HEIR AND EXECUTOR.

No. 1. 1741, June 4. Thomas Pringle against Executors of Pringle.

A TENANT entering into a grass-room at Whitsunday and the rent payable half yearly, the first payment being the first Martinmas after his entry, and the heritor dying after Martinmas,—the Lords found, that he having survived both the legal terms, his executors have right to the rent not only payable at Martinmas but also at the following Whitsunday after the heritors death,—much against the inclination of several of us, who were for the interlocutor. But we thought ourselves tied down by former precedents, 21st February 1635, L. Westnisbet, observed by Durie and also by Spottiswood, verbo Executry in fine, (Dict. No. 15. p. 15,883) and 20th July 1671, Guthrie, (Dict. No. 25. p. 15,890.)

No. 2. 1744, Dec. 7. SIR W. DALRYMPLE against LADY DALRYMPLE.

SIR JOHN DALRYMPLE died 24th May 1743. He had a field of clover on the ground whereof that was the first year or crop, having been sown with the barley the preceding year 1742. There was also a field that had been sown with rape-seed but did not prosper, and the day he died a number of ploughs were yoked and ploughed the whole ground, and it was sown with barley. The competition was betwixt his relict, executrix, and his heir Sir William, for the crop of clover of the year 1743 and for the barley crop. There was also a competition anent other grass grounds, in respect Sir John survived Whitsunday; but as to this none of us made any difficulty that it belonged to the heir. We all agreed likewise as to the barley sown after his death,—but Arniston doubted. As to the clover we also adhered,—but Arniston differed,—and the case was mentioned of wheat sown at Lammas and the heritor's dying at or before Martinmas. The President thought the heir would have the crop, from which I own I differed, but I did not hear Arniston.

No. 3. 1745, June 11. CAMPBELL against CAMPBELL of Skirven.

Lands being let to different tenants, whereof some paid fore-hand rent, that is the entry was at Whitsunday, and therefore the removal also at Whitsunday, but the whole rent payable at the Martinmas after the entry, though only half a year's possession was then past; others were after-hand rent, that is, the rent was payable Martinmas come a year after the entry, that is, at the Martinmas after rouping the crop, and what victual was due was payable betwixt Yule and Candlemas after separation of the crop,—and parties differed whether it was grass-rooms or corn-rooms. Arniston was for distinguishing betwixt corn and grass-rooms. Tinwald thought that the heritor dying after the Martinmas, his executor had right only to the half of the fore-hand rent payable at the term, and I inclined a little to the same opinion; but there were so many precedents to the contrary, that I thought we could not now alter them, and for the same reason I thought we could not distinguish between corn and grass-rooms; and likewise because I thought