

in their Persons; and the Substitute may after the Original Creditor's de-  
-cease, charge summarily for Payment 18 January 1625 Wat cont  
Dobie 26 June 1629 Keith contra Innies 4 Feb. 1630 Robertes  
Dreston.

Sir George McLenzie (Treatise of Feudal) tells of a case  
wherein he and others were consulted: A Feud of Lands did res  
the Superior's Hands for new Investment to himself in Liferent to  
his Daughter E. in Liferent only, and to the Heirs of her Body  
which failing to A. B. in Fee: The Daughter having died without  
Children, the Question was how A. B. could come to the Right of  
Estate? Some of the Lawyers were of Opinion, that he behoved to  
serve Heir to E. Because tho the Lands were resigned to her in Liferent  
yet seeing they were to descend to her Children in Fee, and no Child  
existed, the Fee remained still with herself. But this was rejected  
the Taxative only in Liferent excluded her from the Fee. Others would  
have the Fee continued in the Superior, who only could make a Right to  
the Lands. But neither did this satisfy, because it non agebatur by the Resi-  
-gation in favour, to transfer the Fee to remain with the Superior. Sir  
George himself and others thought more probably, that the Fee remain-  
-ed with the Resigner. For that Dominium nunquam confertur per resignationem  
-antistum, donec alteri fuerit quaesitum. And as had the Person in  
-favour Resignation was made refused, or been incapable to accept the  
-it would certainly continue with the Resigner, so it behoved to con-  
-use, where the Condition failed. One having signed a Disposition  
-rite to his Son which failing to <sup>subjoin't to the Disposition</sup>  
-yet empowering a certain Person to fill up the Blank in the Name of  
-Arden and his Heirs ~~et c.~~ The Docquet was found to import a Substi-  
-tution in Favour of the Person therein named. Albeit it was plain  
-in constituting Rights and Conveyances, the regular legal dispositive or ob-  
-gatory Words must be used, before a Person can be deemed to convey to  
-himself: For it were dangerous to countenance the Alteration of the In-  
-heritance Heretage is transmitted; upon which Account, it cannot be done  
-in a Testament made in Liege proutie, or by a mispive Letter, nor  
-could such a Testament or Letter import an Obligation upon the Heir  
-at Law to divest himself. In respect it was answered, that the Docquet  
-must have at least the Force of a Fideicommiss, so as to oblige the Heir  
-at Law to make the Substitution according to the Grantor's Intention, tho  
-is not contrary to the formal Style of Conveyances: For when the legal  
-Heir comes to implement his Predecessor's Will, he is obliged to do so by  
-formal Conveyance. But Law hath not tied down Proprietors to a pre-  
-Form

form in the naming of substitutes, any thing doth it, that expresseth the  
Will of the Grantor. Nor is it any. Unlawfulness to name a Substitute by a  
mispive Letter, if the Date is supported by Witnesses: And tho Heretage  
cannot be disposed of by Testament it may by any other Deed, 13 July 1722  
Kennedy of Colzean contra Arbuthnot.

Substitutions in Scotland differ from those in the civil Law in so far as  
-jo The Latter were altogether cut off by the Institutes entering Heir 13 July  
-impub. et alij substit. Whereas with us a Substitution in Heretage takes effect  
-tho the Institute enter by being confirmed Ex. 1. (Who is Heir in mo. et his)  
-And obtain Decree against Debtors for Payment, notwithstanding what  
-the Substitute will exclude, and so preferred to the Institute nearest of Kin  
-13 July 1601 Christy contra Christy. Tho. J. James in v. C. H. 1711  
-says that all Substitutions in movable Goods, should be only of the Nature  
-of common Substitutions in the civil Law, and so consist of two kinds  
-vit. 1. By the Roman Law there were three kinds of Substitutions, 1. Vol-  
-gare Substitution, where by a Person could substitute a Heir to himself in  
-his own Estate, in case the Heir institute cannot or will not, being preven-  
-ted by Death, or should decline to enter to an overcuried inheritance. 2.  
-Inst. de vulg. substit. 2. Pupillary Substitution, an Act whereby a Father  
-substitutes an Heir to his Children living under his Power at the  
-of his Death, and dying in their Pupillarity, before they can name  
-Heirs to themselves (Pr. Inst. de pupill. substit. 2. Quasi Pupillary or  
-exemplary Substitution, which is the Father or Mother's Institute of an  
-Heir to their Children that are Lunatics, Idiots, interdicted, or naturally  
-deaf or dumb, in case they die in that condition. But the pupillary  
-and Quasi-pupillary Substitutions are peculiar to the Romans and unknown  
-to other Nations, Groeneweg. de Legib. abrog. Inst. de pupill. substit. 2. pupil-  
-lary Substitution hath no Place in Scotland 13 July 1601 Christy contra  
-Christy. That is, tho a Father may make pupillary Substitutions either to  
-his own Children or to Strangers who are under Age, with Respect to  
-the Goods which he himself leaves to them; yet that Part of the Pu-  
-pillary Substitution empowering a Father among the Romans, by Vir-  
-tue of his paternal Authority, to dispose not only of the Goods which he  
-left to his Son, but of what other Effects the Son had belonging to him  
-any other Manner of Way, in case the Son should die before he was of Age,  
-sufficient to dispose of them himself, is not received in Scotland. Nor doth the  
-Law of England allow so large an Extent to the paternal Authority,  
-as to enable Fathers to make Testaments for their Children under Age  
-Covel