

dramas for the Jeury men ” and 225 pounds for “ Cap^t Brodnox boat prest to attend the Jeury men ” (*Arch. Md. liv*, 231). It seems certain that these were men of Kent who had gone across the Bay to St. Mary’s City to serve on Provincial Court juries there. The use of a then current slang expression for a jury is to be found in the Charles County record in 1662 in a defamation case, when the threat was made to bring a woman accused of poisoning before “ her twelve Godfathers ” (p. 262).

While the accused in criminal cases in the county courts had the option of choosing trial by the court or by a jury, the records of these four county courts disclose only seven cases in which a criminal issue was involved, where a jury was impanelled, and it is not always very clear in this group whether the jury acted in the capacity of a petit jury or of a grand jury, or as a combination of both. To students of the law it may be of interest to discuss this group.

Two cases came before the Charles County Court at its January 1664/5 session which involved suspicion of hog-stealing. Both cases were brought before the court by William Calvert, the Attorney-General. In the first case, that against four men who had killed James Lee’s hogs, Calvert “ *enditeth* ” the four “ for the killing and stealing of hogs contrary to the laws of this Province ”. A jury of twelve men was impanelled, who were ordered to inquire as to the guilt of the four accused. The evidence was then offered. The Attorney-General *presented* a “ manuscript ” containing “ instructions ” to the jury which thereupon swore to bring in a true verdict. The jury then returned the Attorney-General’s note subscribed “ *billa vera* ”. This same jury was then directed by the Attorney-General to determine the value of the hogs stolen, and it rendered a “ *verdict* ” placing the value of three sows at 120 pounds of tobacco each, and four pigs at 30 pounds each. The court thereupon ordered damages double the value of the swine to be paid to Lee as the owner, and 200 pounds of tobacco to him as informer, and imposed a fine of 300 pounds of tobacco to be paid to the Lord Proprietary (pp. 544-549). Immediately thereafter at the same court session the Attorney-General took similar action against Thomas Standbridge, also accused of hog-stealing. All the steps in this trial—the “ *presentment* ”, the “ *billa vera* ”, the “ *verdict* ”, damages to the owner, a fee to the informer, and fines to the Proprietary, are enumerated, as were those in the preceding trial of the four hog-stealers just narrated (pp. 551-553).

John Dere was brought before the Kent County Court at the February 2, 1656/7 and March 2, 1656/7 sessions, under “ suspicion of felony ” and charged with hog-stealing. Various depositions were filed and his case placed before a jury, which brought in a “ *verdict* ” that from the evidence he was not guilty of the charge, although it was ordered by the court at a later session that he should not go into the woods unless accompanied by two honest neighbors (*Arch. Md. liv*, 88-9, 103, 111).

At a Kent County Court held in April 1661, two servants, John White and Sarah Taylor, were brought before the court charged with stealing from their master, Capt. Thomas Bradnox, numerous itemized articles of wearing apparel, including a “ wastcote Laced with goold lace ”. A jury of twelve was impanelled “ to Examine the Evidence and Bringe in youre *verdit* whether the