

TYSER, C.J. the family. Even in Cyprus he takes his share in any of his father's  
&  
BERTRAM, moveables that may be in the country. Why then should our law  
J. refuse to recognise his sonship for the purpose of his father's mulk  
immovables?

PHORION  
TANO  
AND  
ANOTHER  
v.  
GEORGI  
TANO  
AND  
OTHERS  
—

In the second place, I think it is to be regretted that the law of Cyprus in this particular should be out of harmony with the law of the Orthodox Church. Adoption is no doubt in practice obsolete in Cyprus, but it is still ecclesiastically possible. The *Μέγα Εὐχολόγιον* of the Orthodox Church contains a regular adoption service, the *Ἀκολουθία τῆς Υἱοθεσίας*. Any man who goes through the ceremony of being adopted according to this service becomes in the eye of the Church a son in the fullest sense of the word. The relationship is recognised as real relationship by all provinces of the Orthodox Communion, and is part of the family system of the Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria and the Kingdom of Greece. If the adopted son of a person domiciled in any of these places claimed to inherit the mulk immovables of his father in Cyprus, his sonship, though recognised by the Church, could not be recognised by the law.

I agree with Mr. Rossos however that in a codifying law of this kind the recognition of such a relationship cannot be implied—but must appear by the express words of the law—as the words of the Law seem to me insufficient for this purpose I am of opinion that the appeal must be dismissed with costs.

*Appeal dismissed.*

---

The case of *Rex v. Ianni Papa Antoni, Ex parte Georghi Haji Panagi*, reported in pages 107-111 of the original edition is no longer of any importance.