

in the Council proceedings, this commission appears as dated 1672. This error is to be found both in the original entry in the manuscript Council Liber H H, and also in the printed *Archives* (V; 21), the latter being a faithful copy of Liber H H. That the original date of entry, "December xxiiij; MDCLxxij", as found in Liber H H (folio 188) is an error due to the careless use of an "x" instead of a small "v" for the sixth letter of the year date, is disclosed not only by adjoining entries which are correctly dated, but by the fact that the commissioners or justices named in the same commission formed the bench of 1667, and not that of 1672 (*Arch. Md.* V; 21).

Richard Boughton, who succeeded Thompson as clerk, had been commissioned, May 17, 1666, Provincial Secretary, a member of the Governor's Council, and a Judge of the Provincial Court. His formal appointment as clerk of the Charles County Court was made, as stated above, on December 23, 1667. It is most unlikely that he held at the same time the three important Provincial positions of secretary, councillor, and judge, and the office of county clerk. He was almost certainly no longer in office, when, in the spring of 1669, he was summoned by the sheriff of Charles County before the court (p. 187). Although one suspects, the record does not disclose, what was charged against him at the hearing which doubtless followed. Light, however, is thrown upon the difficulties which had resulted in his losing the clerkship, in a suit for slander which he filed at the August, 1669, court, against Nicholas Emanson (Emerson), an innkeeper. It appears that the innkeeper had circulated reports that Boughton's fee accounts as clerk of the worshipful court were dishonest, and Boughton declared that these slanderous rumors had resulted in his being "at p^rsent destitute of employment", and that his "future preferm^t" was thereby jeopardized. It appears that the innkeeper had also said that it was Boughton's "reall intention to goe for Eng^{land} this year" to defraud his creditors, and that he had not paid the innkeeper for the liquors drunk at his wedding. The court refused, however, to allow the suit for slander to come before a jury, for, it declared, no damage had been shown (pp. 212-214). The suit for slander was the result of a suit for debt entered by the innkeeper against Boughton for 2703 pounds of tobacco, in great part for drinks consumed at his recent marriage (p. 214). The court gave judgment for the innkeeper and Boughton appealed to the Provincial Court (*Arch. Md.* LVII; 538-539). The appeal does not seem to have been prosecuted. Some eighteen months later we find Boughton in prison for the debt which he owed to Emanson, and probably also for debts owed to others as well (*Arch. Md.* LI; 358). When, in 1671 and again in 1674, the sheriff sought to serve a warrant upon Boughton in suits for debt, he could not be found (pp. 349, 518, 549). Our record discloses that on June 24, 1668, Verlinda Burdit, widow of Thomas Burdit of Nangemy Creek, "before the marriage intended to be Consummated between me and M^r Richard Boughton", had made a deed of gift of cattle and a slave to her four Burdit children (pp. 133-134). Mrs. Burdit was the daughter of the Reverend William Cotton, minister of Lower Accomac Parish, Virginia, whose sister Verlinda was the wife of Governor William Stone of Maryland (*Va. Mag.* VI, 1899, p. 405). It was to celebrate this wedding that Boughton had overextended himself in the