fessed lease entry and ejectment and insisted only upon title, the defendant would confess judgment and possession would be delivered to the plaintiff. When the case came to trial, the Court often ordered a survey of the land, in the presence of the sheriff and of a jury of twelve good lawful and honest men of the neighborhood, and said that when the sheriff and the jury had decided, the county surveyor should make a plot and certificate of the land.

Sometimes the process of settling title to a piece of land dragged on, year after year. In the case that began as John Watkinson *v.* Thomas Collins, the Court at once decided that it was an action in ejectment begun by Watkinson as lessee of Frances Morgan Sawyer (or Sayer) against Christopher Goodhand, casual ejector, and that Collins had substituted himself as defendant to try title to a messuage called Marron, on the Eastern Shore, in Talbot County. Thereupon the Court ordered Richard Peacock, deputy surveyor of Talbot, to lay out Marron, in the presence of the sheriff and of a jury of twelve men of the neighborhood, who were to call witnesses and examine them, and that Surveyor Peacock should thereupon run the lines according to the patent and the directions of the jury. He was to return a certificate and a plot of his findings to the next session of the Court, so that they could "doe therein as to justice appertaines (*post,* p. 13). So far the case followed standard operating procedure. On October 4, 1681 the parties and the surveyor came into court and said that the jury had split on the meaning of a phrase in the patent. On which side of a creek did a boundary line run? The Court sent the surveyor out to try again (*post,* p. 110). After three continuances and several months time, the Court ordered the surveyor to run the line over the creek, Champes Creek, and to return the usual certificates and plots to them. On October 16, 1682 the jury found for the defendant, but the plaintiff got an arrest of judgment (*post,* p. 233). On April 2, 1683 the parties came into court and Plaintiff Watkinson offered his reasons for arresting judgment. His first reason was that Evan Carew, one of the first jury, was an alien and therefore not eligible to serve on a jury. His second reason was that the jury, contrary to evidence, records and well-proved allegations, had found for the defendant instead of for the plaintiff. Watkinson prayed a new trial at bar. The judges looked into and "diligently examined" the reasons alleged by Watkinson, and the answers of Collins. And it seemed to them that the first reason given by the plaintiff, the alienage of one of the jury was enough to arrest judgment on the verdict of the jury. Collins was, then, to go without day, although he was ordered to repay to Peter Sayer his costs and charges (*post,* p. 359).

SERVANTS

Servants took up a lot of the time of the Provincial Court, although the county courts probably had even more cases. In 1676 the Assembly enacted a law relating to servants and slaves, and one provision concerned the length of time a servant had to serve (*Archives* II, pp. 523-528). If he or she had an indenture, that settled the matter; he served the time called for in his indenture. But sometimes he had no indenture, and then the length of time depended on the age of the servant when he came in. Those under fifteen (and some were