

ing it with Sennet's own marks. He also asked 3000 pounds damages. Godfrey lost his suit when the jury found that he had sold the mare to Nicholas Solbey, the chirurgion, and that Solbey had sold it to Sennet. Costs of 720 pounds were also awarded to Sennet (p. 563).

Livestock marks were registered with the clerk of the county court and recorded in the court proceedings. For horses branding was usually employed; for cattle earmarks and occasionally branding; for swine earmarks alone. Three imaginative owners selected the same earmark, "a flower of Deluce", obviously a fleur de lis (p. 91, 142, 526). They may have lived in different sections of the county, and confusion of their stock running at large was therefore unlikely. Most of the marks are merely described, but in a number of instances a rough outline sketch, reproduced in this volume, is entered in the court record together with the description. Sheep are not mentioned during this period, wolves being still sufficiently numerous to render their raising unprofitable. During this nine year period, over 150 livestock marks are found recorded, or an average of over seventeen a year. The records were very badly kept, however; for example there were no entries of livestock marks at all in the year 1670, so that the above figures are an understatement. Had the entries been accurately kept the annual increase in the number of livestock producers in the county would have been a rough measure of the population increase. The names of new settlers and of indentured servants who had recently become free, are to be found among the new registrants.

INNKEEPERS AND LIQUORS

Wines, liquors, and other drinks are of frequent mention in these records. Under acts of the Assembly maximum prices that might be charged by innkeepers for various drinks were specified. There were also a number of suits filed by innkeepers against patrons who had not paid their bills for drinks, food, and lodging. The most conspicuous case is that of the Clerk of the Court, Richard Boughton, who was sued by Edmund Lindsey for not paying for the drinks consumed at his wedding (pp. 212-214). At the March, 1673-4, court, John Wood sued Edmund Taylor for 850 pounds of tobacco for "24 Gallons of quince drinke 400^{lb-tob} . . . [and] 21 Gallons of quince drinke in September 420^{lb-tob}" (p. 548). At the same court John Wood was sued by Alexander Sennet for 444 pounds of tobacco for 37 gallons of "sider." It was shown that Wood had received only 25 gallons, and the court then ordered Sennet to pay for this at the rate of 12 pounds of tobacco per gallon (p. 540). At the January, 1674/5, court, John Allen, gentleman, who was presented by the grand jury "for sellenge liquors at unreasonable rates, pleaded he never sold any, which not beinge proved the presentment was dasht" (p. 519). He had evidently not yet opened the "public ordinary", near the new court house he was building, which he had given bond to do (pp. 617-618). At the same court two others were presented for the same cause but "were never called" (p. 519). Fayal wine was the cause of a suit. Phillip Lynes sued Samuell Cooke for not having delivered as agreed be-