

Joanes of St. Mary's County was "bound over by Mr. Benjamin Salley for a Rape upon Mary Smith and for speaking words ag<sup>t</sup> the Lord Proprietary" (*ibid.*, p. 12). Joanes and the witnesses against him appeared, and he was committed to the custody of the sheriff of St. Mary's County. Mr. Attorney General submitted an indictment against him, but when, later, the grand jury made return of the bill delivered them against Joanes, they had written on the backside of it *Ignoramus*, or no true bill, so the bill was thrown out.

But Humphry was not yet out of the woods. That same day, he and Hugh Mackmarrough were presented by the grand jury "for that they . . . the 26<sup>th</sup> of December last past at Lapworth in the county aforesaid did then and there utter certeine seditious speeches against his Lo<sup>pp</sup> the Lord Propry, and the Governo<sup>r</sup> of this Province, as by the Information of John Weare of the same County" (*post*, p. 15). He was bound over to appear at the December 19 session of the Court, and when, at that time, no one came to prosecute him, he was bound over to the next court and gave bond for £20 sterling, with two sureties. At the April 1672 court he appeared, and when again no one came to prosecute him, he was acquitted by proclamation (*ibid.*, pp. 21, 30). Hugh Mackmarrough does not appear again, nor does John Weare, the informer.

On October 23, 1671, James Lewis of St. Mary's County gave bond for £50 with the usual two securities, to appear at the December court and answer charges of uttering mutinous and seditious words against the Proprietary. In December he appeared and was committed to the St. Mary's County sheriff. When he was neither indicted nor presented, the Court continued him in the custody of the sheriff but admitted him to bail. He had to give a recognizance of £100 with three securities instead of the usual two. On October 1, 1672, "The Court being informed that the said Lewis . . . had severall times since broke the said Recognizance It is ordered that . . . [his securities] be summoned . . . to show cause why the said Recognizance should not be Estreated." A few days later the grand jury presented him for having said, several times, that the Governor, the Chancellor and Col. William Calvert "were all Rouges & that y<sup>e</sup> said said Coll was a Bastard . . . and many other Scandalous words". Lewis plead not guilty but the jury "upon their oathes doe say that they finde the said James Lewis guilty" as charged. "Whereupon it is redered by y<sup>e</sup> Court that y<sup>e</sup> said James Lewis receive imediately thirty nine Lashes on y<sup>e</sup> bare back and that" he remain in the custody of the sheriff until he found securities for his good behavior who were acceptable to two justices of the Court (*post*, pp. 17, 21, 39). Presumably the sentence was carried out. Although Lewis had enough goods and chattcls, lands and tenements to stand a recognizance of £100, he is nowhere described as a gentleman or even a planter, and it must be that he was neither, since lashes were given only to persons of the servant class (*Archives*, I, p. 184).

Mrs. Frances Roades (Rhoads, Rhodes, etc.), wife of Abraham, had been bound over to appear in court on February 11, 1672 "for scandalous words ag<sup>t</sup> the Right hono<sup>ble</sup> the Lord Proprietary" came into court "and the Co<sup>rt</sup> upon Examination of the matter found that the s<sup>d</sup> Abraham was in some pt guilty as well as his wife, and because their was no Grand Jury this Co<sup>rt</sup>" (*post*,