

No 13.

was found to meet the assignee, as it would have met the cedent's self; and seeing the bond made by the buyer to the seller, which was assigned, bore to be granted for the price of the land, it was found, That the buyer could not be compelled to pay the same, before that the assignee should obtain the cedent's ratification of the alienation, done by the cedent after his majority, conform to the back-bond, or else until the time he was past the age of 25 years, and so after the years of his restitution; and which was so found, albeit the back-bond bore no clause, that the buyer should not pay the price till that were done, but only astricted the seller to pay a greater failure to the buyer, if he ratified not, which was not respected, as said is; but in the mean time, during the retention of the money, the buyer was obliged to pay profit to the assignee yearly, while the sum were paid by him.

Act. *Lawrie.*Alt. *Nicolson et Neilson.*Clerk, *Hay.**Fol. Dic. v. I. p. 595. Durie, p. 396.*

No 14.

1663. February 12. RELICT of GEORGE MORISON *against* His HEIRS.

THIS relict pursues for implement of her contract.—It was *alleged* she had accepted a wadset, in full satisfaction thereof, which now being redeemed, she could crave no more, but re-employing the money to her in liferent.

THE LORDS found, That this acceptance by the wife, being *donatio inter virum et uxorem*, she might now revoke it, and therefore found the heir liable to make up what was in the contract.

*Stair, v. I. p. 177.*

1663. February 13.

ELIZABETH FLEMING and SIR JOHN GIBSON *against* FLEMING and ROBERT BAIRD.

No 15.

Acceptance of full satisfaction imports an obligation to denude of what is over.

BY contract of marriage betwixt the said Robert Baird and his spouse, he accepted 12,000 merks in name of tocher, in satisfaction of all his wife could succeed to by her father, mother, sister, and brothers, and discharged his mother as executrix and tutrix thereof; yet she having formerly put more bonds in the name of Robert's wife than this sum, and there being no assignation to the remainder in the contract, pursues the said Robert and his spouse, to grant an assignation thereof, and to pay what he had uplifted of the sums more than his tocher.—The defender *alleged* the summons is not relevant, he neither obliged *ex lege* nor *ex pacto* to assign.—The pursuer *answered*, This being *bonæ fidei contractus*, the meaning and interest of parties is most to be respected; and therefore, though it contains but expressly a discharge, which cannot be effect-