

In general ~~it is~~ the compound interest is not
authorized by the law (Ferguson v. Fyffe (1840)
8 Q. & F. 121)

The interest on interest is not, in fact, excepted from
the law of usury (1 Eq. Cas. 44. 287; Birchard v/
Munson's Estate 31 Vt. 679; Stokely v. Thompson 24 13.
210); and the current opinion of the jurists is
~~that it is not~~ that it is disfavorable on
reasons of its character as compound and recurring and
of its ~~being~~ ^{being} ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~case~~ ^{case} of ~~usury~~ ^{usury}; Connecticut v/
Jackson, 1 Johns. Ch. (N. Y.) 14 2 Am. Dec. 471;
Henson v. Dickins 1 N.C. 522, ~~2 Am. Dec. 18~~
2 Am. Dec. ~~18~~ 642; Wheelock v. Milton, 13
Vt. 430; Levens v. Briggs, 21 M. 333, 28 Pac
15, 14 L. R. A. 1888; mais l'anatocisme est
autorisee et est admis apres l'echance des
interets: Barbours v. Thompson 31 W. Va. 410
2 D.E. 1; Moretz v. Mortgage Co. 79 Ga. 213 72 E.
267 etc

l'art 248 du C. Civ. decide "qu'une convention
faite a l'avance comme ayant pour objet que
les interets des producteurs d'interets est nulle"

Schuster § 106.2. Code prussien de 1794 l. 11,
§ 818-819. Code Saxon 680-681; Projet de Codification
Hervie (1841-1853) 146, 2; id. Barten 631;

Code Civil: Italie 1232; Hollande 1287; Sw. Fed. 335 h. 1;
(1894) Spain 1109; Jap. 409; Chile 1559; Mex 2699;
Colombie 1617; Guatemala 1445