

## THIRLAGE.

---

1565. July 12. LAIRD OF FORDEL *against* TENANTS OF FRENCHY.

ALBEIT ane be astrictit to pay thirle multuris, and to grind the cornis growand upon his ground at an ather man's miln, zet he nevertheless is not bund nor oblist to bring to his miln that part of his cornis, quhilk payis his zeirlie fermes, his teindis, the toill of the threshing of his cornis, his pence maill, or cornis for sawing of the ground, the sustentatioun of his bestial, or for uphalding of his pleuch or pleuch graith.

*Balfour, (MILNS) p. 495.*

---

1566. April 4. HOPPRINGLE *against* CAIRNCROSS.

Anent the action pursued be ——— Hoppringle and Ker his mother against Robert Cairncross of Colmestre, for payment of the thirle multures of the land of C. to the pursuer's miln of ———, as it was thirled thereto, alleging that the Abbot of Melrose and Convent thereof had made acts in their Convents, that the tenants of C. should come as said is with their corns to the said pursuer's miln, and pay their multure thereto, and so had thirled themselves thereto as said is; and to that effect had set the said miln to the pursuer's predecessors and himself for long tacks with the thirle multure thereof; and before that the tacks were run furth, the pursuer got the said miln and thirle multure thereof in feu and heritage: Be the whilk tacks and feu, the pursuer and his predecessors had been in possession of the miln and multures, and specially of the lands of C. The defender alleged he should be assoilzied from the petition, because that his predecessors obtained the lands of C. in feu and heritage of the Abb. and Convent of

No. 1.

No. 2.

Where a superior by an act of his own court, thirled all the barony, it was found that such feuers as were in-  
*feft cum molendinis, &c.*  
prior to the said act, were not thereby bound.