by the act of Assembly duly signed by the Governor (*Archives,* II, p. 467). Since neither of the Carletons had paid the sum, he sued Arthur, son and executor, for the usual double amount, 800 pounds of tobacco. Carleton secured a delay until February 12, 1675/6, but when that day arrived, he "came not but made default". Whereupon the Court granted that Attorney Ridgely recover the 400 pounds damage and 528 pounds more for costs of suit. In February 1674/5, Margaret Penry asked Ridgely to "be her Attorny at Law to manage any couse she should imploy him in . . . [and] did faithfully promise that for his care & paines in & about her said cause or causes she . . . would pay unto the said Robert his just ffees". Ridgely said that at her order he sued out of the Provincial Court four writs and that he prosecuted them. For four writs he asked 1600 pounds of tobacco according to the pertinent act of Assembly, but neither Mrs. Penry nor her executor had paid him, "though often thereto required". So he sued the executor, John Irland, and when the case came to trial, Irland said nothing in bar of his action. Accordingly, the Court granted, April 21, 1677, that Ridgely recover the 1600 pounds of tobacco damages and 536 pounds costs of suit (*post,* 461-462).

In one case an attorney seems to have joined with a husband to take from a wife the right she had in real property, property which she had brought into the marriage. The husband, by threats and persuasions, induced his wife to join him to convey land to attorney Charles Boteler for a valuable consideration, and immediately Boteler re-conveyed it to the husband alone (*post,* xix, 471).

There were special liberties and privileges attached to the Provincial Court, but it has not been possible, up to now, to find out just what they were. Almost without exception, when an attorney or a justice, or an official of the Court came before it, the case was said to be "according to the libertyes and priviledges &c". Most of the cases so designated concerned attorneys, who were, of course, officers of the Court, but the clerk and the crier made the same claim, and even a justice of the Court, being the defendant, appeared according to the customs and privileges (*post,* 457-458). And he came not but made default. The only feature common to all these cases is that whenever the plea was made, the party making it appeared in proper person, and not by attorney.

Today the sheriff of a county is, in law, distinctly subordinate to other county officers, but three hundred years ago, with many of the settlers only lately out of England, he was much more than the court's servant. Indeed, in two cases here, the sheriff was a member of the Court. As in England, he had to be of large estate. In many cases he held other important offices. Benjamin Rozer, sheriff of Charles County, was also a member of the Council and of the Upper House, justice of the Provincial Court and attorney before it, and receiver general of the Proprietary's revenues. Col. Vincent Lowe, sheriff of Talbot County, was an attorney before the Court, and, until March 1676, attorney general of the Province. Of course, he was also brother-in-law of the Proprietary. There had long been complaint from the people against the sheriffs, and some attempts had been made to curb their powers. In 1666 an act of Assembly had provided that no sheriff could plead as an attorney in