passu for the remnant: but if Drum would not possess, then they preferred Gairden, he paying Drum his expenses out of the first end of his intromission.

Vol. I. Page 195.

1682. Nov. 29. Euphame Seton, Lady Kirklands, against Thomas Butter.

EUPHAME Seton, Lady Kirklands' action against Thomas Butter, tutor to her son, and executor to her husband, being reported by Castlehill; the Lords preferred the relict pursuer to her husband's creditors, not only quoad the funeral expenses, which is uncontroverted in law; but also for her mournings, he being of that rank and quality that his wife might wear them. 2do, For the servant's fees. 3tio, For the entertaining the family to the next term after his death; and 4to, For the expenses of her in-lying of a posthumous child, though the same fell to be after the term immediately subsequent to his decease, and so fell when she was entered to her own jointure.

Which last they had decided before, in 1675, in Agnes Wilkie's case against Morison; but quær. if under this she may claim the expense of the child's nurse's fee. And the Lords having remitted to Castlehill the auditor to consider the accounts given in by the relict, and to modify the same as he saw just; upon his report they modified to her 900 merks; she allowing, in the first end of it, what provisions she had in the house at the time of her husband's death, and any victual she received either then or since, providing it was not in payment of her jointure; and they found both the aliment to the term due, and that term due for her jointure, seeing she might lose a term by her dying before Whitsunday or Martinmas.

I find the Lords have allowed relicts' mournings even where the husband has died obæratus with more debt than their estate could pay; as in the case of Lady Kincardine and Lady Boggie.

Vol. I. Page 197.

1682. November 29. SIR ANDREW DICK against ROBERT DEANS.

This was an advocation from the Commissaries of Edinburgh, where Sir Andrew pursued Mr Robert Deans for slandering him, and stealing away and murdering his good name and reputation, by calling him a belted, i. e. in one sense, a whipped knight, for stealing some Scots records out of the Tower of London, the time of Oliver Cromwell's usurpation. Mr Robert's reasons of advocation were: 1mo, He was a member of the Session; 2do, the Commissaries had committed iniquity in sustaining process, after he had debarred Sir Andrew Dick with horning.

Answered,—The first was a declinator; and was not competent now, after he had proponed peremptors. *Item*, The privilege of advocates was only in civil cases, but not in slanders, where the Commissaries, as judices Christianitatis, were only competent in prima instantia privative of the Lords are till they had