with a *verdict* fixing the guilt of the accused and the value of the animals stolen, which was apparently less than made the offence a felony; thereupon the court awarded damages to the owner, a fee to the informer, and a punitive fine to the Lord Proprietary based upon the valuation of the jury. It would also appear that had the jury found the accused guilty of felony by placing a high value upon the hogs, the case would have automatically gone up to the Provincial Court for a trial on this charge. In this instance the jury would appear to have functioned both as a grand jury and a petit jury. A verdict of " not guilty " in the third case, one also tried upon " suspicion of felony ", leaves us uncertain whether, had the jury found the accused guilty of hog-stealing, it would have exercised the dual functions which are to be found in the first two cases. In the fourth case, that of servants brought before the county court on what was obviously suspicion of felony, the jury placed a value upon the goods stolen which did not bring the accused within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Court. In this instance it also would seem to have exercised a dual function, in not only determining whether the crime were a felony but also in bringing in a *verdict* fixing the value of the articles stolen. In the two cases where masters were brought before the court upon " suspicion of felony " in having caused the deaths of servants which they had unmercifully beaten, the juries seem to have been acting rather as grand juries, or juries of inquest, than as petit juries. Certainly county court and jury could not have proceeded to try either case had the question of murder entered. In the Lumbrozo case the accused was found guilty of having brought on an abortion, which was a felony, and the case was at once sent up to the Provincial Court. Here the jury seems to have acted as a grand jury. In none of the seven cases, however, does the usual secrecy now exercised by a grand jury seem to have been observed.

Frequent mention is found in these county records of *inquests* held by juries functioning as *coroner's juries,* although they are not so designated, over the bodies of persons dead from violence, drowning, or by suicide or suspected suicide. Before 1666 when the act providing for the regular appointment of coroners was passed (*Arch. Md. ii,* 130-131), juries of inquest, as they were usually called, were held by sheriffs, justices, or constables, acting as coroners. The first record of a coroner's jury was one held in January 1637/8 (*Arch. Md. iv,* 9). In at least one instance an autopsy was held and the brain examined (*Arch. Md. liv,* 390-391). The duties of the coroner are discussed fully later (p. xli). Where the finding of the jury was suicide, a frequent verdict was to the effect that the deceased was a felo de se, or as the Talbot County clerk sometimes wrote it, a " fielo de si ", with the recommendation that a Christian burial ought, or ought not, to be accorded, although there is no record of a suicide ordered buried at the cross-roads. A verdict of felo de se, or self-murder, carried with it in Maryland at this period the confiscation of the suicide's properties to the Lord Proprietary (*Arch. Md. liv,* 21), as it would in England have done to the Crown. In instances of death by misadventure, a falling tree or other object responsible for the fatality, is sometimes referred to in the verdict as a *deodand,* written " Devo Dane " (*Arch. Md. liv,* 412.)