

less from Indian warfare in the seventeenth century that did some of the neighboring colonies. A few years after the date when the Kent records begin in 1648, however, there was a flare-up in Indian relations. At the November, 1659, session the court gave a certificate to Margaret, the widow of a certain Francis Hunt, that her husband had "lately been slain upon the Isle of Kent" in the previous month. This certificate was sent to the Provincial Court, which on March 7, 1652/3, issued a *quietus est* as a bar against any future suits against Margaret Hunt, the wife and administratrix, who had already made payments in excess of the total inventory of the Hunt estate, apparently a relief measure for the widow (*Arch. Md. x*, 194, 230-231).

At a court held in Charles County in November 1661, a servant sued his master for wages due him for work done about the month of May 1661, before he was "prest out in the cuntry sarvice to goe to the Susquesahannoks fort" (pp. 158-160, 163-164). The Kent tax levy for 1660 shows 108 pounds of tobacco paid "To Cap^t Leads for powder and Shott for 3 souldiers sent to the Susquahankes" (*Arch. Md. liv*, 231). On December 7, 1661, the Governor issued a proclamation forbidding trade with the Indians without a special license (*Arch. Md. iii*, 443). When a planter was pressed into service against the Indians it was apparently obligatory upon his neighbors to care for his crops when he was absent, but whether this was done under the general powers of the county courts or by order of the Governor and the Provincial Court is not clear. Under an act passed in 1654 the Provincial Court in the intervals between assembly meetings was given wide powers to conduct warfare against the Indians (*Arch. Md. i*, 345). In any event the Charles County Court, December 7, 1665, assessed damages of 1800 pounds of tobacco and 4 barrels of corn against the guardians of young John Stone, a son of the late governor, William Stone, because they had neglected to tend the crops of a neighbor, Samuel Harris, on service during the past summer against the Indians (pp. 617, 618). At the same session four carpenters were each allowed by the court 15 pounds of tobacco per day for eighty days for service against the Indians, and a fifth carpenter at the same rate for forty days "for the Encoragement of others that shall be Called to sarve the Country", and allowance of 5520 pounds of tobacco for their payment was made in the county levy (p. 619). It would appear that the different status of a planter and a craftsman was recognized by the court in its action in these two cases. Included in this same levy was an item for payment to "will the Indan Living by M^r. Addameses for his sarvices performed to the contry . . . 0300 [pounds of tobacco] . . . to which M^r. William Marshall disassents to the leviing of it on the Publicke and profered to pay it out of his owne purs rather than that it shoold bee layed on the Publicke", but the item seems to have been retained in the levy (p. 619). Will was doubtless a friendly Indian who had been of use in the recent campaign. It would seem from an entry in the December 1665 Charles court records requiring that Capt. Hugh Oneale appear at the next court with an account of the provisions, powder, and shot he had "prest for his Souldiers", that he was then in command of the Charles County contingent (p. 620), although in 1660 he had been involved in the Fendall "rebellion" (p. 148-149).