

There is no specific mention of a *midwife* in these county records, but in the suit of William Smith against Mr. Thomas Vaughan at the August 15, 1671, session of the Talbot County Court, among the items entered in the account filed by Smith is: "To 12 days of my wifes Attendance on yo<sup>r</sup> wife in Child Bed . . . 240" pounds of tobacco (*Arch. Md. liv*, 503). This was doubtless for Mrs. Smith's services as a midwife and nurse. In addition to those formally designated in the records as "Doctor" or "Chirurgion", there are a number of what may be called lay practitioners, both men and women, of medicine and surgery. Two names stand out from the frequency with which they appear as plaintiffs for the recovery of fees for "cures", or for the care of the sick or diseased. One of these, John Cherman of Charles County, has already been referred to. An overcharge against Henry Grace, an "infirm man", whose leg Cherman had treated, brought him before the Charles County Court on September 4, 1660, when his fee was cut from 300 to 100 pounds of tobacco, and the public notified that the "infirm man" was not thereafter to be considered capable of making a bargain (p. 85, 92). Mrs. Mary Vanderdonck, a widow and the daughter of the Rev. Francis Doughtie, the witch hunter, entered suit at the September 1661 Charles County Court against former Governor Fendall, who, she alleged, had sent three servants to her to be cured, one with a sore leg, one with a sore mouth, and one with a canker. Fendall by his attorney appealed the case to the Provincial Court, but as it did not come up there, it was doubtless either withdrawn or compromised (pp. 145, 147). At the same court Mrs. Vanderdonck sued Christopher Russell for physick she had given him, but lost her suit because Capt. Hugh Oneale, her principal witness, was disqualified from testifying because of the part he had taken in the late Fendall "rebellion" (pp. 148-149). The case was postponed, but nothing further is heard of it. When she next appeared in court, July 8, 1662, she had become Mrs. Hugh Oneale, and her husband as the plaintiff in a suit against William Heard, the administrator of the estate of Samuel Parker and his wife Joan, sued Heard for physick which his wife had administered to the Parkers. It appears that Joan Parker had died while under the lady's care. The case was non-suited because of a technical legal defect, but came up again in another guise at the October, 1662, session, when Mary Oneale sued Heard for defamation in spreading stories that Joan Parker had said on her death-bed that Mary had poisoned her (pp. 229-231, 261-262). When Heard apologized in court Oneale declared himself satisfied, but at once entered another suit for the physick which had been administered to Mrs. Parker, but was again non-suited on a technicality (p. 263). When at this same court Mr. William Marshall, one of the justices, sued Oneale for debt the latter countered with a demand for fees due Mrs. Oneale by the justice for physick, and the cure of the justice during the past winter, which the court in part allowed (pp. 240-241). Mrs. Oneale last appears on the record when her husband unsuccessfully sued one William Bowles for her fee for Bowles' cure (p. 329).

A curious incident of a contract based on a promised cure is to be found in the suit of a certain Thomas Watson who agreed to serve Mr. John Edmondson for two years if the latter would cure his sore leg. Watson ap-