

or Parts of the Body that may give a just Abversion, as Lameness, Dumbness, Deafness, or Blindness; the more Beauty is required in a Woman offered as a Match to an Heir, than in a Man offered to an Heireft 9 July 1622. French & L. Thordydes contra Cranston Craig filio. s. d. Vers. Si sancte alii Stair filio. The necessary Formalities of the Offer are i. The Superior or his Donatary or one having Commission from him trust offer the Person by Name to the Heir, in an equal unsuspected Place for Interview and Conference, not in the Notary's own Drawing, and at a lawful Time. Whereupon as instrument is taken bearing Production of the Donatary's gift, if the Offer was made by a Notary, or of the Commission of a Translator made by a Notary, and the reading thereof before Mag. Pratt. Et. Marriage Drummond contra Munro 8 March 1627. E. Rothf contra Balfour 3 & 5 July 1622. French & L. Thordydes contra Cranston Stair filio. s. 6. Where the Heir is minor such Requirement made to himself sufficeth without making it to his Curators. Because their Consent is not necessary to his Marriage 9 July 1622. French contra Cranston Craig filio. s. 7. Vers. In his requisitions Spotswood Pratt. Et. Marriage 2. In the Day appointed for Victim, the Superior Notary or Notary appearance the Time at the Place named with the Person offered, and waiting till Midday it palls requires the Heir to examine the Marriage, at a convenient Hour in particular Day not being Sunday, because that is not an usual Day for Marriage. Whereupon another instrument is taken, bearing Production and reading of the former Instrument Craig filio. s. 7. Vers. Si dominus regis filio. E. Angliae contra His. However two Instruments are not absolutely necessary. For one requiring the Heir to an Interview with the Person offered on a certain Day, and another to marry on a Day thereafter was sustained as sufficient 22. Feb 1678. Drummond contra Stewart of Innernytie. The doing of these Formalities of requirement and the Vassal's Refusal cannot be proved by Witness, but only by Notary Instruments Craig filio. s. 7. albeit the Vassal be not yet married, the Lord may decern for the double Avail of his Marriage. But so long as he remains unmarried, no Execution can pass for Payment of the Double. 8. March 1627. E. Rothf contra Balfour. Seeing the Superior or his Donatary never offers a Match to his Heir, that he has Reason to think will be accepted, and uses such sinister Method for obtaining that double Avail, contrary to the original Design thereof, viz. Matching in a Family at Odds with the Superior, this Casually is so unfavourable, that the Lord Stair (filio. s. 9) tells us, he never observed since the Institution of the College of Justice, the double Avail found due.

Where a Vassal holds Ward Lands of several Superiors, every Superior has Right to the Casuality of Ward of Lands held of himself. But the Vassal is liable only for one Avail of the Marriage, because he can get but one Soother, which falls to the eldest Superior, that is he from whom the Vassal had the first. See 26 June 1672. E. Queensberry contra D. Bulleugh. Where some of the Vassal's Lands are held of the Prince of Scotland, some of other Subjects the Casuality

of Marriage belongs to the eldest Superior without any distinction or Consideration of the Prince's Character, his Highness being only a Subject Stair filio. s. 2. filo. 4. s. 5. But if the King be one of the Superiors his Majesty gets this indissoluble Casuality as presumed to be the eldest. For that all Fees originally flow from the Sovereign Craig filio. s. 5. Vers. Si vasallus moriens Stair filio. s. 9. McKenzie filio. s. 2. filo. s. 12. Stewart Answer to Dr. Set Doubts Et. Marriage. Yea when there is a Prince of Scotland, and a Vassal holds some of his Lands Ward of the King and others of the Prince, the Casuality of his Marriage is due to the King, the Prince as hath been said Reilly a Subject Stair filio. s. 5. The preferring the King in a competition with other Superiors to the Casuality of the Vassal's Marriage is an Advantage to the Vassal. Seeing his Majesty is the most benign Superior, and always favourable if timely application be made before the Casuality come in his Person of a rigorous Notary. This Preference is given to the King not only in simple Ward Holding, but also where the Ward and Marriage are held in the same Land. In which Case the Vassal is liable only for the last Estate. The King. And where he hath several Ward Fees with last Marriages held of the Sovereign, his Vassal, albeit he might claim the greatest Duty, he can have but one of them: As no Superior can hold more than one Ward Value for the Marriage of one Vassal is July 1622. E. Argyle contra L. M. Leod. But a Vassal who held Part of his Estate simple Ward held last Ward, having paid the sum taxed for his Marriage was notwithstanding liable for a full Ward of the Marriage deducting the last Duty. 24 Feby R. Lovelace contra L. Innernytie. So Sir James Stewart filio. s. 12. holds the last Duty only due the Ward being thereof stated. If some of the Vassal's Lands are held of the Prince and some of other Subjects the eldest Subject Superior is not excluded from the Marriage Casually by the King as Administrator to the Prince in his Minority to whom His Majesty is accountable. But where there is no Prince, the King who enjoys the Principality is intitled to the Marriage of a Ward Vassal thereof in a Competition with another Superior of whom that Vassal more recently held Lands Ward 9 January 1600 Purves contra L. Liff. Because albeit during the Nonexistence of a Prince the King acts as Prince and Stewart of Scotland, yet he hath so pure proprio as a Sovereign Prince, and not as a Subject Prince supersedes vice inquit, or as curator hereditatis jacentis. Administrator of the Principality. Nay suppose a Superior hath enjoyed the Marriage of a Ward Vassal's Predecessors for 100 Years, if that Vassal acquire any Land held in immediately of the King, the Majesty, the later Superior, hath the Marriage. But if the Heir of a Ward Vassal be a Subject, should during his Ward, acquire an Estate held Ward of the King, the former Superior would not thereby be cut off from the Casuality of Marriage, but the Vassal might justly find