

pp. 58-59) both were committed to the custody of the sheriff of St. Mary's until the next court. If, however they offered bail of which the court approved, they could go, and they did offer such bail. Rhoads also acknowledged a recognizance for £100 with two sureties, on condition that they would both appear at the next court, and that they would behave themselves until then. Frances appears no more in this record, but her husband served on juries, until April, 1674, at least.

There was one other case at this time in which the charge of uttering seditious words was made, but it never came to trial. Stephen Whitman, arrested on that charge, was admitted to bail of one person only, "whereby the said Whitman is now escaped & fled this Province & so hath Escaped Justice." (*post*, p. 36).

In November, 1675 there arose a case involving the alleged uttering of scandalous words against a sheriff. Here, however, the sheriff did not bring criminal action against the persons who had, he said, maligned him. Instead, he brought civil suit for damages to his reputation, alleging trespass on the case. For a discussion of the case and of the resulting decision, see page 607 *post*.

In a region as new as the Province of Maryland, there was bound to be a great lack of English coins, and a need for establishing the value of foreign coins. English coins were, of course, not foreign ones. As early as 1671, an act of Assembly was passed (*Archives* II, pp. 286-287) declaring the value of all those in common use and providing penalties for anyone refusing to take them at their legal rate. Richard Moy, of St. Mary's City, innholder, was presented by the grand jury on October 1, 1672, for refusing to take a Spanish piece of eight at its established value of 6s. sterling. When his case came to trial on December 10, 1672, his attorney, Richard Carvile, appeared for him, and succeeded in having the presentment quashed for its insufficiency "and so the said Moy went thereof without day." (*post*, pp. 38, 44). This case is one of the first in the Province in which a person accused of crime had an attorney.

The events centring around Capt. Thomas Jones of Somerset County provide much work for the Court and the attornies, and much color and excitement for the laymen. Of course, be it remembered, with a name like Thomas Jones, it is sometimes not easy to identify the individual with certainty. On October 1, 1672, it was ordered by the Court that Thomas Jones of Somerset "(being accused for severall things done beyond his Commission) should have subpena's for his witnesses." (*post*, p. 35). On April 20, 1672, Thomas Jones of St. Mary's County, merchant, had been commissioned sole Indian trader within the Province, and had also been given the right to seize anyone else attempting to trade (*Archives*, V, pp. 106-107). In June of that year he was commissioned captain of the military forces of the recently-created Worcester County (*ibid.*, pp. 110-111). That same summer, Jones, who was sheriff of Somerset County, too, was commissioned collector of Somerset, as his predecessor had been. He was to enter and clear all undecked vessels entering Somerset, and to take the necessary bonds (*ibid.*, 111-112). He was also one of the justices for Worcester County. Other men than the justices of the Provincial Court held a multiplicity of offices.