

also all such portion of the estate of her former husband, James P. Tucker, as may be recovered and allotted to her as a distributee thereof, and to award to her the value of such property which she had at the time of her marriage, as has been converted and disposed of by Tayman, to be paid to her by him, and for general relief.

*The answer of Tayman, filed on the 30th of November, 1850,* admits the marriage as stated in the bill, and that his wife since that time, has resided with him and demeaned herself towards him as a chaste and with few exceptions as a loving and obedient wife. He denies that his habits generally, or his behavior towards his wife became changed shortly after his marriage, that he become excessively dissipated, or began to treat her in a cruel and forbidden manner. On the contrary, he avers, that the complainant for a long time before their intermarriage, lived in the same house with respondent, he boarding with her; that she knew him to be very much younger than herself, and on occasions seeking the society of young men who were convivial, and would sometimes indulge in dissipation, and that complainant had herself, seen respondent before her intermarriage with him, intoxicated, and that his habits in this respect were the same as they were before his marriage, until about the month of September last, since which time he has not drank any quantity, whatever, of intoxicating drinks. He denies, that he ever was utterly given up to drunkenness, or that his treatment of his wife was ever barbarous. He admits, that she has occasionally done acts calculated to reclaim him, but on many other occasions she has provoked him, disobeyed him, and fretted him into passion. He denies that he did, in the month of August or at any other time, assault complainant, or beat or bruise her person, or that she had any occasion to fear that her life would be taken. He admits, that on one occasion, she, in her disobedience, attempted, by interposing her person, to prevent respondent from whipping her negro boy, who was disobedient and impudent to respondent, and when, in his proper efforts to chastise the boy, he may have accidentally struck complainant, but without intending to injure her, and, in fact, without injur-