

- No. 3. who should succeed to the estate, to pay the sum of 10,000 merks; so that his daughter, as heir of line, can never be convened for payment of the sum libelled, whether she did succeed to the estate or not, the bond being only obligatory against the heir of tailzie, and not against any heir of his own body. It was replied, That the bond was opposed wherein the Laird of Ayton himself being obliged to pay that sum, by our law, *qui se obligat, hæredes obligat*, and all who represent him, except they be expressly secluded and excepted out of the obligation; neither can that parenthesis, (not being of my own body) seclude his heirs of line, seeing immediately after these words, "his executors, and others representing him," are obliged and made liable, which being general and adjected to the foresaid parenthesis, must be interpreted to include all persons who in law can be liable, or representing him, albeit of his own body, if, by any particular right or disposition from him, they should succeed to the estate, or be served heirs of line, and thereby have right thereto; the clear intention of the granting of the bond being, that if his heirs-male or tailzie should succeed, not being of his own body, that they should only be liable; but, if it be otherwise, that they of his own body should succeed to the estate, they are not at all declared free by the bond, but ought to be comprehended under the general of all others succeeding to him in his estate and fortune. It was replied, That the bond, and whole context thereof was opposed, bearing expressly, that no heirs were to be obliged but such as were not of his own body; and it being inconsistent with that express clause under the word "others," to comprehend the heirs of his own body, who were particularly exeemed; the defender being his only daughter, could never be made liable as heir of line or heir of provision. The Lords did sustain the defence, and assoilzied the daughter as heir of line and as heir of provision, by a particular right from her father; but if she was executrix, or could be made to represent him as having right to heritable bonds, or other rights, as being general heir, they found her liable; for, after serious considering of the conception of the bond, being in the terms foresaid, they were all unanimous, that he did only intend to burden all heirs, who could represent him, excepting heirs of his own body succeeding to his estate; but, if they did represent him by the general subjoined, they were to be liable; as likewise, they found the Laird of Plenderguest, if he should succeed to the estate, would be liable to the debt; but could not decern, because the controversy betwixt him and the Lady was not decided.

*Gosford MS. No. 805. p. 505.*

1682. *March.*

GORDON *against* ANDREW BRUCE.

- No. 4. Found, That where sums were tailzied to heirs and substitutes, these heirs ought to serve to the last defunct in fee, though no infeftment had ever followed; and that a cognition was not enough.

*Harcarse, No. 959. p. 270.*