an inferior court of a record which had been improperly removed from it by *certiorari,* with instructions for proceeding without regard to the removal; now its office was enlarged by statute to return a record properly removed, on appeal or error.[25]

There was no limit to the length of arguments; a single argument would often take days. And of course this means that much time was devoted to mere display and the delectation of audiences. Arguments were also orations. The practice of that period, however, required longer arguments than would now be needed strictly for the business in hand, for speech was still the chief means of presentation, all papers were read to the judges, all arguments made in their utmost fullness, and all authorities which the court was expected to consider were gone over fully with the court then and there, in open court. Generally speaking, judges were not expected to do any reading in a case. The method of the hearing on appeal and that on arguments at trials were the same. And while it is in this later time customary for judges to read papers in equity cases, and to study them out for themselves, living lawyers of no great age will recall a time when a hearing in equity regularly began with a reading of the papers to the court, and then a reading of the record of testimony followed, and there was a reading of authorities in full during the argument; and such was a hearing on appeal up to the end of the eighteenth century and later. The practice of reading the authorities fully in court has not

25. See Evans, Maryland Practice, 1839, 441 ff.