1613. June 16. HEPBURN against NASMYTH.

No. 6. A wife reducing her deeds must libel verum et justum metum.

A woman having consented to an alienation made by her husband of lands wherein she was infeft by her husband before her marriage in liferent or conjunct fee intuitu matrimonii, or an annual-rent of 400 merks yearly during her life-time; the woman seeking thereafter reduction of the security made by her husband with her consent of that tenement as done by her metu reverentiali, for fear of an awful answer and cruel husband, and upon her revocation made since her husband's decease; the Lords assoilzied from the summons, albeit she had never ratified the infeftment by her oath given in judgment; because the Lords found that judicial ratification not necessary, and were not moved with the reason founded super metu reverentiali, unless she had libelled verum et expressum metum by relevant circumstances and deeds, and proved the same by lawful and ordinary means.

Haddington, MS. v. 2. No. 2497.

\*\* See a case to the same effect, Marshall against Ferguson, in 1683. No. 192. p. 5990; also Leishman against Nicols, in 1696, No. 10. p. 13406. voce Recompense.

1623. January 9. MARISHALL against MARISHALL.

No. 7.

One being bound in his son's contract of marriage to provide the wife in a jointure, her discharge of the same was not sustained, being presumed done ob reverentiam maritalem.

Durie.

\*\* This case is No. 245. p. 6036. voce Husband and Wife.

1632. June 27.

Cassie against Fleeming.

No. 8.

A wife, who was conjunct fiar, having consented to a wadset of the lands let by her husband; and, after his decease, having raised reduction ex capite metus, and libelling beating, expelling the house, &c. the same was found relevant and sustained, it being specifice libelled, as was found requisite, that she suffered the above maltreatments for refusing her consent to the alienation; and this, though at the time of her subscription, she showed no repugnance; and the onerous purchaser was neither partaker of the violence nor knew thereof.

Durie,

\* This case is No. 91. p. 10279. voce Personal and Real.