schemers, who, under the specious cloak of liberality, or of being what is called public-spirited citizens, have no hesitation in spending the money of the people in order to gratify their own vanity or to promote their own private interests. \* \* \* As a condition, therefore, of my will, let the managers and contributors join to exclude all such persons from the direction of the Library Company. It is for the quiet, unostentatious and disinterested character of the directors and of their management that I have drawn the motives which induced me to choose the Philadelphia Library Company as the heir to my estate."

So much for the natural meaning of the words.

Now upon the question of judicial construction—of legal interpretation—the law is clear. It is settled that a codicil is never to be taken as revoking a will, unless—

- 1. It contain express words of revocation, or,
- 2. Its provisions are so repugnant to the will that the two cannot stand together.

Of these, only the second need be considered.

"Where a devise in a will is clear, it is incumbent on those who contend that it is not to take effect by reason of a revocation in a codicil, to show that the intention to revoke is equally clear and free from doubt as the original to devise. The law thus laid down has been recognized and acted upon as an established rule in numerous subsequent cases;"

I Williams on Executors, 185 (7th edition), and notes.

An analogy may be found in the rules of construction of statutes. A statute and its supplement are taken as one statute, just as a will and its codicil are taken as one