HUSBAND AND WIFE.

SECT. 8.

## 1724. July 21.

## ELIZABETH BORTHWICK, widow of Thomas Scot, against JOHN Scot, son to the said Thomas.

THE pursuer, with consent of Thomas Scot her husband, granted a disposition of certain tenements in Edinburgh which belonged to her, in favours of Pringle of Torsonce, brother-in-law to the husband, who thereupon disponed the same to the said Thomas Scot. She having survived her husband, raised reduction of these two dispositions, as being in the same case as if she had disponed the tenements directly to her husband, which she could have revoked, as a donation *inter virum et uxorem*.

The defences were, 1mo, That she had judicially ratified the disposition extra præsentiam mariti, and sworn, 'that she should never quarrel, impugn, nor 'reduce the same, nor come in the contrary thereof, directly or indirectly, in 'judgment, nor without the same, any manner of way, in time coming;' and this, according to Sir James Stewart's opinion, in his Answers to Dirleton's Doubts, tit. Don. inter vir. et ux. excludes revocation. 2do, That she had homologated the disposition, in so far as, a liferent of the subjects being reserved to her, she had, after her husband's death, uplifted and discharged the rents, and set tacks, &c. as liferentrix.

Answered to the 1st, That the judicial ratification does only exclude a reduction ex capite vis et metus, but does not hinder a wife to revoke a donation made by her to her husband stante matrimonio, as was found February 15. 1678, Gordon against Maxwell, No 353. p. 6144.; which authority must be of greater weight than the opinion of any private lawyer. To the 2d, That her uplifting rents, to which she was entitled, could not be construed an homologation of the disposition; for, till that deed was reduced, she could do no more than levy the rents as liferentrix.

 $T_{HE}$  LORDS found, that the judicial ratification did not exclude the revocation; and that the setting tacks as liferentrix was not a sufficient homologation of the dispositions.

Reporter, Lord Grange.

Act. Arch. Hamilton, sen. Alt. Ch. Binning. Clerk, Mackenzie.

Fol. Dic. v. 3. p. 288. Edgar, p. 97.

## 1793. December 4.

ANDREW BULLIONS against JAMES BAYNE and JOHN HEPBURN.

JOHN GUERNSEY, a soldier, husband of Margaret Bullions, went with his regiment upon foreign service.

No 356. A decid executed by a married wo-

34 N 2

No 355. A wite, with

consent of her husband, disponed certain houses to her brotherin-law, who redisponed them to her husband. She afterwards raised a reduction of the disposition, on the ground, that it was donatio inter vir um et uxorem. Answered, She had ratified it extra præsentiam mariti, and had homologated it

by letting

tacks as life-

reutrix (the liferent being

reserved to

repelled the defence.

her.) The Lords