tained at the instance of both the executors, the half belonged to the nearest of kin of the conjunct executor, who was dead.

It was REPLIED, That a testament cannot be said to be executed by a decreet, unless payment had been made; which is the opinion of Sir Thomas Hope, in his Treatise, that instrumentum non est executum but by intromission of the executor; and therefore, jure accretionis, the defunct's part did belong to the sur-

viving executor.

The Lords did sustain the defence, notwithstanding of the reply, and found, That an executor, either sole or conjunct, obtaining a decreet for payment to him of the defunct's debt, the testament is fully executed, and his creditors may affect the same; or, if he die, it is in bonis defuncti, and belongs to the nearest of kin: and that the naked office of executry does only accrue to the surviving executor; as it was found in a case of the Lord Southwall, who, as creditor, had arrested the executor's goods, who had obtained sentence, and [was] preferred, in respect of his diligence, to the proper creditors of the defunct, to whom the executor was confirmed; albeit the competition was for the debts belonging to the defunct, for which the executor had gotten decreet.

Page 176.

1671. June 24. Stevenson against Dobie.

Stevenson, having comprised the lands whereof Dobie was tacksman, did pursue for maills and duties. It was alleged for Dobie, That he was infeft in an annualrent, and in possession before the compriser's infeftment or diligence; which being found relevant for proving his possession, in termino probatorio, at the advising of the cause; It was alleged for the compriser,—That the tack could not prove possession of the annualrent; because the first term of payment thereof was after the compriser's infeftment; and so it could not be drawn back, there being medium impedimentum. It was answered, That the annualrenter being tacksman, and in natural possession, could do no diligence against himself for obtaining a decreet of possession; and therefore, his possession, from the time that he was infeft, behoved to run, and make his annualrent clad with possession.

The Lords did repel the defence, and preferred the compriser; and found, that the annualrent could not be clad with possession until the first term of payment was past; but, if the annualrenter had obtained decreet of poinding the ground against the heritor, the term of payment being elapsed, the case would have been more difficult.

Page 176.

1671. July 4. Mr William Douglas against The Laird of Balfour.

In a pursuit, for mails and duties, of the lands of Airly, at the instance of the Laird of Balfour, upon a comprising whereupon he was infeft; compearance was made for Mr William Douglas, who had comprised the said lands in anno 1652; whereupon he ALLEGED, That he ought to be preferred; because his comprising was expired long before the pursuer's right.