

his trustee ; in regard he was personally liable, and that the distress arose from no fact and deed of hers : and therefore found, she had not only access to the annualrent of the £3400, for which his comprising was sustained, but also to the stock of it, for making up her 600 merks yearly. But now the Lords altered that interlocutor, and thought it more equal, (it not being an infetment of annualrent, but a liferent,) that she should have no farther right, but allenary to the restricted sum of £3400 ; and this both for bygones since the eviction, and in time coming.

*Vol. I. Page 672.*

1695. *February 21.* GEORGE DALLAS of ST. MARTINS *against* MACKENZIE.

GEORGE Dallas of St. Martins against Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh's son, for payment of an account of writings, for his father. ALLEGED,—They are prescribed *quoad modum probandi*, not being pursued within three years after the last article. ANSWERED,—The act is anent merchants' and tradesmen's accounts ; and the general words of " others," could not extend to writers, which was a liberal science.

The Lords thought, If he had the principal writs in his hands, it presumed he was yet unpaid ; but, being delivered, and he only showing scrolls, and never craving it in Sir George's own lifetime, that it prescribed as well as other accounts ; else, where one has served *gratis*, he may afterwards pursue his heirs for payment of such accounts.

*Vol. I. Page 672.*

1695. *February 22.* SHARP of HODDAM *against* MURRAY of BROCKILRIG.

MERSINGTON reported Sharp of Hoddam against Murray of Brockilrig, being a spuilie of teinds. ALLEGED,

*1mo.* Your tack is null, being set by the episcopal minister after the revolution of the government, and the abolition of episcopacy. The Lords repelled this, unless it had been set after he deserted his church.

*2do.* That, being without consent of the patron, it was null. ANSWERED,—*1mo.* It is set to the patron himself ;—but he should have taken it in a third party's name. *2do.* He restricts it to three years, as the Act 200, Parliament 1594, allows. The Lords sustained it for that time, as had been done, *18th July 1688, Johnston against Parishioners of Houden.*

*3tio.* ALLEGED,—I have a tack yet standing, set by the incumbent in 1662, with consent of the Archbishop of Glasgow, patron ; and the setter, Mr James Craig, though transported, is yet alive. ANSWERED,—*1mo.* The Duke of Queensberry and Southesk are patrons, as appears by their several presentations produced. *2do.* It is signed by Bishop Burnet ; whereas Fairfoul, in 1662, was Archbishop of Glasgow. It seems they have got his subscription *ex post facto.*