

1. (a) This brings up the problem of a shifting use. Prior to the passing of the Statute of Uses in 1535, you could not have a shifting use. After the passing of the statute they were possible. There could not be an overlapping of estates prior to the statute. Since the states *Corymena* would have been bad. It could have been done by granting a use to B + his heirs but if B dies without leaving children then to C and his heirs. This would then make it a valid shifting use.

(B) This case represents a spring use. One which comes into effect after a specified event. This was ~~not~~ good ^{under} the Statute of Uses because there was a "reverter". The procedure should have been to grant a use to X and his heirs when X is admitted to the state bar of NY. On both A + B. Before the statute