

this law was limited to a period of three years, as were most of the other acts passed at this session (Arch. Md. I, 195-196). It is likely that the enactment of the statute merely gave legal sanction to a custom which already existed, and one which, as we see, was still current some twenty years after the law had expired making the use of the Broad Arrow obligatory.

Two instances occur in the period covered by this volume in which we find the sheriff marking with the Broad Arrow tobacco attached by him for fines levied against the owners. In the first case Richard Blunt, High Sheriff of Kent, served an execution on tobacco and on a boat owned by a certain William Ellyote, to enforce payment of a fine of three hundred pounds of tobacco levied against him for his failure to plant a certain quantity of corn, as required by the statute. The case came up before the Provincial Court in 1663, because Ellyote had made away with the boat and had erased the Broad Arrow which the sheriff had set upon the tobacco house. The court held that the sheriff was personally responsible to the Lord Proprietary for the amount of the fine, and that he must seek his remedy at law against Ellyote to reimburse himself for this (pages 85-86). In the second case, which came before the court in February, 1664, Thomas Hawker employed the sheriff to impanel a jury to mark the bounds of his land, and then failed to pay the costs of the proceedings, which amounted to four hundred pounds of tobacco. The sheriff then laid an attachment for this amount, with costs of fifty pounds added as his charges for execution, and placed the Broad Arrow on the tobacco house. Hawker objected in court to this latter charge as unreasonable, but the justices decided in favor of the sheriff (pages 138-139). We find a similar use of the Broad Arrow in 1657 reported in the Proceedings of the Provincial Court (Arch. Md. XLI; 174). The Maryland archives show that the Broad Arrow was made use of in Virginia in a somewhat similar way at this period. In 1662 when the boundary dispute between Maryland and Virginia over the dividing line on the Eastern Shore was at its height, Colonel Edmund Scarborough, Surveyor-General of Virginia arrested John Elzey, a prominent resident of Maryland living in the disputed territory, demanding of him "obedience" to the Virginia authorities, and threatened to set the Broad Arrow upon the house of any one who did not submit to the authority of Virginia (Arch. Md. III, 473-474).

Suicide, especially among indentured servants, was quite common in the Province at this period. The verdict of a jury of inquest which was called to investigate the death of a certain Anne Vaughan illustrates the attitude of the public mind of the day towards suicide. The jury found that her wounds were self inflicted, and brought in the verdict of wilful murder against her (page 88). Similar verdicts were also rendered in several other cases of suicide.

A suit by Philip Calvert, as Treasurer and Receiver-General of Rents of the Province, against a certain Hugh Stanley, shows that when a man married a widow, the personal property which he had acquired through his wife's interest in her former husband's estate was subject to the latter's debts, as has been seen in the case of Hannah Price. Stanley had married Dorothy, the widow and administratrix of Giles Sadler, a deputy Receiver of Rents, who had failed to pay over to Calvert certain rents which he had collected as deputy. Suit was