

him from Foorde. So far good. But the clerk referred to Phelps as "the said Wm. Phelps Adm^r as aforesaid" when it does not appear that Phelps was administrator of anyone.

ATTORNEYS

Of the men who appeared as attorneys at this time, more and more were attorneys at law, though the attorney in fact has not yet disappeared. Little is known of their training, or of their qualifications. It is a fact that every attorney must be a freeman. Anthony Underwood, who had come over from England, petitioned the Proprietary for admission as an attorney. He had for several years served as clerk to a London counsellor at law (although the clerk spells it councillor), and, since coming over to the Province, he had worked for Attorney Robert Ridgely. The Proprietary wrote on the petition: "Let Underwood be sworne an Attorney of y^e Provinciall Court if yo^u thinke him capable thereof". The justices did think him capable thereof, and so on March 1, 1681/2 Anthony Underwood was sworn in. Next day, the Court said it could not, in deference to the other attorneys, admit Underwood unless he could make it appear that he was a freeman. To that end he presented to the Court a certificate from the widow of Ridgely, under whom he had served, that he was a freeman (*post*, 115-116).

Only one attorney came up for disbarment in these years. There had been bad blood between Richard Hill and Thomas Bland for several years. Both men had lived and worked in Anne Arundel County. Hill was a justice of the Anne Arundel County court: Bland was an attorney in that court and also in the Provincial Court. Bland said later that he had been sworn in as attorney of the higher court on December 10, 1672, but existing records are silent on that point. When Bland sued Hill in the Provincial Court, he declared that he had had a substantial amount of work in the courts, that he had enjoyed a good reputation, and that he had been making a plentiful and sufficient maintenance for himself and his family. Yet, on August 10, 1680, before the Anne Arundel County Court sitting at the Ridge, county Justice Richard Hill, in the hearing of the justices and of others present in the room, used "false feigned scandalous lyeing and Malicious words" about him (Bland), saying that the Proprietary had said that Bland should no longer be an attorney in any Maryland court, because he (Bland) "made it his businesse to make and urge men to go to law". This was (and is) barratry, and any attorney guilty of it was liable to disbarment and even to criminal prosecution. As a consequence of Hill's words, the county justices refused to let Bland practice before them, and his clients withdrew their papers from him. So, he sued Justice Hill for 100,000 pounds of tobacco. When, later, the case came to trial, Bland failed to appear and was adjudged to pay Hill's costs. With execution. (*post* 9-12).

Attorneys were, of course, officers of the Court, and the Chancellor never hesitated to remind them of that fact, and to call them to order when he judged it meet. On October 17, 1882, while the Chancellor was giving the charge to the jury in a case, "George Thompson, gentl one of the Attorneys of this Court disturbing the Chancello^r in giving the charge . . . is ordered to depart