There are a few cases in these county court records where a *jury of women* was summoned to determine [*de ventre inspiciendo*] the question of alleged pregnancy, either existing or recent. In Kent there were two such instances. At the June 7, 1662, court a jury of nine women proceeded " to search " a servant woman who declared she had become pregnant by a certain man on " Candlemuse Day last in the night ", and brought in a verdict that they could not decide whether or not she was pregnant, but the court took no chances and bound over the man by a bond of 5000 pounds of tobacco " to save the county harmless . . . if in case it be proved to be his " (*Arch. Md. liv,* 233). In the second case information was given to some of the justices that a woman of a higher social class, " Hannah Jenkins Daughter-in-Law of M[r] George Harris of this county hath beene delivered of A man Childe ", and that there was "A suspition of Murther " of it. A jury of twelve women ordered " to search the boddy " of Hannah, gave as their verdict that she was " cleare from child bearing and never had A Child to the best of their knowledge ". The court then ordered the sheriff to clear Hannah by proclamation (*Arch. Md. liv,* 250).

Appeals from the county courts to the Provincial Court during the period covered by these records were relatively infrequent considering the very large number of cases which came before these four lower courts. There were some thirty in all. When it is remembered, however, that the county courts only had original jurisdiction in civil cases involving not more than 3000 pounds of tobacco, or about £20, and in minor criminal cases, it is obvious that the cost of carrying a case up to the Provincial Court was a deterrent to an appellant, where the amount involved in the suit was small, or where the most frequent offenders in criminal cases were of the ignorant and impecunious servant class. Another deterrent in civil cases was the requirement that the appellant give bond for double or treble damages should the appeal be lost.

Judge Carroll T. Bond in his exhaustive study of appeals in the early Maryland courts (*Proceedings of the Maryland Court of Appeals, 1695-1729,* p. xxix), states that before 1678 there were four methods by which cases in the county courts might be removed to the Provincial Court. *Before trial* in the lower court, removal might be (1) by a *writ of certiorari* issued by the higher court ordering that the record be brought before it, or (2) by writ of *habeas corpus cum causa detentioni* (or *habeas corpus ad faciendum et recipiendum*) with a statement of the cause of detention, which really meant a trial in the higher court. *After trial* and judgment in the lower court cases might be brought before the Provincial Court either (3) by direct appeal entered in the lower courts for trial anew in the high court, or (4) by writ of error asking review of a specified rulings of the lower court. The records of the county court, however, rarely show by what route the case reached the Provincial Court, the entry usually simply reading that the appellant " claims an appeal ", or " requesteth an appeal ". Occasionally the county court, itself sent the case up, as in an instance where an estate sued was already in the Provincial Court (p. 14). In two instances, on the other hand, the Provincial Court sent down cases entered above to the Charles County Court for a hearing, in one instance apparently for final determination; and in another to report back its opinion to the