1610. *February* 20. MAR *against* KER.

No. 6.

An infeftment of knaveship of a miln, and of the bannock, not found to be valid for the bannock, because the bannock is rather a voluntary gratuity of the persons bringing their corns to the servants of the miln for their thankful service, not a right of the heritor of the miln.—See No. 17. p. 15965.

Haddington MS. No. 1811.

1610. *July* 20. WILSON *against* ————.

No. 7.

In an action of thirled multures pursued by Gilbert Wilson for the mill of Inverstoun, it was found, that thirlage of lands being clear by an infeftment or other title, the quantity of the multure might be craved according to the use and custom of the most part of the lands thirled and astricted to the mill.

Kerse MS. p. 94.

1610. *December* 1. MURRAY *against* ————.

No. 8.

In an action of thirled multures pursued by Giles Murray, relict of Laurence Seaton, heritor of the mill of Dunsley, the Lords found, that she would have no action for the multure of the corns inbrought within the lands, but only corns growing thereupon, because the charter bears the mill to be disponed, una cum multuris omnium terrarum intra parochiam de Wadderly; which words the Lords found could not be interpreted but to corns growing upon the land, and not of the corns inbrought.

Kerse MS. p. 94.

1611. *January* 16. AFFLECK *against* HAMILTON in Strathaven.

No. 9.

He who has set rentals of his lands to his tenants for a certain duty, may notwithstanding thereof set a tack of his mill with the thirle multures of his barony, by virtue whereof the rentallers and remanent tenants will be astricted to bring their corns to the mill, and pay thirle multures therefor agreeable to the custom of the barony.

Haddington MS. No. 2089.