

## Evidence Explained: Citing History Sources from Artifacts to Cyberspace

### 8.38 Courts: Colony Level

In some American colonies, the court seated at the capital was the only court in the colony. In others, it was the principal court, or it served only an appellate function. (For appellate courts, see 8.39.) In the Maryland example, below, the case label carries a quaint notation seldom seen in later years: the use of the symbol @ as a substitute for *against* (i.e., *versus*). The Louisiana example illustrates the difference between citing an original file vis à vis the microfilm image.

#### BOUND VOLUMES

##### **Source List Entry**

Maryland. Provincial Court Judgments, 1679–1778. Maryland State Archives, Annapolis.

##### **First Reference Note**

1. Maryland, Provincial Court Judgments, vol. 58: 99–102, Pergrine Frisby @ Alexander Calder, May Term 1768.

##### **Subsequent Note**

11. Maryland, Provincial Court Judgments, 58: 99–102.

#### LOOSE PAPERS

##### **Source List Entry**

Louisiana. Spanish Judiciary Records, 1769–1804. Louisiana Historical Center, New Orleans.

##### **First Reference Note**

1. Louisiana, Spanish Judiciary Records, 1769–1804, doc. 1777-03-13-01, Rex v. Cesario, for testimony of Margarita, 17 March 1777; Louisiana Historical Center, New Orleans.

##### **Subsequent Note**

11. Louisiana, Spanish Judiciary Records, doc. 1777-03-13-01, Rex v. Cesario, testimony of Margarita, 17 March 1777.

#### Microfilm (FHL-GSU)



##### **Source List Entry**

Louisiana. Spanish Judicial Records, 1769–1804. Louisiana Historical Center, New Orleans. FHL microfilm, 239 rolls. Family History Library, Salt Lake City, Utah.

##### **First Reference Note**

1. Louisiana, Spanish Judicial Records, 1769–1804, doc. 1777-03-13-01, Rex v. Cesario, for testimony of Margarita, 17 March 1777; FHL microfilm 1,033,277.

**Subsequent Note**

11. Louisiana, Spanish Judicial Records, doc. 1777-03-13-01, Rex v. Cesario, for testimony of Margarita, 17 March 1777.

**FILM SERIES, NOT CONSECUTIVELY NUMBERED**

If the FHL film series above were consecutively numbered, you might want to record the beginning and ending numbers. When the series is not consecutively numbered, as with the 239 rolls of the Spanish Judicial Records, your Source List Entry might cite the specific roll you used or, if you used multiple rolls, it might simply state the number of rolls in the series.

**Online Databases & Indexes** **Source List Entry**

South Carolina. “Criminal Journals, 1769–1776.” Database. *South Carolina Department of Archives and History*. <http://www.archiveindex.sc.gov/> : 2009.

**First Reference Note**

1. South Carolina, “Criminal Journals, 1769–1776,” database, *South Carolina Department of Archives and History* (<http://www.archiveindex.sc.gov/> : accessed 15 July 2009), entry for King v. John Smith, Stealing Negroes, 1769.

**Subsequent Note**

11. South Carolina, “Criminal Journals, 1769–1776,” entry for King v. Smith, Stealing Negroes, 1769.

**CITING A COMMON NAME**

When citing a database entry for a common name, you should include enough detail to identify the specific case.

**CITING NATURE OF CASE**

When citing court cases, it is usually not necessary to identify the charges, unless the detail is needed to identify an entry for a man with a common name.

**8.39 Courts: State (or Provincial) Appellate Cases**

*See also* QuickCheck Model *for* ORIGINAL RECORDS: STATE-LEVEL: APPEALS COURT...

When a case is appealed from a local court to a district, state, provincial, or federal court, the file generated at the local level is transmitted to the higher court, where it is assigned a new docket number or case number. The case name may also be reversed. For example, a case might originate locally as John Brown v. Sam Smith. If the case was decided in favor of Brown, then Smith appealed, the