The procedure during this period remained much as it had been for the past hundred years and more. The old writ of *scire facias* to hear errors gradually dropped out of use, and defendants in error or appellees learned of appeals by a summons, or learned of them informally. The use of the writ of error was at least as frequent as before, and a blank printed form of it was provided and used up to about 1813. It was still regularly issued by the Register of the Court of Chancery, who designated himself, even as late as 1812, by the abbreviated Latin, *Reg. Cur. Can.*

Before the end of the century some questions of the authority and jurisdiction of the court arose; and by an act of 1800, chapter 69, it was provided that on reversals the court should have full power to give such judgment as should have been given below, and to enforce it by execution. Apparently no rules were formally promulgated prior to 1806, and there were no statutory definitions of the jurisdiction and powers of the court; it merely continued in the course set for it before the Revolution. An innovation of importance was in the introduction of the practice of returning cases at law to trial courts for retrial after reversals of judgments. That was begun with an act of 1790, chapter 42. Before that time a plaintiff who obtained a reversal of a judgment against him was under the necessity of instituting a second original suit if he would proceed with his case; but now the old common law writ of *procedendo* was adapted to a new use to avoid that profitless requirement. The writ of *procedendo* had originally been designed and used for the return to