

There is one other point on which the decree below was in error. This is as to the scope of the materialmen's lien given to the plumber Al Davis, apparently under Ark. Stats. § 51-701, for his \$509.68 bill against Tyra for work on the well. This work was done by Davis for Tyra. Tyra was not defendants' agent in contracting for the work; he was contracting for himself only. The decree provided that Davis should recover this sum "of and from the plaintiffs and defendants" and gave him a lien "upon the lands aforesaid." Actually, this debt was owed by Tyra only, and under the statute the lien could exist only on his interest in the land, and not on defendants' interest. *Roberts v. Tice*, 198 Ark. 397, 129 S. W. 2d 258, 122 A. L. R. 1177; *Judd v. Rieff*, 174 Ark. 362, 295 S. W. 370; *Snodgress v. Huff*, 234 S. W. 2d 505. Tyra's interest in the land now exists only in the form of his rights against defendants under the decree to be entered in this case, but it is proper that the materialmen's lien be good against his interest in this changed form, and we so hold.

The case is remanded for further proceedings and entry of a decree in accordance with this opinion.