

Revealed & reveal'd found Relevant to Restrict the Libel to an arbitrary punishment in November 1712 Margravate for November 1715 Magdalene Alexander. Also it was provede in the presence that the Defendant right to be Speciall and direct, that she the plaintiff Revealed her Condition to her husband personall living in the Neighboor hood, who might be helpfull to her in the Birth, and by Discovering it to a third might be a check upon her from trying any Unlawfull Marke or destiny the Child. And that she Revealed it Directly & plainly, Revealing in Generall not being Relevant, saying that might be to the father of the Child in order to conceal it the more, or to others at a great Distance, whose knowledge of the Matter signified little to prevent Discovering the Child; or by Informing to those who shall be deliver, that if she was well past the known of a father to which, if possible Rather a Denyal. And therefore the Lord ought to Determine the Manner of Revealing, & before it is admitted to proof. In Respect Concealing during the whole Space Impost property the Woman in some manner to hide the Matter, Expressly saying, or artfully Method to conceal the Bigness of her Belly, which I afford ~~not~~ from Revealing that it is only a partie filione all the while, and this general law is to be generally transported according to the Express words, which are proper to Concealing without mention of place or persons, or the Manner of it. Again it was sustainted Relevant to be Strik an Indictment for this presumption two Misdemeanors arbitrary punishment, that the plaintiff Revealed her pregnancy to the father of the Child, and to a Woman in whose house she intended to bring December 1701 Janeth del. It was once Argued as a Defense, that the plaintiff Revealed her being with Child to one single woman 22 Novbr. 1695 Ch. St. Barn Park. Because such Revealing is Understood to be only for Concealing it yet the more from the Rest of the World. But afterward a Cannall having it coured her being with Child before the Birth to one person was sufficient sufficient to exclude the Capital punishment and they were all remit.

found obliged to prove that they Roved and their being with
child by concurring in the first 23 March 1713 Margaret Stew-
erton 1 March 1715 Eliza both John & Eliza living seeing a person who
Discovered them, cannot be said to conceal but to justify the
law which Required only Revealing in General without
distinguishing whether it was Revealed to one or more, without
of which both satisfy the Design of the Law. For if after a thing
is Revealed to one, it is no longer in the Revealed hand, but
keep it a secret: because that one may discover it to another
and so will it be publicly known, by which means the per-
son may be protected if the C. C. is Annoying. Whereas
a Woman with Child a Robber by concealing her condition
is seem'd to have no good design, seeing the Child by ^{as yet} 1715
her power clandestinely without the Knowledge of any
except the Child bearing of God. Besides, Examination being
more favourable than Accusation, a Slighter proof might
be sufficient of a persons defence than of a child. Yet, upon
the Revealing the Child to one or more, or, and so
a Month before she brought it further, and found it necessary
to afflict her from Capital punishment: a Child the 1716
man to whom she Revealed it said that it was Revealed to
her in jest, seeing he could not in that case be charged with
Concealment during the whole time of his Appearance to
quid to suffer presumptively Murther and the Law doth not
distinguish betwixt serious and Trivial Revealing, ^{as}
whereas nondescript, notwithstanding distinction
23 September 1703 Marion Daigleste. But the Mother of
a Woman Inducted upon the Act of Parliament for the
presumptive Murder of her own Child, was not Reared
to prove the Defence of Revealing her being with Child
or the Child not being come to the full time 1 December
1718 Margaret Stewert. Albert Voluntary Murder is ordi-
narily excepted in the Kings General Indemnity: Yet the
Supposition of Murder upon the Act of Parliament 1690 for the
Murder it. Albert it was pleaded that presumptive
Murder and Murder directly proved are punifiable
the same way: and all the Different forms from Con-
cerns only the proof, and not the Removancy or Nature
of the Crime. Of being law both equalled the proof of