, c. 24; 32 Hen. 8, c. 28. Fine levied by wife alone, *Moreau's case*. Fine levied by husband and wife; examination not always necessary. Recovery. Bargain and sale. Dissaisin.

*Hedd v. Chalener*, *Saverne v. Smith*.

9 Geo. 1, c. 29, *Lord Kensington v. Mansell*.

Abolition of Fines and Recoveries Act. 15 & 16 Vict. c. 80. 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108. Conveyancing Act, 1882, *Hobby v. Allen*, *Tuer v. Turner*, *Briggs v. Chamberlaine*, 8 & 9 Vict. c. 106, s. 6.

Married women could elect without acknowledgment, *Barrow v. Barrow*. 8 & 9 Vict. c. 108, s. 7; old rule as to disclaimer, *Butler and Baker's case*, *Townson v. Tickell*, *Begbie v. Crook*.

Acknowledgment by married woman. 4 & 5 Vict. c. 38, s. 5. Before an interested commissioner, *Banks v. Ollerton*. 17 & 18 Vict. c. 75; *Ex parte Jane Menhennet*, *Re Bendyshe*, *Re Sarah Harper*. Refusal of wife to acknowledge, *Jordan v. Jones*, *Field v. Moore*, *Billing v. Webb*. Commissioners, *Webster v. Carline*, *Blackmur v. Blackmur*. Commissioners had a lien for fees, *Williams v. Walker*.

Sect. 91 of Fines and Recoveries Act.

Husband of unsound mind, *Re Jane Turner*, *Re Murfin*.



- Husband abroad, *Ex parte Mary Gill, Anonymous, Ex parte Gilmore, Ex parte Elizabeth Taylor, Re Squires, Re Mary Eden, Re Kelsey.*
- Husband and wife separated, *Ex parte Thomas, Ex parte Shuttleworth, Re Alice Rogers, Re Mary Graham, Re Caine.*
- Wife's separate property, *Re Eliza Haigh, Ex parte Yarnall, Re Ferrin, Re Woodcock, Ex parte Susannah Andrews, Taylor v. Meads.*
- Affidavits in support, *Re Mary Williams, Ex parte Bruce, Ex parte Trencry, Re Sarah Price, Ex parte Mackarinah Fish, Re Schiff, Re Mary Noy, Re Anderson.*
- Form of rule dispensing with husband's concurrence, *Ex parte Ann T. Duffell.*
- Divorce Acts, 1857 and 1858. Married Women's Property Act, 1870, *King v. Voss.* Settled Land Act, 1882. Married Women's Property Act, 1882. Married women's municipal rights, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 55, *The Queen v. Harrauld.* Effect of the Act of 1882.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### EQUITY OF REDEMPTION AND EXONERATION . . . PAGE 71—77

- Mortgage of wife's estates, equity of redemption in wife and her heirs, unless a change of title was clearly intended. *Jackson v. Innes, Buscombe v. Hare.*
- Origin and growth of equity of redemption, *Brend v. Brend, Rowell v. Whalley, Huntingdon v. Huntingdon, Jackson v. Innes, Reeves v. Hicks, Re Breton's Trust Estates.*
- Equity of exoneration, *Robinson v. Gee, Parteriche v. Powlet, Kinnoul v. Money,* remarks of Lord Westbury in *Gleaves v. Paine, Scholefield v. Lockwood,* Married Women's Property Act, 1882. Effect of Act if wife's property be in trustees. Mortgage of wife's separate estate for husband's debt.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### DOWER . . . . . 78—100

Dower by the civil law. Feudal rule of dower.

Five kinds of dower, viz. :—

1. At common law.
2. By custom.
3. *Ad ostium ecclesie.*
4. *Ex assensu patris.*
5. *De la plus belle.*

## Dower at common law.

Wife must be nine. Wife an alien. Dower of a Jewess. Treason or felony, 1 Edw. 6, c. 12; 5 & 6 Edw. 6, c. 11; 5 Eliz. c. 14; 8 Eliz. c. 3; 31 Eliz. c. 4; 1 Jac. 1, c. 31; 3 Jac. 1, c. 4; Lunacy, Quarantina, Mag. Char. c. 7; Statute of Merton, Statute of Gloucester, writ of annuity, castle of defence, caput baronia, *Gerard v. Gerard*, Tithes, 32 Hen. 8, c. 7.

Husband had to be seised. Estate tail after possibility of issue extinct. Merger. *Bote's case*, *Broughton v. Randall*. Dower attached though estate gone, *Nash v. Preston*. Dower out of improved land.

There had to be marriage, seisin, and death. Contract of marriage, 16 Hen. 3; 25 Hen. 8, c. 21; 26 Geo. 2, c. 33. Consent to marriage, divorce, 32 Hen. 8, c. 38. Seisin at law and in deed. Death meant natural death.

Assignment of dower, *Stainfield v. Binden*, 17 Edw. 2, c. 4; 17 Edw. 2, c. 13. Exchange, recovery of dower, *Hitchens v. Hitchens*, W. 2, c. 4; W. 2, c. 34.

Jointure, 27 Hen. 8, c. 10. Six requisites to a jointure, 4 W. & M. c. 16; 20 Hen. 3, c. 2. Days of common return, Statute of Marlborough, 32 Hen. 8, c. 21. Writ of administration, W. 2, c. 7.

## Dower by custom.

Gavelkind. Borough-English. Lands and tenements.

Dower *ad cetum ecclesie*.

Not more than one-third in Glanvil's time. When it could be made.

Dower *ex assensu patris*.

Husband had to be heir apparent. Borough-English. Heir under age, 1 Edw. 6, c. 12; 5 & 6 Edw. 6, c. 12.

Dower *de la plus belle*.

What it was.

No dower out of a trust. Attached to hereditaments of which the husband was seised at any time during coverture. Means of barring dower.

Joint estate, conveyance to uses to bar dower, satisfied term. *Lady Radnor v. Vandebendy*, 8 & 9 Vict. c. 112; Dower Act, 1833. Mr. Joshua Williams remarks on the Act, *Anderson v. Pignet*, *Roper v. Roper*, *Dawson v. Bank of Whitehaven*.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## COURTESY OF ENGLAND . . . . . PAGE 101—115

Littleton's statement incorrect, it existed in Ireland, Scotland, and under Constantine. Blackstone's statement. Writ of 11 Hen. 3. Statute of uncertain date. Courtesy in time of Glanvil and Bracton. Treatise of Stephanus de Segreve, 13 Edw. 1, c. 1.

Lunacy, &c., treason and felony, præmunire, alien. No courtesy out of a use at common law, 27 Hen. 8, c. 10, *Sweet-apple v. Binden*, *Watts v. Ball*, *Chaplin v. Chaplin*. Copyholds, *Pauker v. Cornhill*, *Sir John Savage's case*. Writ of annuity. Ancient demesne. Gavelkind.

Prærogativa Regis, c. 13. Not applicable. Marriage of the king's neife. Castle of defence, Caput Baronie. Title of honour, *John rex Castile's claim*, *Richard Earl of Salisbury's case*, *Richard Bertie's case*, *Sir Thomas Fane's claim*, *Sampson Lennard's claim*.

Wife had to be seised of freehold and inheritance. Courtesy attached though estate had ceased. Issue had to be such as could succeed. Issue had to take by descent. Wife had to be seised during coverture. No courtesy if tenant married his seignores. No courtesy out of estate tail after possibility of issue extinct. Merger. Sometimes seisin had to continue until birth of issue. A moneter no issue. Death of mother in childbed. Cry of issue. On birth of issue husband had to do homage, 17 Edw. 3, c. 51, *Harris v. Nichols*. Advowson. Statute of Westminster the 2nd. No action for waste before 6 Edw. 1, c. 5.

Courtesy out of wife's separate realty, *Bennet v. Davis*, *Hearle v. Greenbank*, *Lechmere v. Brotheridge*, *Moore v. Webster*, *Appleton v. Rowley*, *Cooper v. Macdonald*.

Real Property Commissioners' First Report, 1829. Bill introduced in 1831. Article in Solicitors' Journal as to Married Women's Property Act, 1862.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

### PARAPHERNALIA . . . . . PAGE 116—119

Origin of paraphernalia. Custom of London and York, *Biddle v. Biddle*, *Viscountess Binden's case*, *Seymore v. Tresilian*, *Mangey v. Hungerford*. Paraphernalia liable to husband's debts, *Tipping v. Tipping*, *Graham v. Londonderry*, *Snelson v. Corbet*, *Ridout v. Plymouth*, *Burton v. Pierpont*, *Northey v. Northey*.

Husband could alienate the paraphernalia during his lifetime.

Widow's right to paraphernalia personal to her, *Clarges v. Albermarle*. Widow's right to paraphernalia might be barred. Gift from relative or friend to wife was separate property, *Williams v. Mercier*. Married Women's Property Acts, 1870 and 1882.

---