

committed to the custody of the sheriff of St. Mary's County, and was required to give bond in the sum of £20 sterling for his good abearance and for his appearance the next Provincial Court (*post*, 456-457). Thomas Vaughan, of Talbot County seems to have incurred the disfavor of the Proprietary and of some of his neighbors too. Of course before he took up the office of sheriff, he had to take the oath of office, and he had as well to give bond to the Proprietary in the sum of 200,000 pounds of tobacco. What his troubles were as sheriff is not clear, but some of the neighbors were on the point of getting out executions against him. The Proprietary, or the attorney general in his name, sued Vaughan on his bond, and the conditions of the bond were read in court. A sheriff must serve the Proprietary well and truly as sheriff, and must receive and collect the dues and rents and anything else he was ordered to collect, and he must give a faithful account of them (*post*, p. 364). To the charges the sheriff pleaded nothing in bar or avoidance, and judgment for the sum demanded was rendered to the Proprietary. Before collection could be made against Sheriff Vaughan, the Proprietary sued the sureties, and, when they paid up, the sheriff was set free (*post*, p. 365).

Although the Provincial Court was the main Court or even the only one in the Province to hear cases coming up from county courts, there were not many such cases. In 1678 the General Assembly provided that there should be no new trials in the Provincial Court of cases arising in county courts (*Archives* VII, 71). By doing that, they substantially did away with the main difference between appeals and writs of error. In the years covered here, there were seven cases coming up on appeal and nine on writs of error. Of the writs of error, in no case was there an assignment of error: in two of the cases on appeal there was such an assignment, and the basis for the appeal was a matter of fact and not a matter of law (*post*, pp. 128, 235). In more than one case, the error charged rested on a variance between the declaration and either the writ or the jury verdict (*post*, p. 128, 401).

IMPORTANT CIVIL CASES

There were at this time no criminal cases although an attentive reading of some of the civil cases shows acts and actions that today might lead to indictment and trial. Grand juries sat and had their expense paid (*post*, p. 170). They had the usual troubles with men who, being summoned, failed to appear (*post*, pp. 105, 361, 455). The act for the impanelling of the Grand Inquest, of April 13, 1674, provided for a fine to the Lord Proprietary of 500 pounds of tobacco in such cases (*Archives* II, 392), and in at least three cases recorded here (*post*, pp. 105, 361, 455), the fines were levied on the recalcitrants. Of course the Proprietary, who was in the Province at the time, could remit the fines, and sometimes he did remit them (*post*, pp. 200, 345).

The one case of slander or defamation which appears now followed the familiar pattern. Thomas Bland of Anne Arundel County was an attorney of the Provincial Court and also of the Anne Arundel County Court. Richard Hill was a commissioner or justice of the Anne Arundel County Court. On August 10, 1680, which was Court day, Hill announced in a loud voice that