

them as a ground of their knowledge 18 Decemb. 1673
Thompson contra Portebo. But such oath given by an execu-
tor, or holding him at Confesse, is effectual only against
himself, so far as he may have benefit by the testamens.
And therefore the Plaintiff ought to find caution to sue
upon his oath, to relieve the executor at the hands of
all other creditors or legataries 6 March 1627. Solon
Cockburn 13 March 1627. Her contra Lady Coventry town
lib. 3 Jul. 8877. Which is something Analogous to Sanc-
t Maliana in the Civil Law.

Anciently executors having executed the whole de-
signment behaved for their security to get a Decree of Execu-
tion before the Commissioners against the Creditors,
all having Interests, upon proving, that the whole Invent-
it is exhausted by payments
but such a decree is not now necessary to executors: for
it is sustained relevant for them to prove by except/
that the Inventory is exhausted. For obstructing where
the executor may found upon 14 debts due to himself
before Confirmation Stat lib. 3 Jul. 8876. For among
debts that are of equal Degree, the executor may rem-
ain him self first. 16 Nov. 83. but he cannot found in
debts assigned to him after Confirmation. *ibid.*
Privileged debts paid at any time, and testamentary
paid before citation at the instance of other Creditors 23/4
Common debts paid by Virtue of Settlements, according
the order of Diligence done for them. 14 Decrees aga.
registered his wings against debtors of the Deceased
sentence & solvency obtained by debtors pursued by
executor, which are relevant to assilize him from
further accounting for such debts not recovered
the expence of Confirming the testament, which is
allowed out of the whole head of the executors. Because
the the Relict or Children need not conform their
respective shares of the moveables for establishing
titles thereto; yet it is impracticable to make the
Division, till the subject be confirmed and the Cred-
itors brought fairly in the testament, that Cred-
itors or others concerned be not injured 20 Junij
1713. Montcrieff & her husband contra Monipenny
But an Executrix in a Court and Reckoning all
In Ireland

In France, against one as heir to the Deceased, was not allowed
out of the executors extraordinary expence necessarily disturbed
in keeping the Confirmation, because by the fault of the
Apparent heir of the Deceased, against whom no action was brought
in his life time, in prejudice of the Defendant his heir born. whom
Benedictus Inconstantly, was all represented the Apparent heir 15
Decemb 1710 & 17 January 1711 Lord and Lady Montcrieff contra
Hamilton of Bangour. Nor yet was he found to have right to
retain the extraordinary expence of the funerals of the Deceased
Suppose the same were furnished by order of the said Appar-
ent heir, Edmon die inter Cadeaux. The charge of build-
ing a Monument to the Deceased ordered by him in his
testament was allowed to the Executor out of the debts
paid 20 June 1713 Montcrieff & her husband contra Monipenny.
But the Lord seemed to be of opinion that a Monument
erected to one whose character and fortune deserved it Monu-
ment would be considered as a part of the funeral expences
and to come off the whole debts Edmon die inter Cadeaux. Yet
the executor was allowed Deduction of the expence of the
Monument, albeit the testament Ordering it to be built,
was reduced for Informality in a Recitation added before the
building, and the executor got a bond of relief from the heir,
in all the testament happened to be reduced. Because the
will of the Deceased, the afterwards Reduced, should keep the
executor in demand as to all his Debts in accounting thereof:
And while the testamens debt, the Executor might have
been compelled by the Relation of the Deceased to fulfill that
part of his will. But the executor could have no allowance
for the expence of defending against Reduction of the testa-
ment: because the the Loss of a pleiait often ordained
to pay the gainers expence, it were hard to make the
gainer pay the Losses expence, who must blame himself
for pleading without a just Ground 19 Feb 1712 Montcrieff
& her husband contra Monipenny. 6 of the Executor men-
tioned in his executorship the necessary expence of process,
and Execution against the Debtors of the Deceased, which
he gets allowance of because such debts are not bound
to pay to him without a sentence for their Recovery and their
ibid. Where Executors have only an office to the Bishop
of others, they are obliged to do Diligence upon all proba-
ble Interests of the executors, and the expence thereof
must