ture could only oblige him, but not her. It was replied, That she had a peculiar estate left by her father, wherefrom her husband was secluded, and which was appointed for her entertainment, that her husband was at that time, and yet, out of the country, and hath no means.

' THE LORDS found the reply relevant.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 398. Stair, v. 1. p. 498.

No 155.
ed to her and
her children
by her orders, she having an estate
from which
her husband
was excluded.

1688. July 6. HENRY ROBINS against The Countess of Southesk.

No 156.

Found that though any furnishing made by merchants, &c. to the Lady Southesk, after she had a separate aliment settled upon her, would oblige her personally, and affect her aliment, yet neither she nor her aliment could be liable for furnishing before constitution of the aliment; and that her promise since the settling of the aliment, to pay what was furnished to her before the aliment, was revocable as done stante matrimonio; and that her husband's representatives were liable for that furnishing.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 398. Harcarse, (STANTE MATRIMONIO.) No 890. p. 253.

SECT. III.

Furnishings to a Wife, whose Husband has deserted her.

1611. January 9. Hog against Little, in Kirkcaldy.

No 157.

A woman and her husband having deserted and dwelling sundry, and the wife keeping an open hostlerie diverse years, albeit her husband have served inhibition upon her, yet if she give her bond for flesh and furnishings made to her house, the husband will not have action for reduction of the bond, if the party renounce all action and execution upon the bond against the husband's person and goods, and seek only execution against the wife and her goods.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 398. Haddington MS. No 2103.

1629. March 19. Russel against Paterson.

A MERCHANT furnishing wines to a woman, and she being pursued by him for the price thereof, the action and process was sustained against her, albeit Vol. XIV.

33 M

No 158.