RALEIGH LECTURE ON HISTORY

THE PROFESSSIONS AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN ENGLAND, 1680–1730

By GEOFFREY HOLMES

Read 31 October 1979

IN the summer of 1698 a visitor to Bury St. Edmunds was struck by one particular house, built in 'the new mode' that set it apart from those 'great old houses of timber' in which the well-to-do of the neighbourhood still lived. This 'high house' standing some sixty steps up from the ground and crowned with a lantern tower belonged, she found, to an apothecary. Since the visitor was that intrepid sightseer Celia Fiennes, who could no more pass a paper mill than a mansion without an incurable itch to get inside it, she was soon being shown round by the affable owner; and the costly furnishings, the fine china and the plate she saw within amply bore out the local opinion that he was 'esteemed a very rich man'.[1] Over thirty years later the earl of Oxford was to go to Bury and find that by then, with modern buildings palpably gaining ground on the old, it was lawyers—judges and barristers—who were in the van of progress.[2]

Few who journeyed through England between the 1690s and the 1730s and obligingly left accounts of their travels failed to remark on the physical and social presence of members of the professions. Lawyers perhaps attracted more notice than any.[3] The first fine house to greet Fiennes as she rode from the south into Preston was a lawyer's house, newly built in the London suburban style. Perhaps the sight did not surprise her unduly, for Preston was the seat of the courts palatine of Lancaster as

[1] Christopher Morris (ed.), *The Journeys of Celia Fiennes* (revised edn. 1949), pp. 151–2.

[2] This was in 1732. Hist. MSS Comm., *Portland MSS*, vi. 150.

[3] What was said of the English traveller at the beginning of George III's reign—that 'his eyes are constantly caught by the appearance of a smart house, prefaced with white rails and prologu'd by a red door with a brass knocker', and that he was 'always told that it belongs to lawyer such a one'—could have been appropriately written thirty years earlier. Samuel Foote, *The Orators* (1762), pp. 21–2.

well as being the mecca of the Lancashire landed gentry; and before 1731 the number of attorneys and solicitors alone living and practising there was to rise to at least 28.[1] But the Revd. Timothy Thomas was clearly astonished in 1725 to find in grimy Sheffield a north side 'rebuilt within these few years . . . [which] now makes no mean figure in brick', where Mr Sherburn, the duke of Norfolk's agent, had a house with apartments fit to entertain his grace himself when he toured his south Yorkshire estates. And 'a short stop' some miles to the south 'at a new-built little box, very pleasantly situated in a grove . . . [which] belongs to a gentleman of the law, Mr. Wright'[2] further reminded Thomas of that clutch of attorneys now thriving among the forges, the cutlers' wheels, and the coal pits of Hallamshire.[3]

Since the Restoration a growing number of barristers had chosen to settle in the provinces, where the rewards were far less glittering than those enjoyed by the bar elite but generally more secure.[4] The business of the London courts was becoming ferociously competitive: three parts in four, said Addison, of those 'ingenious gentlemen' who were 'carried down in coachfuls to Westminster Hall, every morning in term time', spoiling for a fight, were fated to remain 'only quarrelsome in their hearts'.[5] So by the early eighteenth century hundreds had preferred a more comfortable berth in the provinces, where they could often cut a fine figure, like Roger Comberbach the Recorder of Chester or Robert Raikes, who lived a country gentleman's life in Northallerton, 'a famous jockey' (it was reported) and 'some say more conversant with ladies than law books'. At very least the local barrister could expect to prosper quietly in

[1] *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 187 and n. 5; John Macky, *A Journey through England*, ii (1722), 153–4; *Lists of Attornies and Solicitors admitted in pursuance of the late Act for the better Regulation of Attornies and Solicitors: presented to the House of Commons*—(London, 1729[–30]), p. 27; *Additional Lists of Attornies and Solicitors admitted in pursuance of the late Act*—(London, 1731), pp. 3–109 *passim*, 258–60. [Hereafter cited as *Lists* (1730) and *Additional Lists* (1731)].

[2] For Thomas Wright, attorney of the King's Bench, see *Additional Lists* (1731), p. 30; PRO, I.R. 1/4, p. 193; Robert Robson, *The Attorney in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 71, 155.

[3] 'A Journey through Hertfordshire, Lincolnshire and Notts to the Northern Counties and Scotland', begun 10 April 1725: Hist. MSS Comm., *Portland MSS*, vi. 145–6.

[4] For the example of one county early in our period, see P. Styles, 'The Heralds' Visitation of Warwickshire, 1682–3', *Birmingham Archaeological Soc. Trans.* 71 (1953), pp. 121, 127–8, 132.

[5] *The Spectator*, No. 21, Saturday, 24 March 1711.

the manner of Edmund Blundell of Prescot, advising south Lancashire attorneys on many thorny problems.[1] But of course, such men were far outnumbered in any local community by the attorneys and solicitors themselves. Concern had been widely expressed between the 1680s and Queen Anne's reign over their startling increase in every county since the early seventeenth century: phrases such as 'swarm like locusts' and 'exorbitant proportions' are not uncommon then.[2] But there was considerably more to come, and papers laid before the House of Commons in 1730 and 1731 were to reveal just how impressive even the strictly legitimate element of the profession had become, far away from the capital. Leeds by then had twelve registered attorneys and solicitors, not counting Robert Lepton in Hunslet Lane and six more who practised in nearby Birstall, Elland, and Kippax. Manchester linen-drapers could take their business to no fewer than 19 attorneys in the town itself, to three in Salford, or to two members of the ancient Mosley family practising in Stretford; while among the fashionable resort centres of the north, Beverley could boast ten resident lawyers, rejoicing in such exotic names as Randolphus Hewitt and Suckling Spendlove, and York had 23.[3] Travellers in farthest Cornwall in 1730 must have been even more astonished to come across eleven attorneys with practices and houses in the most westerly market town in England, Penzance.[4]

But lawyers were not the only professionals to catch the traveller's eye. Closer to London, and particularly on its outskirts,

[1] W. R. Williams, *The History of the Great Sessions in Wales 1542–1830* (Brecknock, 1899), pp. 71, 113–14, for Comberbach and his contemporary, Hugh Foulkes, also of Chester; Hist. MSS Comm., *Portland MSS*, iv. 641: John Durden to [R. Harley], Scarborough, 5 Dec. 1710; R. Stewart-Brown, *Isaac Greene: A Lancashire Lawyer of the Eighteenth Century* (Liverpool, 1921), pp. 8–9.

[2] e.g. John Aubrey, *The Natural History of Wiltshire* (ed. J. Britton, 1847), pt. ii, chap. xvi (unpaginated); E. S. de Beer (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford Standard Authors edn. 1959), p. 1049, 4 Feb. 1700.

[3] Numbers calculated from *Lists* (1730) and *Additional Lists* (1731), *passim*. *Additional Lists*, p. 74 for Lepton; p. 80, for Francis Mosley of Turfemoss; pp. 64, 98, for Hewitt and Spendlove.

[4] Similarly with Helston in the same county, where (assuming a roughly stable population between 1715 and 1730) there was one lawyer to approximately every 170 inhabitants in a place of 'no particular manufacture [as a local clergyman described it] but a medley of all sorts of trades, just enough to supply the town and the neighbourhood with all the necessaries and comforts of life'. Bodleian Lib. MS Willis 48, f. 127: John Jago to Michael Peach, Helston, 24 July 1715; for Penzance, Helston, and other Cornish attorneys (99 in all) see *Lists* (1730) and *Additional Lists* (1731), *passim*.

the scene was a more varied one. Visitors to Greenwich by George I's reign found that this sprouting town of 4,000 inhabitants and the fringes of Blackheath behind it had become a high-class professional ghetto, a retreat not just for city lawyers but for retired generals and many other officers of the army and navy, and as Defoe observed, for working civil servants too—ordnance officials and dockyard executives.[1] Most long-serving officials of the central government now preferred to settle within easy commuting distance of their offices: Adam de Cardonnel lived unflamboyantly in a house at Chiswick and Josiah Burchett, that indispensable factotum of the Admiralty, among the Jewish businessmen at Hampstead.[2] But some had moved a little further afield and bought land. Travellers through Sussex between 1694 and 1717, for example, found two manor houses cheek by jowl, Cuckfield and Wakehurst Place, occupied by colleagues and close friends at the Navy Office, Charles Sergison, Clerk of the Acts, and Dennis Lyddell.[3]

Even the clergy were able here and there to reassure the English traveller, through brick and stone, that the good things of this world had not entirely passed by the most ancient of the learned professions. But outside the closes of cathedral cities, where the amount of new and elegant building since the late seventeenth century caused some remark,[4] it was often medical

[1] Daniel Defoe, *A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain* (Everyman edn.), i. 95; Macky, *Journey*, i (1714), 80. Cf. C. W. Chalkin, *Seventeenth-Century Kent* (1965), p. 258.

[2] *DNB* on Cardonell; G. F. James, 'Josiah Burchett, Seceretary to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, 1695–1742', *Mariner's Mirror*, xxiii (1937), 492–3.

[3] T. W. Horsfield, *History, Antiquities and Topography of the County of Sussex* (Lewes, 1835), i. 253, 259; M. A. Lower, 'Some Notices of Charles Sergison, Esq., one of the Commissioners of the Royal Navy temp. William III and Queen Anne', *Sussex Arch. Soc. Collns.* xxv (1873), 62–3, 79–80; R. D. Merriman (ed.), *The Sergison Papers* (Navy Record Soc. 1949), p. 2. Lyddell, who died in 1717, was Comptroller of the Treasurer's Accounts. See also *VCH Sussex* vii. 156 for the Cuckfield estate.

[4] For example, the splendour of the houses of the cathedral clergy in Salisbury, Durham, and Lichfield greatly impressed Defoe and Macky: *Tour*, i. 189, ii. 248; *Journey*, ii. 156–7. In 1725 Lord Oxford's chaplain noted with approval the number of fine new parsonage houses along his route through north Yorkshire (Hist. MSS. Comm., *Portland MSS*, vi. 97, 99) and had he passed earlier through Hemsworth he would have found another there (*Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 95). The parish clergy of Oxfordshire, among others, were building too: see, e.g., Jennifer Sherwood and N. Pevsner (eds.), *The Buildings of England: Oxfordshire* (1974), pp. 519, 526 for Burford rectory and Chalgrove parsonage (*c.*1700–2).

men who vied most with provincial lawyers in flaunting their prosperity. In Wells even the dean and prebends were outshone by the city's only physician in the early years of the eighteenth century, Dr Claver Morris. Morris lived in one of the handsomest houses in the city, built between 1699 and 1702 at a cost of £807, with every convenience a man of his interests and conviviality could desire—from a private laboratory down to a splendid cellar, normally well stocked (as befitted that of a good Tory) with smuggled French clarets.[1] When the centre of Warwick was rebuilt after being largely destroyed by fire in 1694 the most richly ornamented of the four largest and tallest new houses was tenanted by the town's leading apothecary-doctor, John Bradshaw.[2] Indeed, wealthy apothecaries at this time seem to have had a passion for tall houses. John Pemberton, Liverpool's leading apothecary for much of the period 1660–1703, was thus an odd man out when, during the building of Moor Street, he turned down repeated requests to add a fourth storey to his house, the first to go up on one side of the road. He could well have afforded to comply, for he died a rich man. But he preferred to puff off his self-consequence instead by defying his gentry landlord, Sir Edward Moore, and telling him flatly 'he would not have it built an inch higher'; and since Moor Street had a marked fall of ground and all the other tenants on his side had 'engaged to build uniform with him', his next-door neighbour had to bend double to get into his own upper rooms and the street as a whole, thought Sir Edward, was 'wronged . . . five hundred pounds'. Moore found Pemberton's perverse combination of *nouveau* wealth and pride peculiarly hard to stomach—'a base, ill-contrived fellow', he called him.[3] Bury

[1] E. Hobhouse (ed.), *The Diary of a West Country Physician, A.D. 1684–1726* (1934), pp. 12–14, 18, 22–3, 63–4. Perhaps Morris was a special case, in that he had already married and lost two wives before he began building his house at the age of forty, both his first two wives had brought him property, and he made a third advantageous marriage in 1703. But physicians' houses at least as impressive as his were more than isolated freaks in the Augustan provinces: Landor House in Warwick, rebuilt for Dr Johnson early in William III's reign, Dr John Castle's 'Great House' in Burford (*c.*1700) and the grandiloquent town mansion in Pontefract later dubbed 'Doctor Burgess's folly' are three examples. Sherwood and Pevsner, *Oxfordshire*, pp. 519–20; *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 94; information on Landor House kindly supplied by Mr Peter Borsay.

[2] I am indebted to Mr Borsay for this information and also for that in p. 321 n. 4 below.

[3] *Liverpool in King Charles the Second's Time*: 'by Sir Edward Moore, Bart. of Bank Hall, Liverpool, written in the year 1667–8' (ed. W. F. Irvine,

St. Edmunds thought a good deal better of Thomas Macro, the apothecary whose 'high house' Fiennes had so admired. Yet Macro's career, too, could well be considered a prime example of social mobility through the profession of medicine, if an unusual one. He started in business as a small grocer, and though he developed a deep interest in herbal remedies I am not certain that he ever had any formal training as an apothecary; yet after building the best new house in the town in his forties, he educated his son at Cambridge and Leyden as a fine gentleman, bibliophile, and scholar, and before he died in 1737 owned a landed estate.[1] Several I have already mentioned in other professions had clambered at least as far up the social ladder as Macro, among them three of the civil servants. Burchett—possibly the son of a tradesman in Sandwich—Sergison, and Lyddell all began their working careers as clerical drudges, the two latter in the obscurity of the dockyards.[2]

The years when the Macros, Sergisons and Burchetts were building up their fortunes, between the 1670s and the 1730s, are not usually associated with profound social change;[3] and in a spacious and fertile essay published in 1966 Professor Lawrence Stone[4] developed the hypothesis that after a century, from 1540 to 1640, in which English society 'experienced a seismic upheaval of unprecedented magnitude', with opportunities for individual upward mobility that were wholly exceptional, 'an increasingly immobile society' [as he put it] evolved be-

Liverpool, 1899), pp. 119–20. Pemberton died in 1703 owning extensive property in the town, and having seen his son become a wealthy merchant and his daughters prosperously married to local men. Ibid., p. 119 n.

[1] *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, pp. 151–2; *DNB* article on Cox Macro (though the author fails to mention that Macro senior turned from grocery to medicine); E. Ashworth Underwood, *Boerhaave's Men at Leyden and After* (Edinburgh, 1977), pp. 11, 187.

[2] G. Jackson and G. F. Duckett, *Naval Commissioners . . . 1660–1760* ([Lewes], 1889), p. 92 for Lyddell; M. A. Lower, 'Some Notices of Charles Sergison', loc. cit., p. 75. Burchett's precise social origins remain cloudy, but they were unimpressive; when he was dismissed by Pepys in 1687 from the clerkship to which the Admiralty Secretary had appointed him (aged 14) in 1680, Burchett described himself as 'a poor young man who is entirely at a loss to keep himself'. Burchett to Pepys, 28 Aug. 1687, quoted in G. F. James, loc. cit., p. 478.

[3] But for recent qualifications of this orthodoxy see, for example, W. A. Speck, *Stability and Strife: England 1714–1760* (1977), ch. 3, 'Social Change'; Geoffrey Holmes, 'Gregory King and the Social Structure of pre-industrial England', *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.* 5th series, 27 (1977).

[4] 'Social Mobility in England, 1500–1700', *Past and Present*, 33 (1966).

tween 1660 and 1700, setting a pattern of development which lasted from then until the Industrial Revolution. Once the base of the pre-Reformation social oligarchy had been broadened to accommodate the rise of the gentry and the bestowing of greater social recognition on certain non-landed elements, including leading members of the old professions, a greatly restricted land-market and a deliberate reduction of educational opportunities after 1660 enabled the new élite to close ranks again almost as effectively as the old. Thus Stone postulated for the years after 1688 an oligarchic rather than an 'open' society, one to which the avenues of entrance were severely limited and controlled: a society in which young men from, in particular, the classes of yeomanry, small tradesmen, craftsmen, and artisans who had had so many opportunities to rise before 1640 now had precious few.[1]

Hypotheses are put forward to be tested; and Professor Stone, who delights in providing matter for argument, would probably have been disappointed as well as surprised if his 'social mobility' edifice had survived unscathed at every point since 1966. It has already taken something of a battering from students of the land market and from a number of historians of education as well. But I believe the most serious weakness in the elaborate model he constructed for the society of the pre-industrial century is its failure to take account of a crucial period in the development of the English professions. Of course Stone was right to draw attention to the importance in this respect of the years 1580–1640, which saw a remarkable professional advance by the common lawyers and significant changes both in the practice of medicine and in the growth of a professional consciousness among clergy and royal officials; and this appears to fit neatly into his hypothesis. But one of my two main objects in this paper will be to argue that there was a much more far-reaching transformation of the professions later, in a period that can be very roughly demarcated at the one end by the introduction of a formal examination for a naval commission in 1677/8 and the creation in 1683 of England's first really large professional government department, the Excise, and at the other end by, for example, the foundation of the great Edinburgh medical school in 1726 and the passing of the Lawyer's Bill in 1729; and that these late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century developments produced social changes

[1] Ibid., especially pp. 33 (and n. 42), 34, 39, 44–5, 51, 54–5.

which, so far from clogging the channels of upward mobility, kept some of the old ones wide open and created others that were essentially new.

First, however, I hope to explain how the connections between the professions and social change at this period went far beyond the problem of mobility, vital though that was. For this is a problem which should ideally be seen in a very broad social context; one in which rapidly rising standards of material prosperity and comfort, economic demands that were growing steadily more complex, a period of fruitful urban development, and not least the needs of the post-Revolution state throughout eighteen years of relentless warfare, were all basic ingredients. All are inseparable from the rapid evolution and innovation in the professional sector which took place between Charles II's reign and the early years of George II, either because of the impetus they received from the professions or the response they evoked from them. I have already referred in the introduction to this lecture to an obvious link between urbanization and the professions. But I have chosen to concentrate here on the one ingredient in the situation which seems to me central to almost everything else, namely, the growth of prosperity in our period and with it the improvement in the quality of life. Many students of pre-industrial England now agree that, thanks partly to the so-called financial and commercial 'revolutions' of the later seventeenth century, and partly to the astonishing improvement in the fiscal resources of the state between 1683 and 1712, an enormous amount of both private and public spending power was produced and released. The result of this, and also of fifty years of uneven but still significant agrarian progress after 1680, was a society which over five to six decades from the mid 1670s grew strikingly in material prosperity (a benefit far more widely shared than was once thought), and a society which, in part consequence, became more sophisticated, probably more status-conscious, certainly more comfort- and amenity-conscious, and also more cultivated than any which had preceded it in England.

Several of the consequences of this burgeoning of wealth and social sophistication have recently attracted attention. Professor Plumb has written persuasively of the 'commercialisation of leisure' from the end of the seventeenth century onwards; Mr Machin has argued that 'the Great Rebuilding' of England reached its peak not in 1600 but around 1700; and Peter Borsay has pointed to what he calls an 'urban renaissance' in the

English provinces between 1680 and 1760.[1] The place of the professions in this many-hued, subtly changing scene has never been adequately assessed, but it is not, I hope, difficult to appreciate.

On the one hand, the professions obviously helped to create a good deal of the new spending power in a consumer society; and as their own numbers and rewards rose, so they bought land, stocks, and securities;[2] they built houses (especially town houses, as we have seen); they patronized a host of tradesmen, craftsmen, and other professionals.[3] Not least, they developed the keenest interest in improving the amenities of the places they lived in. Professional men are to be found interesting themselves, and often taking the lead in, for example, town planning;[4] the improvement of water supplies;[5] the promotion of river navigation schemes;[6] the founding of charity schools.[7]

[1] J. H. Plumb, *The Commercialisation of Leisure in Eighteenth-century England* (Stenton Lecture, Reading, 1973); R. Machin, 'The Great Rebuilding: A Reassessment', *Past and Present*, 77 (1977); Peter N. Borsay, 'The English Urban Renaissance, 1680–1760', *Social History*, 5 (1977).

[2] P. G. M. Dickson, *The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit, 1688–1756* (1967), chs. 11 and 17, *passim*, contains much interesting information on the latter, especially in respect of doctors and lawyers. On investments by physicians, for instance, see pp. 267, 278–9, 426. See also Sir Zachary Cope, *William Cheselden* (1953), p. 11, for a leading surgeon's investment in South Sea Stock in 1714.

[3] To give one example, among many. They often spent heavily on fitting their children for suitable careers, and among the fellow professionals to profit from this were the growing number of schoolmasters in private educational establishments.

[4] e.g. Thomas Newsham, barrister-at-law, Town Clerk of Warwick, was a dominant figure on the Fire Court which carefully planned the rebuilding of the town in the 1690's (cf. above, p. 317).

[5] As with Lawrence Carter, senior, Leicester's leading solicitor in the late 17th century. Carter lived—like his son, a prominent barrister and politician—in one of the 'severall good houses, some of stone and brick' which Celia Fiennes found in 'the Newark', one of the few enclaves of good private building in Augustan Leicester. *Journeys*, p. 163; J. Simmons, *Leicester Past and Present*, i (1974), p. 100.

[6] For Isaac Greene's services to the corporation of Liverpool in connection with the river Weaver navigation (1719), see Stewart-Brown, op. cit., p. 21; for Alexander Leigh, the wealthy Wigan attorney, and his active promotion and financing of the river Douglas navigation, see M. Cox, 'Sir Roger Bradshaigh and the Electoral Management of Wigan, 1695–1747', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 37 (1954–5), p. 138 and n. 3.

[7] Clergymen, such as White Kennett, minister of St. Botolph's, Aldgate, and rector of St. Mary Aldermary, Thomas Bray, his successor at Aldgate, Thomas Bennet, rector of St. James's, Colchester, William Stubbs, archdeacon

But at the same time we also find them patronizing local music societies and assemblies;[1] by their own private leisure interests making their neighbourhood a place to be sought out by visiting antiquarians, virtuosi, bibliophiles and collectors;[2] and either delivering, organizing, or subscribing to all manner of those courses of public lectures to which the educated Englishman of the early eighteenth century was growing so addicted—lectures on natural philosophy, on trigonometry, mechanics or hydrostatics, on geography, on anatomy (a particular source of fascination), and so on.[3] The lawyers frequently exercised far-

of St. Albans, and Richard Willis, dean of Lincoln, naturally played the most prominent roles with their fund-raising sermons and tracts and pastoral oversight [for the above see G. V. Bennett, *White Kennett, 1660–1728, Bishop of Peterborough* (1957), pp. 187–90; J. Hunter (ed.), *The Diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S.* (1830), ii. 380–1; Thomas Bennet, MA, *Charity-Schools Recommended, in a Sermon preach'd at St. James's Church in Colchester, on Sunday March* 26, 1710 (London and Cambridge, 1710); M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement* (Cambridge, 1938), p. 73; John Strype, *A Survey of the cities of London and Westminster* (1720 revision of John Stow's *Survey* of 1598), Book V, p. 43]. But among other professional men identified with the charity school movement from 1699 onwards were, e.g., Dr Gideon Harvey, senr., the physician, and John Hooke (d. 1712), serjeant-at-law. Jones, op. cit., pp. 39, 40, 73.

[1] E. Hobhouse (ed.), *The Diary of a West Country Physician*, pp. 51-3,. 56, 58–134 *passim;* Defoe, *Tour*, ii. 231; Macky, *Journey*, ii. 41–2, 211.

[2] Defoe, *Tour*, i. 47 (for Dr Beeston and Mr White, physician and surgeon of Ipswich); Hist. MSS Comm., *Portland MSS*, vi. 76–9 (for Dr Thorpe, physician of Rochester, and Mr Martin, the bibliophile attorney of Diss, Norfolk); William Munk, *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, i (1878), 453–4 (for Nathaniel Johnston, MD [d. 1705], who in the end ruined a flourishing practice at Pontefract through his obsession with Yorkshire antiquities and natural history); G. F. James, 'Josiah Burchett', loc. cit., pp. 493–4, for the collection of 392 paintings which Burchett had built up at Hampstead by the time of his death. See also E. A. Underwood, *Boerhaave's Men*, pp. 178–81 for the extraordinary west-country physician, John Huxham (1692–1768), and his meteorological investigations at Plymouth, 1724–35, which attracted the interest of the Royal Society.

[3] e.g. E. R. G. Taylor, *The Mathematical Practitioners of Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 284, for John Harris's public lectures on applied mathematics, 1698–1707, one of a score of London schoolmasters and academy tutors active in this field; Underwood, op. cit., p. 128, for James Jurin's celebrated public lectures on experimental philosophy, 1710–15, when he was headmaster of Newcastle-on-Tyne grammar school; G. C. Peachey, *A Memoir of William & John Hunter* (Plymouth, 1924), pp. 18–19, and Z. Cope, *William Cheselden*, p. 5, for Cheselden's and Francis Hauksbee's courses of public anatomy and zoology lectures in Fleet Street, 1721–2, 'being chiefly intended for gentlemen', in which 'care will be taken to have nothing offensive'; W. Brockbank and F. Kenworthy (eds.), *The Diary of Richard Kay, 1716–51 . . . A Lancashire Doctor* (Chetham Soc., Man-

reaching local influence in their role as Town Clerks, and the civic importance of both them and medical men was occasionally signalized by their election as mayors.[1]

However, it is a different side of the relationship of the professions to a more prosperous and socially demanding England that I want to explore most carefully, namely their response to that prosperity and to those demands. For it is here I see the main clue both to the transformation of the professions themselves and thereby to their emergence as the most active and capacious vehicle of social mobility under the later Stuarts and the first two Georges. Professional men, by definition, provide certain specialized services for their fellow citizens and for the state. So it should not really surprise us to find that in response to a society and a state which increasingly required new services, or a greater volume and variety of existing services, on a scale without precedent—and (a vital point) had the capacity as never before to pay for those services—the professions did expand; that they did prosper; that they adapted their methods of training and to some extent of organization to meet the requirements of the changing world about them; and that in addition they acquired new offshoots, tiny to start with but destined in time to become large branches.

To begin with, between the 1680s and 1713 the English state needed a far larger civil service, army, and navy then ever before, far larger even than Cromwell's; and so far as the bureaucracy was concerned, the determination of all early Hanoverian administrations to keep the land tax as low as possible and their heavy dependence in consequence on indirect taxation, in much the same multiplicity of forms devised during the French wars, guaranteed that the need would, in effect, be just as great after the Peace of Utrecht as before it. But the state could not have had these services, with all their professional implications, had not first the monarchy in the 1680s and then the Parliaments of post-Revolution England been able, and

chester, 1968), pp. 63–5, for the Revd. Caleb Rotherham's Manchester subscription lectures on magnetism, electricity, hydrostatics and pneumatics; ibid., pp. 26, 42, 47–8, 97–8, for other south Lancashire lecture courses, 1738–45, patronized by local physicians, surgeons, attorneys, and clergy, including Dr Hamer's lectures on trigonometry, logarithms, and natural philosophy.

[1] Among lawyers, surgeons, and apothecary-doctors who served as mayors in this period were John Bradshaw (Warwick), Thomas Macro (Bury St Edmunds), James Yonge (Plymouth), Philip Potter (Torrington) and Alexander Leigh (Wigan).

prepared, to foot the bills. The result by 1710, at the climax of the struggle with Louis XIV, was a civil service (excluding household officers, officials of the law courts, and political appointees in the government)[1] of well over 11,000, some 4,000 commissioned officers in the army, and in the royal navy perhaps 1,000 officers of lieutenant's rank and above, plus a much larger number of warrant or 'petty' officers, some of whom would in due course achieve commissions.[2]

Once this great edifice of state-employed professionals had been erected it proved extremely difficult to dismantle: for reasons already suggested the 'army of civil officers', as a prominent member of the Commons apprehended early in George I's reign, had come to stay,[3] and so had the 'military men' and the naval profession, essentially because of the half-pay system, which was institutionalized for both armed forces in 1713. And thus it was that three professions which had been no more than nascent in the 1670s (indeed, in the case of the army and the bureaucracy so tiny and insecure that, considered as lifelong occupations, they barely merited the description), had all become long before the 1720s fully-fledged and well-fleshed

[1] Because of these numerous exclusions my estimate of the number of 'civil servants' (a conservative one, which also leaves out of account several thousand auxiliaries, part-timers, and trainees) is not measurable against Gregory King's optimistic guess of 10,000 'persons in greater and lesser offices' for the year 1688. It does, however, include dockyard officers, clerks, and craftsmen, and that basic core of dockyard workers not laid off in time of peace, who together with a part of the Ordnance Office establishment may legitimately be seen as the forerunners of the 'technical civil service'.

[2] The above figures will be fleshed out in my book *Augustan England: Professions, State and Society, 1680–1730*, to be published shortly by Allen and Unwin. Of the many sources drawn on, the most important are *The Calendars of Treasury Books* for Queen Anne's reign; John Chamberlayne's *Magnae Britanniae Notitia* (1708, 1710, and 1716 editions); five volumes (I–IV and VII) in the series *Office-Holders in Modern Britain*, compiled by J. C. Sainty and J. M. Collinge (University of London, 1972–8); John Ehrman, *The Navy in the War of William III 1689–1697* (Cambridge, 1953), appendix on dockyards; D. A. Baugh, *British Naval Administration in the Age of Walpole* (Princeton, 1965); R. D. Merriman (ed.), *Queen Anne's Navy* (Navy Records Soc. 1961); R. E. Scouller, *The Armies of Queen Anne* (Oxford 1966); E. Hughes, *Studies in Administration and Finance, 1558–1825* (Manchester, 1934); an establishment list of the Treasury in 1711 in Brit. Lib. Loan 29/45B/12; and *A List of the Principal Officers, Civil and Military, in Great Britain in the year 1710* (printed for Abel Roper by John Morphew, London, 1710).

[3] See the speech of Archibald Hutcheson, MP for Hastings, a former member of the Board of Trade, in the debate on the Septennial bill, April 1716. *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England* (1806–20), vii. 356–7.

professions. In the meantime, in the course of twenty years of major warfare the élite of these professions—three or four hundred men, to put the figure at its lowest—had made fortunes. The army, for instance, had no fewer than 68 generals by 1710; the 'non-political' civil service contained close on a hundred officials whose income from salaries alone or from ascertainable fees[1] was worth anything from £500 to £2,500 a year.

But what of the senior professions in our period—the law, medicine, and the Church—and another profession well-established though still unorganized by 1660, schoolteaching, whose rapid expansion since Tudor times had, of course, drawn very heavily on clerical manpower? Here again, with the qualified exception of the clergy, we find the same three elements interacting: demand, supply, and the resources necessary to sustain and increase supply. The law provides the most obvious illustration. More young men trained for the bar in the late seventeenth century, and many more young men went into attorneys' and solicitors' offices as articled clerks then and in the early eighteenth century than at any previous time. Between 1660 and 1689, 1,996 young men were called to the bar at one or other of the four inns of court, 623 more than in the thirty years before 1640, customarily considered the common law's most dynamic and productive period before the nineteenth century.[2] And although the output of the inns fell away to some extent during the reigns of William III and Anne, recovering again in the 1720s, it remained more than enough to maintain the strength of the bar at the unprecedented level it had reached by the early 1690s. I have alluded already to the proliferation of attorneys and solicitors in particular local communities. To convey some idea of what this meant nationally, we know that

[1] Very probably this figure is an underestimate, because in some parts of the executive, notably the Exchequer where fees remained the basis of remuneration, their level in most individual cases is not ascertainable without detailed departmental studies on the admirable model of H. C. Tomlinson's *Guns and Government: the Ordnance Office under the later Stuarts* (1979) [see especially pp. 83–102, 'The Rewards of Office']. See also Kenneth Ellis, *The Post Office in the Eighteenth Century* (1958), Part One.

[2] The figures for 1610–39 are taken from W. R. Prest, *The Inns of Court . . . 1590–1640* (1972), Table 8. Those for 1670–89 are distilled from H. A. C. Sturgess (ed.), *Register of Admissions to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple*, i (1949); F. A. Inderwick (ed.), *Calendar of Inner Temple Records*, iii (1901); R. J. Fletcher (ed.), *The Pension Book of Gray's Inn*, ii (1910); *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn: The Black Books*, iii, iv (1899–1902). I am grateful to Mr Richard W. Pearce of St. John's College, Cambridge, for the figure of 714 calls for the years 1660–9.

the *bona fide* attorneys alone—those formally sworn and registered by the Courts of Common Pleas and King's Bench—rose from 1,725 in 1633 to 3,129 in 1729–30,[1] plus another 418 accredited attorneys who chose to register under the provisions of the 1729 Act with one of the provincial courts of record;[2] and this over a century when the population was increasing very very little; when solicitors (on whom for technical reasons it is almost impossible to pin any precise numbers) and entering clerks are known to have been spawning at least as actively as attorneys;[3] and when notaries and scriveners were still fairly numerous on their own account.[4]

All this can only have happened, in the first place, because there was a greater demand for lawyers' services by the second half of the seventeenth century than prior to 1640, and above all a demand for a greater range and variety of such services than ever before. By the years 1680–1730 the call was not only for practisers who could handle the mounting volume of litigation in the courts.[5] There was a pressing need for experts 'of a clear,

[1] M. Birks, *Gentlemen of the Law* (1960), p. 99; R. Robson, *The Attorney in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 166.

[2] Between May 1729 and March 1731. *Lists* (1730), pp. 27–35; *Additional Lists* (1731), pp. 111–18, 255–60.

[3] See Birks, op. cit.; the report of the Strickland Committee to the House of Commons, delivered 14 Mar. 1729, which showed, for example, roughly 1,000 entering clerks on the books of the Court of Commons Pleas alone by that time (evidence of Sir George Cooke, Prothonotary, *Commons' Journals*, xxi. 267). William Tully told the Committee (ibid.) he believed there were 'some thousands of entering clerks' practising in the country at large.

[4] By 1700 their narrower specialisms were already in danger of being absorbed in the general competence of the 'ministerial persons' of the law. Nevertheless, a study of lawyers in Halifax, for example, has detected 7 scriveners as well as 33 attorneys and solicitors practising in that parish in the period 1668–1730. C. D. Webster, 'Halifax Attorneys', *Trans. of Halifax Antiquarian Soc.* (1968–9), pp. 80–7, 117–19. For notaries and scriveners see also John Patten, *English Towns 1500–1700* (1978), pp. 283, 288; R. Robson, op. cit., pp. 26–8; W. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law*, vi (2nd edn. 1937), 447. Campbell allocated a short chapter to each in his survey of the London professions in 1747 and recommended the notary's, in particular, as 'a very reputable employ'. R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman: being a Compendious View of all the Trades, Professions, Arts, both Liberal and Mechanic, now practised in the Cities of London and Westminster* (London, 1747), pp. 79–80, 82–4, esp. p. 83.

[5] For the general increase of Common Pleas business in the early decades of the 18th century, see *Commons' Journals*, xxi. 267. Edward Hughes (*North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century: The North East 1700–1750*, p. 77) describes this as 'a great age of litigation in the north', and cites as one example the 21 suits in which William Cotesworth was involved during ten years as lord of the manor of Gateshead.

solid and unclouded understanding'[1] who could both draft and execute increasingly complicated property and marriage settlements or comprehend, in developing commercial and manufacturing centres, the mysteries of international exchange; for men who could negotiate mortgages, collect rents on commission, and keep accounts for local land- or property-owners; who could act as investment consultants, and quite frequently—before the arrival of the provincial private banker—serve as money-lenders. But what is equally clear is that along with this ever-rising tide of demand for both litigious and non-litigious services, there must also have been an ability and a willingness to pay for them, and meet in the process the substantially higher fees which were generally being charged to clients by the years 1680–1730.[2]

Another professional sphere in which by the late seventeenth century the changing expectations of the consumer were beginning to have a profound effect was education. The desire of parents, from the aristocracy down to the urban tradesman and the ambitious yeoman, for the best education—or at any rate the most fitting education—for their sons, rather than being content with the most convenient, traditional local education for them, had three main consequences. It encouraged the habit of employing private tutors in the families of the nobility and wealthy gentry and so afforded a new career-opportunity to the ordained clergy of the Church of England. It stimulated a remarkable growth in demand, partly private and partly generated by the needs of the armed forces, for schoolmasters who specialized in subjects other than the basic three Rs, Latin, and Greek: for experts in mathematics; in commercial and career-orientated subjects such as book-keeping, surveying, even excise-gauging; for teachers of navigation, of calligraphy, and to a lesser degree modern languages.[3] Some of them could be accommodated within the existing or new endowed foundations,[4] but most taught in a rich new crop of private schools

[1] R. Campbell, op. cit., p. 70.

[2] Lawyers' fees will be one theme developed in the essay 'The Lawyers and Society in Augustan England' in my forthcoming book (see above p. 324 n. 2).

[3] Foster Watson, *The Beginning of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England* (1909); E. G. R. Taylor, *The Mathematical Practitioners of Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1954); id. *The Mathematical Practitioners of Hanoverian England* (Cambridge, 1966); A. Heal, *The English Writing Masters and their Copy Books* (1931); R. S. Tompson, *Classics or Charity? The Dilemma of the Eighteenth Century Grammar School* (Manchester, 1971); M. Seaborne, *The English School: its Architecture and Organization, 1370–1870* (1971).

[4] For example, in Manchester, Birmingham, Hull, Newcastle upon Tyne,

and academies.[1] Finally, parental ambitions made the taking in of boarders and fee-paying day boys, as much by the best of the old grammar schools as by the most progressive of the new 'modern' schools, a commonplace in late Stuart England. And so profitable did this enterprise become after 1680 that, what with this and his increasingly technical or non-classical specialisms, the secondary schoolmaster and academy tutor of George I's reign was in many places almost unrecognizable as the successor of the miserably paid drudge so familiar in the mid seventeenth century. The financial incentives for able men, either with or without taking orders, to take up schoolmastering as a life profession were transformed by the early eighteenth century;[2] though among those who did so, there remained of course very many, especially among the ushers, who could only watch disconsolately as the gravy train passed by.

However, the reaction of the professions to Augustan society involved much more than supplying governmental or largely economic demands, or simply responding to that society's growing wealth. We should also see it as a reaction to the greater sophistication I emphasized earlier and to the Englishman's rising and widening expectations. These, for one thing, generated certain demands which the existing professions could not meet; so that this period sees the birth of a number of small professions which are truly novel, in that they are by 1730 minor occupational groups, whereas in 1660 only isolated individuals had foreshadowed them. The age of baroque and Palladian

and Holt grammar schools; and in many endowed 'secondary' foundations of the years 1660–1720, including Christ's Hospital; Tuxford School, Notts; Sir John Moore's school, Appleby Magna; Brigg Grammar School; Pierrepoint's, Lucton; Williamson's School, Rochester; Sir Thomas Parkyn's School, Bunny; and Saunders' School, Rye.

[1] The works of Taylor and Heal (above, p. 327 n. 3) teem with examples. Twenty-eight private writing schools were advertised in the pages of John Houghton's periodical *A Collection for the Improvement of Industry and Trade* in the eleven and a half years from March 1692 to September 1703. Bret's Academy at Tottenham Cross in Charles II's reign provided a staff of seven to teach a comprehensive 'modern' syllabus, and Watts's Academy in Little Tower Street, which began by teaching accountancy and book-keeping only, was employing in the 1720s four masters or 'professors', a resident French tutor, and several more part-time tutors. W. A. L. Vincent, *The Grammar Schools: their Continuing Tradition, 1660–1714* (1979), p. 200; N. Hans, *New Trends in Education in the Eighteenth Century* (1951), pp. 83–6; Taylor, *Mathematical Practitioners* (1966), pp. 113, 164.

[2] The argument is developed at length in the essay 'Schools and the Schoolmaster', in *Augustan England* (above, p. 324 n. 2).

mansion-building, together with the careful, symmetrical planning which so much new urban development required by 1700, called for a new breed of specialist architects.[1] Again, while a more scientific approach to agrarian improvement and the maximization of rents among the big landowners gave birth to the full-time estate steward or agent,[2] it was a more grandiose approach to the planning and even mapping of their grounds that encouraged the training of surveyors. And of course one of the most interesting occupational offshoots of a society more leisured and cultivated than that of two generations before was the emergence of musicians as a minor profession, reputable enough to be considered suitable, in some quarters, for the scions of good families; though there were those who professed a certain social uneasiness at the development.

> If a parent cannot make his son a gentleman, and finds that he has got an itch of music [wrote R. Campell Esq. in his guide to trades and professions in George II's reign], it is much the best way to allot him entirely to that study. The present general taste of music in the gentry may find him better bread than what this art deserves. The Gardens in the summer time employ a great number of hands; where they are allowed a guinea a week and upwards, according to their merit. The Opera, the play-houses, masquerades, ridottoes, and the several music-clubs employ them in the winter. But I cannot help thinking that any other mechanic trade is much more useful to the society than the whole tribe of singers and scrapers: and should think it much more reputable to bring my son up a blacksmith (who was said to be the father of music) than bind him apprentice to the best master of music in England.

The writer was willing to admit, however, that 'this . . . must be reckoned an unfashionable declaration in this musical age'.[3]

However, the professional response after 1680 to essentially non-economic social expectations can be seen writ largest of all

[1] H. M. Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of English Architects, 1660–1840* (1954), especially the valuable introductory essay on 'The Architectural Profession' (pp. 10–25). James Lees Milne, *English Country Houses: Baroque, 1685–1715* (1970) and John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain, 1530–1830* (4th edn. 1963), pp. 119–243, also contain many individual examples, as of course do the numerous county surveys in N. Pevsner, *The Buildings of England* (1951–).

[2] E. Hughes, 'The Eighteenth Century Estate Agent', in H. A. Crowne, T. W. Moody and D. B. Quinn (eds.), *Essays in British and Irish History in honour of James Eadie Todd* (1949).

[3] Campbell, op. cit., p. 93. See also E. D. MacKerness, *A Social History of English Music* (1964), especially pp. 83–4, 88, 103–4; John Harley, *Music in Purcell's London: The Social Background* (1968), the introduction to which touches on the pre-Restoration background of professional music-making.

in the case of a major ancient profession, that of medicine. By the later decades of the seventeenth century a less philosophical attitude to illness and pain, an attitude that was a natural consequence of a more comfort-conscious society, and also a less devout one, led to a rising pressure on both the drugs and the diagnostic advice of the apothecary and at the same time stimulated the most important advances yet seen in England in the art of surgery. The science of *materia medica* made significant strides during the seventeenth century; and it was the now formidable array of medicines which any well-appointed apothecary could stock and dispense by 1700, and above all the variety of opiates and other 'exotic' drugs now on the bill of lading of almost every East Indiaman sailing into London,[1] which were decisive in translating the status of the apothecaries in the course of the half-century after 1680 from that of a superior trade to that of a profession, most of whose members were engaged in some measure in general medical practice by 1730.[2] Their chance would naturally have been more difficult to seize had it not been for the small numbers and the high fees of the *pukka* doctors, the university-trained physicians, in later Stuart England. The abandonment of the London field to them by the physicians during the Great Plague and the decision of the House of Lords in 1704 to uphold the legality of their right to prescribe for patients as well as dispense, gave the apothecaries two powerful shoves along the way. But in the end, as their sourer critics in the Royal College of Physicians, like Robert Pitt, were not slow to observe, they were floated into the ranks of the professionals and 'this new dignity of *Doctor*' on a sea of pills, boluses, decoctions, electuaries, and juleps for which there now seemed a limitless market.[3] An estimated

[1] By 1665 a standard pharmaceutical guide was listing some 240 exotics, and it has been estimated that the import of drugs into England was at least 25 times greater in 1700 than in 1600. See R. S. Roberts, 'The Early History of the Import of Drugs into Britain', in F. N. L. Poynter (ed.), *The Evolution of Pharmacy in Britain* (1965), pp. 171–2.

[2] In general see C. Wall, H. C. Cameron, and E. A. Underwood, *A History of the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London* (1963), vol. I; Bernice Hamilton, 'The Medical Professions in the Eighteenth Century', *Economic Hist. Rev.* 2nd ser. iv (1951), esp. pp. 141, 159–66; R. S. Roberts, 'The Personnel and Practice of Medicine in Tudor and Stuart England', Part I. The Provinces, *Medical History*, vi (1962), Part II. London, *Medical History*, viii (1964). Cf. J. F. Kett, 'Provincial Medical Practice in England, 1730–1815', *Journal of the History of Medicine*, xix (1964), pp. 17–18, 20, 28.

[3] R[obert] Pitt, MD, *The Antidote: or the Preservation of Health and Life, and the Restorative of Physick to its Sincerity and Perfection* (London, 1704), Preface.

1,000 apothecaries' shops in London and its suburbs by Queen Anne's reign, compared with 104 (or, by one account, 114) in 1617;[1] the fact that apothecaries have been located by Dr Patten in 21 out of the 47 East Anglian market towns in the second half of the seventeenth century, compared with only five at any time in the century before 1600; the 29 apothecaries who made up the largest single element in the medical fraternity in Bristol by 1754[2]—such figures, and many more, speak for themselves about the new physical dimensions which the old profession of medicine acquired in the process.

The rise of the surgeon to a place of some honour among medical men—marked by the great gulf which existed by 1730 between the leading practisers of 'chirurgery' in London and the provinces, men of now unchallenged professional status, and those who still plied the old trade of 'barber-surgery'—was achieved more rapidly than that of the apothecaries, and with fewer advance signals over the first sixty to seventy years of the seventeenth century. All the same, it owned much to the same root factor—a greater willingness of patients to submit to their ministrations, a greater confidence in their developing skills, and of course the fact that dread of the knife was now dulled to some extent by the use of laudanum and other partial anaesthetics. Even among the surgeons proper, it is true, there was a recognized hierarchy. It embraced a numerous rank and file of workaday practitioners who still confined themselves in the main (and mercifully so) to bloodletting, blistering, mending fractured bones, minor external surgery, and increasingly to the highly profitable business of treating venereal disease with mercury—'upon [which] alone', one

There is ample confirmation from contemporary sources of the growing convention of patients addressing apothecaries as 'doctor'. See, e.g., Roberts, *Med. Hist.* vi (1962), 375–6; *A Dialogue concerning the Practice of Physic* (London, 1735); Extracts from the Town Wardens' Accounts of Torrington for 1696 and 1714, printed in J. J. Alexander and W. R. Hooper, *The History of Great Torrington in the County of Devon* (1948), p. 133; Hist. MSS Comm., *Kenyon MSS*, p. 311.

[1] R. Pitt, loc. cit.; *The Case of the Apothecaries* (London [1727]), conceding that the 'apothecaries' shops within London and seven miles thereof... upon a fair computation will appear to be upwards of a thousand'; [Samuel Foart Simmons], *The Medical Register for the Year 1783*, p. 25. Cf. Wall, Cameron, and Underwood, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[2] John Patten, *English Towns, 1500–1700*, pp. 254, 283; W. H. Harsant, 'Medical Bristol in the Eighteenth Century', *Bristol Medico-Chirurgical Journal*, xvii (1899), 301.

Londoner wrote in the 1740s, 'the subsistence of three parts in four of all the surgeons in the town depends'.[1] At the top of the profession, on the other hand, were now several hundred men who could boast an arduous and careful training[2] and often quite remarkable manual dexterity. And though there were many fine surgeons in England between the 1660s and the 1690s, the turning-point probably came around 1700 with London's rapid emergence as a surgical teaching centre of unquestioned stature. In this, the revived prestige of the anatomy teaching at Surgeons' Hall and the well-advertised and well-patronized private lecture courses and demonstrations mounted by leading London surgeons from Anne's reign onwards were both important.[3] But probably more so was the instruction available by the early eighteenth century in the London hospitals, not only from the salaried surgeons of St. Barts and St. Thomas's, but informally in the three new hospitals, the Westminster, Guy's, and St. George's, whose foundation between 1719 and 1733 was no coincidence in the medical context of the period.[4] It is not surprising, therefore, that the most pro-

[1] R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman*, p. 52. See also below, p. 334; A. Clark (ed.), *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford . . . described by himself* (Oxford, 1891–1900), iii. 202 (on the work accruing to surgeons from the increase in brothels, 1686); Alexander and Hooper, *History of Great Torrington*, p. 133 (extract from the Wardens' Accounts for 1731); A. G. Debus (ed.), *Medicine in Seventeenth Century England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), pp. 138, 263.

[2] A seven-year apprenticeship to a master surgeon was the basis—but increasingly not the limit—of all training, in the provinces as well as in London, and for trainees in the capital there was a stiff examination to be passed before final qualification.

[3] G. C. Peachey discovered 'no definite evidence of the regular delivery of any lectures on anatomy in London, outside the medical corporations and the Royal Society', until the opening of the eighteenth century. But between 1701, when George Rolfe began to lecture both in London and Cambridge, and 1729 he found 19 private teachers of anatomy in England, 16 of them giving courses of lectures or demonstrations in London. *A Memoir of William and John Hunter*, pp. 8–33 *passim*.

[4] There is a good modern account of the foundation of these new hospitals, together with the London Hospital (1740) and the Middlesex (1745) in E. A. Underwood, *Boerhaave's Men*, pp. 159–64. For an 18th-century account see [S. F. Simmons,] *Medical Register for 1783*, pp. 32–3. In the case of the older hospitals the year 1702, when the regulations of St. Thomas's were amended to permit its house surgeons to take in pupils as 'dressers'—on condition that 'none shall have more than three cubs at one time'—was an important landmark. J. F. South, *Memorials of the Craft of Surgery in England* (ed. D'Arcy Power, 1886), p. 249.

gressive provincial surgeons by 1730 were trying to give their sons or their star apprentices a period in London to complete their training; it was for this that Robert Kay of Bury sent his son as a pupil to Mr Steade of Guy's in 1743, where he spent an invaluable year (beautifully documented in his diary) observing operations and attending endless lectures and demonstrations.[1] Surgical instruments themselves were being perfected, and new ones devised. The first surgical instrument-makers began to appear in a few leading provincial centres at the end of the seventeenth century, having hitherto been confined to London. But young Richard Kay was nevertheless at pains to equip himself on the best advice with a brand new case of instruments just before leaving Town and coming back to Lancashire to join his father's practice.[2]

In this atmosphere the surgeon's 'art' flourished as never before; and what is more became socially estimable. Two different new techniques of 'cutting for the stone' were perfected in London between 1719 and 1727, the first by John Douglas, the second by William Cheselden, and Cheselden became so adept that he was soon able to perform his 'lateral' operation in 54 seconds, and later reduced the time much further—and therefore the risk to the patient to minimal proportions.[3] Claver Morris sent a patient from Wells to Robert Gay of Hatton Gardens for the removal of a breast cancer. Ophthalmic surgery, especially the couching of cataracts, made a notable advance. Thomas Rentone received the staggering sum of £5,000 from the Secret Service money in the 1720s 'for making known his art, skill and mystery in cutting

[1] *Diary of Richard Kay*, pp. 66–88 *passim*. 'Seldom a day but something remarkable happens', he wrote at one point; '. . . I believe being here is being at the fountain head for improvement.' Ibid., p. 70.

[2] Patten, op. cit., p. 288; *Diary of Richard Kay*, pp. 88–9. The instruments used by the great Cheselden in his lateral lithotomy operation were drawn by G. Vander Gucht and the illustration included in James Douglas, *An Appendix to the History of the Lateral Operation for the Stone* (1731). It is reproduced in Cope, *Cheselden*, p. 25.

[3] Peachey, *Memoir*, p. 23; *DNB* on Cheselden. According to Dr James Douglas (the brother of John, the surgeon) Cheselden later improved so far on his record that in straightforward cases 'he performs this operation with so much dexterity and quickness that he seldom exceeds half a minute'; and Cheselden himself stated in print that of the first hundred patients he operated on at St. Thomas's with the new method, he lost only six. James Douglas, *The History of the Lateral Operation for the Stone* (1731) and William Cheselden, *The Anatomy of the Human body* (1730 edn., with appendix), quoted by Cope, op. cit., pp. 29–30.

ruptures'.[1] And many ambitious operations and treatments were performed in the provinces, too.[2] The great rewards which the best surgeons could by now expect and their ability to maintain the style of living of wealthy gentlemen—certainly vying with many of the leading physicians in this respect—inevitably helped to raise still further the status of their branch of the profession and to make it so attractive to prospective entrants that it was said by 1747 that 'there are none of the liberal arts more likely to procure a livelihood than this. An ingenious surgeon, let him be cast on any corner of the earth, with but his case of instruments in his pocket, he may live where most other professions would starve'.[3] Cheselden was able to charge £500 an operation to his wealthier patients at the height of his fame (between £9 and £20 a second when cutting for the stone) and Charles Maitland got double that sum for inoculating Prince Frederick against the smallpox in the later years of George I.[4] Equally impressive in its own way is the fact that when Edward Greene, senior surgeon of St. Barts, sat for his portrait he had both the social panache and the money to employ the leading French court painter of his day, Rigaud, the same artist whose portrait of Louis XIV, designed as a present for Philip V of Spain, the King had liked so much he could not bear to part with it.[5]

At the same time there were some fine pickings to be had in the provinces, especially for the dexterous surgeon able to attract a county clientele, or build up the best practice in a growing town. The same man who, quite early in his career, was able to write with something akin to enthusiasm of the pox, 'by this one disease I got this year above £120' was subsequently able to charge from 25 to 30 guineas apiece for 'tapping' rich patients, and in one year between £30 and £70 each for successfully treating nine cases of piles.[6] For country surgeons

[1] *The Diary of a West Country Physician*, p. 29; Cope, op. cit., pp. 75–81; Brit. Lib. Add. MSS 40843, f. 9.

[2] See, e.g., L. M. Zimmerman, 'Surgery', in A. G. Debus, op. cit., pp. 61–2; F. N. L. Poynter (ed.), *The Journal of James Yonge* [*1647–1721*], *Plymouth Surgeon* (1965), p. 208; *Diary of a West Country Physician*, p. 99 (22 Aug. 1723); *Diary of Richard Kay*, pp. 91 ff., esp. pp. 134, 141–2, 147.

[3] R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman*, p. 57. It is interesting that one of Cheselden's apprentices, John Belchier, (born *c.*1706) was educated at Eton. William Wadd, *Nugae Chirurgicae* (1824), p. 17.

[4] *DNB* on Cheselden; Brit. Lib. Add. MSS 40843, f. 11.

[5] I owe this information to Dr Robert Beddard of Oriel College, Oxford. The portrait of Greene, Master of the London Barber Surgeons' Company in 1711, now hangs in the College's Champneys Common Room.

[6] *Journal of James Yonge*, pp. 162, 207, 208.

of high reputation there was certainly every incentive to use their years of accumulated experience to keep their wealthier patients alive. 'January 30th', wrote James Yonge of Plymouth in his journal, 'died Mr W. Addie, another good friend and profitable patient; he had an ulcer in the bladder 4 years, in which time I had of him near £200'. Yonge's comfort was that in the following two years, 1703 and 1704, he still had 444 patients on his books, 'a pretty good estate' (as he modestly put it) and 'more business than I was desirous of'.[1] It may be that for every James Yonge, or even for every country surgeon of comfortable means in the early eighteenth century, like the senior Kay of Baldingstone or William Barman of Wilmington, Kent, there was another more akin to George Wakeman, a struggling practitioner at Cople, Suffolk, who in February 1712 could afford to lay out only £5 to train his son Richard as a glazier in Bedford.[2] All the same, by the 1730s the status gap even in the provincial town between the well-esteemed surgeon and the physician, who only sixty years before had been on a very different social and professional plane, had shrunk so much that some very distinguished physicians, such as Thomas White of Manchester (1696–1778), did not hesitate now to train their only sons as surgeons. In fact there were many close family links by this time spanning the two branches of the profession.[3]

It is this whole question of professional status-changes, and their catalytic effects, which brings me back to the other major theme of this lecture which I anticipated earlier, the relationship between the professions and social mobility. There are three keys, I would suggest, to the supreme importance of the Augustan professions, old and new, in maintaining a far more mobile society than the Stone thesis allows for and also a stabler and better integrated society than the cruder vehicles of 1540–1640, with their more violent motion, had produced.[4] One key

[1] Ibid., pp. 209, 226, 227.

[2] See *Diary of Richard Kay*, pp. 91, 112, for the size and profitability of his father's practice; PRO IR 1/1/121 (for Barman), IR 1/42/44 (for Wakeman).

[3] e.g. Nathaniel Smith, whom Boyer described on his death in 1723 as 'a celebrated anatomist and one of the surgeons to St. Bartholomew's Hospital' (*Political State of Great Britain*, xxv, 356) had a brother, Lawrence, who was a physician. Richard Kay's first cousin, Samuel, was a physician in Manchester and played a vital part in furthering his career as a surgeon (*Diary*, p. 61). See also above, p. 333 n. 3 for the case of the Douglas brothers.

[4] The sudden, explosive progress of the new 'monied interest' did of course cause some disturbance to the social structure for some three decades

is that very rise already noticed in the prestige of auxiliary branches of old professions (hitherto of dubious standing, with the exception of registered attorneys); and at the same time, the transition of those three youthful professions, the army, the navy, and the civil service, into now permanent reservoirs of employment, acceptable to the members of the existing professional and landed classes, and desirable in the eyes of other groups as yet outside their ranks. We have observed what occurred within the medical profession, with the apothecaries and surgeons. A rough parallel can be detected within the teaching fraternity, with the emergence of a small élite in the most successful of the post-primary schools. And there was a much closer parallel within the law. By 1729–30 the clerks of the House of Commons unhesitatingly added the designation 'gentleman' to the name of every duly qualified solicitor as well as attorney reported to their office by the judges' clerks; and it was not many years after the foundation in the late 1730s of their first joint professional association, legitimately called the 'Society of Gentlemen Practisers', that Hume Campbell, the barrister, told a gathering of attorneys and solicitors from the Home Counties that 'he considered the worthy part of the profession, whether attorneys, solicitors, or counsel, as one body'.[1]

By then, moreover, the amount of social aspiration invested in those newer professions wedded to the service of the state had increased vastly since Charles II's reign; and in particular was this true of the navy and the bureaucracy. The transformed status of the non-political civil service by the 1730s depended not just on the great expansion in numbers noted earlier and the rewards it held out to its top executives, but to the infinitely greater prospect of permanency the Crown's service now offered. This was a direct result of the determination of three great Treasury ministers, Rochester in the 1680s and Godolphin and Harley from 1702 to 1714, to fight for the concept of the bureaucracy as a profession—latterly a stern battle waged against the piratical raids of the party bosses, who were ready enough to plunder it so as to reward their adherents. The fact

after the early 1690s. But even this was more localized than we are often tempted to think. See the comments on this question in 'The Achievement of Stability: The Social Context of Politics from the 1680s to the Age of Walpole', my contribution to John Cannon (ed.), *The Whig Ascendancy: Colloquies on Hanoverian England*, shortly to be published by Edward Arnold.

[1] *Records of the Society of Gentlemen Practisers in the courts of Law and equity called the Law society* (introduction by Edwin Freshfield, 1897), p. 33.

that half the jobs in the civil service were superannuable by 1713,[1] and the evidence in London alone of hundreds of men, starting their careers between the 1680s and the 1720s, who managed to serve for twenty, thirty, or even forty years in the same or in cognate departments,[2] are measures of the Treasury's success. Possibly more significant still in terms of social mobility and integration was what happened to the navy. In the late 1670s the status of its officers was not high; they were plagued by dilettantes of what Pepys called 'the bastard breed';[3] and it was by no means clear that the Admiralty Secretary would realize his great objective of making theirs a profession suitable for the sons of gentlemen, without any loss of efficiency and yet without closing the door on promotion from the lower decks. By the end of the wars of 1689–1713, demonstrably and triumphantly, his dream had become reality. The navy of Queen Anne and George I was one whose quarter-decks were, by and large, stocked with gentlemen's sons who had proved their seamanship, and with seamen whose hard-won commissions were now (as they had not been with the old 'tarpaulin' officers of Charles II's reign) a passport to gentility. It was a proud service and the competition to enter it and succeed in it was fierce.

If status changes both among and within professions provide one of our three keys, they also point the way, together with the physical expansion that almost everywhere accompanied them, to the second. The professions of 1680–1730 could provide a unique vehicle of upward mobility not least because of sheer carrying capacity. A rough estimate—and in the nature of our information it can only be extremely rough—would put the number of permanent jobs in the professions by 1730[4] at

[1] Between 1687 and 1713 graduated contributory pension schemes were adopted by the Excise Office, the Salt Office, and the London establishment of the Customs. *Calendar of Treasury Books*, viii. 1173; E. Hughes, *Studies in Administration and Finance*, p. 211; E. E. Hoon, *The Organization of the English Customs Service 1696–1786* (2nd edn. Newton Abbott, 1968), pp. 105–6.

[2] See especially the lists of office-holders printed in successive editions of Edward Chamberlayne's *Angliae Notitia* and John Chamberlayne's *Magnae Britanniae Notitia* from the 1680s to the 38th edn. of 1755, and the compilations of J. C. Sainty and J. M. Collinge, cited above, p. 324 n. 2. See also Brit. Lib. Loan 29/128: Whitelocke Bulstrode to Lord Oxford, 21 Aug. 1714, for a warm tribute to Harley from a senior Excise official.

[3] J. R. Tanner (ed.), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Naval Manuscripts in the Pepysian Library*, i (1903), 205: 29 Mar. 1678.

[4] I have attempted to calculate how many professional jobs were filled by men who were fully qualified—not mere trainees—and who had a reasonable

between 55,000 and 60,000. My guess is that this represented an increase since *c.*1680 of very little short of seventy per cent. An expansion of respectable employment opportunities of this order would have been notable in any circumstances. But when we consider supply in relation to demand; when we take account of the minimal increase of population between the 1650s and the late 1720s—no more than a few per cent in England and Wales; when we bear in mind that the size of the nuclear family in all strata of society was smaller than it had been before 1640—that there were, in other words, fewer sons to be provided for; that the business world had increased its attractions[1] and that there was therefore far less need than before for the landed gentry to seek a monopoly, or even a lion's share, of professional jobs; then it manifestly becomes a factor of prime social importance.

But what made it possible for social classes and groups other than the gentry, including groups far below the ranks of the governing élite, to take up the large surplus thus created between the 1680s and the 1730s (and indeed long after), and to profit to an extent that must otherwise have been impracticable from the development of the professions? To answer this question we need one more key—the master key—to the relationship between this development and social mobility. And it is to be found in the ways in which men trained for the professions in late Stuart and early Georgian England and in the cost of their training.

Many of the most thrusting professional groups of the years 1680–1730 had one thing in common: they demanded an apprenticeship of their recruits, and usually, though not in all cases, a lengthy one. Such was the case with surgeons, apothecaries, attorneys and solicitors, and proctors in the civil law courts;[2] with naval officers and increasingly, as time went by,

prospect of permanency. The estimate includes half-pay officers of the armed forces but excludes officers in the merchant navy, on whom I have been unable to come by even approximate information, officials of the Household and the permanent staff, including craftsmen, of the royal dockyards.

[1] Richard Grassby, 'Social Mobility and Business Enterprise in Seventeenth-century England', in D. Pennington and K. Thomas (eds.), *Puritans and Revolutionaries* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 357, 364–5. See also G. Holmes, 'The Achievement of Stability: the Social Context of Politics from the 1680s to the Age of Walpole', cited above, p. 335 n. 4.

[2] For instance, in Sept. 1711 Darby Stapleton, a victualler's son from Newington Butts, was articled for 7 years to Thomas Newman of Doctor's

with officers in the merchant marine.[1] The same condition applied to a number of the budding professions too: to musicians, to quite a large proportion of the architects, to many of the surveyors. It even came gradually to determine entry to a segment of the teaching profession, notably writing-masters.[2] In general the apprenticeship was formal, as to a trade or a craft. It involved the drawing up of indentures or articles and the payment of a premium by the young man's parent, guardian, or patron. In London the standard period of apprenticeship for intending surgeons was seven years, and for apothecaries eight. Outside London a seven-year training was normal for both.[3] The overwhelming majority of attorneys' and solicitors' clerks in both the capital and the provinces were articled for five years. For the very new professions conditions were doubtless much more flexible, but I have come across examples of a seven-year indentured training with a London musician, with several writing-masters, and a Norfolk surveyor.[4] On the other hand, those who sought a commission in the Royal Navy by learning the ropes either as 'volunteers per order' or as captain's 'servants' (and after 1715 those who followed these routes were

Commons, one of the Proctors-General of the Arches Court of Canterbury; in Dec. 1719 John Pearce, nephew to the London bookseller Awnsham Churchill, was similarly articled to William Chapman, Procurator General of the same court. PRO IR 1/1/12, IR 1/7/71.

[1] Although I have not included them in my counts (see above, p. 337 and n. 4), the merchant navy officers were by the late 17th and early 18th centuries a numerous group (England had the largest merchant marine in the world by the 1720s), and quite often men of substance. Already gentry families such as the Norrises of Speke were beginning to send younger sons into the service. *Journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 128; Macky, *Journeys*, i. 62; T. Heywood (ed.), *The Norris Papers* (Chetham Soc. 1846), pp. xx–xxi. In general see Ralph Davis, *The Rise of the English Shipping Industry* (1962), pp. 117–18.

[2] The music and dancing masters employed in private academies also took apprentices frequently, and so did some of the 'mathematical practitioners', especially those who were trained, as many were, to give instruction in commercial and technical subjects.

[3] Some country apothecaries would take a boy for less and the apprenticeship period of a surgeon might very occasionally be reduced by a year. Apart from the surviving records of guilds and companies, the indispensable source of information on early 18th-century apprenticeships are the Stamp Office registers in the Public Record Office. 19 vols. (IR 1/1–12 and 1/42–9) cover the years 1711–31.

[4] PRO IR 1/1/98; 1/4/4; 1/4/10; 1/4/191; 1/12/1. On the other hand, a London painter took an apprentice for 5 years 5 months in 1718, and a dancing master accepted one for six years in 1715. PRO IR 1/7/1, 1/4/57.

in a majority) were serving not a formal but certainly a *de facto* apprenticeship, and one which became more rigorous and protracted in the light of experience as time went by: Pepy's original three-year minimum length of qualifying service at sea before a 'volunteer' could take his lieutenant's examination was raised by the Admiralty to four years in 1703 and eventually to six in 1730.[1]

Thus it was that in the period covered by this lecture the whole traditional concept of the English professions as 'learned' occupations—vocations for which youths prepared themselves by attendance not just at a grammar school but at a university and/or one of the inns of court—was fundamentally modified. Dr Charles Goodall had recognized the writing on the wall in his own field in 1684, when in the preface to his treatise on *The Royal College of Physicians* he wrote distastefully (in this context of the apothecaries), 'we have to deal with a sort of men not of academical but mechanic education'. I would estimate that no more than a third of the qualified men in professional occupations by 1730 had been trained in the time-honoured way. Even the new bureaucracy recruited only a tiny proportion of graduates and was to a very marked degree in practice an apprentice-based profession: informally so, for the most part, so far as the London civil service was concerned, though with the 'supernumerary' system in the Excise and the system of 'preferable men' adopted in the Customs coming very close to formality.[2] The social repercussions of this re-orientation of professional training were immense. For although apprenticeship, formal or informal, could very reasonably be regarded as the equivalent of the vocational training of the ancient 'learned

[1] Admiralty Order, 1 May 1703, printed in R. D. Merriman (ed.), *Queen Anne's Navy: Documents, 1702–1714*, pp. 319–20; Admiralty Memorial to the King in Council, 30 Jan. 1729–30, printed in D. A. Baugh (ed.), *Naval Administration, 1715–1750* (Navy Records Soc. 120, 1977), pp. 60–1; D. A. Baugh, *British Naval Administration in the Age of Walpole*, pp. 100–1.

[2] The majority of government officials, whatever their social background, learned their business to begin with in subordinate clerkships. For the 'supernumeraries' and 'preferable men', see John Owens, *Plain Papers relating to the Excise Branch of the Inland Revenue Department from 1621 to 1878* (Linlithgow, 1879), pp. 116–19; E. Hughes, *Studies in Administration and Finance*, pp. 161–2; *Rules of the Water-side* (London, 1715), pp. 88–9; E. E. Hoon, op. cit., pp. 144–5, 205–6. There was a certain amount of formal apprenticeship in the Exchequer and associated offices, and likewise in the dockyard service: e.g. in June 1716 the son of Robert Maidstone, gent. of St. Andrews', Holborn, was articled for 5 years to Phillip Tullie, one of the Clerks of the Pipe Office. PRO IR 1/4/197.

professions', and in terms of professional efficiency was often superior to it, it was on the whole *much less expensive* than such a training.

The contrast was especially vivid in the cases of the law and medicine. Reading for the bar by George I's reign could cost a keen young man, availing himself of the best tuition at the Inns and living as well as most of his peers, upwards of £200 a year:[1] which meant that by the time they were called many law students of the 1720s must have drained their families of as much as £1,200 or even £1,400. This represented a big change since the 1620s when a young man could study in comfort and live luxuriously on £80 a year, and even since the early 1670s when Roger North scraped along for five years at the Middle Temple on a total allowance of around £240, though admitting that 'without the [further] aid I had from my brother [Sir Francis], I could not have subsisted and must have fallen'.[2] The expense of an orthodox physician's training at Oxford or Cambridge varied considerably: but it, too, was certainly rising quite steeply between the late seventeenth century and the mid-eighteenth, and two contemporary estimates to which some credence can be given put the poles for the man who went the full course, from matriculation, through the arts degree to the final doctorate in medicine, at between £1,000 in the 1690s and as much as £1,500 in the 1740s. After all, even to go up from Wells for a few days to take his Oxford doctorate in 1691 cost Claver Morris £89. 15*s.* 2*d.*, with fees alone accounting for over £56.[3]

What of the junior branches of these same professions? In 1697 Thomas Brown, physician turned playwright, claimed that a good surgeon's education could be had in London by then for £120—in other words, £17 a year—though it might cost more (presumably if the trainee served his term with one

[1] E. Hughes, 'The Professions in the Eighteenth Century', *Durham University Journal*, xliv (1952), 48. One estimate for a year at the Middle Temple in 1720 was £178. 17*s.* 0*d.*—and that included a mere £5 on books! E. Hughes, *North Country Life in the Eighteenth Century: the North East 1700–1750* (Oxford, 1952), p. 82.

[2] W. R. Prest, *The Inns of Court, 1590–1640*, p. 28; North's Autobiography, in A. Jessopp (ed.), *The Lives of the Norths* (1890), iii. 18.

[3] Thomas Brown, MD, 1697, cited in B. Hamilton, 'The Medical Professions in the Eighteenth Century', *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 2nd ser. iv (1951), 163 n. 1; Munk, *Roll of the Royal College of Physicians*, ii. 64–5; pamphlet of 1749, cited in Sir George Clark, *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, ii (Oxford, 1966), 545–6; *Diary of a West Country Physician*, pp. 147–8.

of the top hospital surgeons).[1] The registers of the Stamp office, dating from 1711 when apprenticeship premiums first became dutiable, suggest that the facts were a good deal less simple than this, but on balance even more favourable to families of limited means. In 1711 and 1712, for instance, not one apprenticeship in ten to a member of the London Company of Barber Surgeons (to which even the crack surgeons continued to belong until 1745) involved a premium of £100 or more.[2] Only surgeons in good practice like George Dottin, John Dobyns, or Peter Lamarque asked as much, and Dobyn's price of £139. 15*s.* was unusually stiff.[3] Lamarque is known to have been a gifted teacher; and yet even in the years from 1720–7 he trained Abraham Chovet, the son of a wine merchant who after 1730 was to become one of the best-known surgical demonstrators in London, for a premium of £105.[4] Of course, some of the crack operators valued themselves more highly than this. William Cheselden is known to have received £200 when he took on his own eighteen-year-old brother in September 1714,[5] and over the next fifteen years or so sums of £150 and £200 are dotted with greater frequency through the voluminous pages of the London registers. In the summer of 1716 a Cheapside druggist, Joseph Webb, paid Robert Gay of Hatton Garden no less than £250 for initiating his son in the 'art',[6] and when Thomas Reynolds of Wellingborough was sent to George Coldham of Covent Garden in July 1730 to add the finishing touches to his training, he was charged £52. 10*s.* 0*d.* for a single year.[7] Yet even by now a sound seven-year surgical grounding could still be had in the capital for around £100 down, though naturally one would pay extra for private courses of lectures or for a

[1] B. Hamilton, loc. cit.

[2] The entries are hard to interpret because more of the masters involved were barber-surgeons than true surgeons, and there is no foolproof way of identifying the occupation of each one with certainty, though most of the former charged only minimal premiums of £5 to £20.

[3] PRO IR 1/1/9. See also IR 1/1/1, 1/1/121 for Dottin (£107) and Lamarque (£100).

[4] Peachey, *Memoirs of William and John Hunter*, p. 31.

[5] Cope, *Cheselden*, pp. 10–11.

[6] PRO IR 1/4/196. In April of the same year Cheselden's own master, James Ferne, senior surgeon of St. Thomas's, took £215 with a pupil, and in 1719 three surgeons, John Bamber, Alexander Small, and Joseph Browne, charged premiums of £200. IR 1/4/153; IR 1/7/10, 1/7/36, 1/7/52.

[7] PRO IR 1/12/68. Cf. [R. Kay, ed.,] *A Lancashire Doctor's Diary, 1737–1750* (1895), p. 12 for the 24 guineas, irrespective of board and lodging and the fees for a private midwifery course, paid by Richard Kay's father to Guy's in 1743 for his son's one-year course in instruction.

hospital training. In the provinces the average cost of apprenticeship for potential surgeons, as opposed to the old-style barber-surgeons, also rose between 1680 and 1730; but even at the end of the period the investment involved, considering the length and rigour of the training, was still very reasonable. Between 1673 and 1684 James Yonge, then consolidating his reputation as one of the outstanding surgeons in the West Country, took a series of apprentices into his flourishing Devonshire practice, and very rarely asked more then £50 of their parents.[1] Premiums in the range between £30 and £60 remained the provincial norm into the early years of the eighteenth century; but by the mid and late 1720s, as the status of the provincial surgeon became more assured and his techniques more advanced, £60 to £90 had become much commoner, and here and there a practitioner of note, like Samuel Pye of Bristol and Jonathan Lippeatt of Newbury, would ask £100, or slightly more.[2]

An apothecary's training was unquestionably cheaper than that of a surgeon in the first half of our period: the going rate for entering the average London apothecary's shop from the 1690s to the later years of Anne was around £50—just over £6 a year[3]—while in the country £30 to £40 was common form, although the price could occasionally be as much as doubled for sons of gentlemen or pseudo-gentlemen.[4] As late as 1716 one of London's most well-to-do and fashionable apothecaries, James St. Amand, asked no more than £70 to take the son of an Isleworth gentleman into his shop.[5] By 1720–30 the loftier status of the doctor-apothecary was at last being more clearly reflected in the higher premiums he required. Even so, while a London training now quite often cost between £80 and £120,

[1] *Yonge's Journal*, pp. 143–90 *passim*. On a solitary occasion, in 1675, he did go as high as £90, but agreed to clothe the apprentice himself.

[2] In Aug. 1723 Pye invited Dr Claver Morris and a Wells surgeon, Mr Lucas, to watch him cut for the stone by the supra-pubic method and he shortly afterwards published *Some Observations on the Several Methods of Lithotomy*. Yet in Jan. 1723 he had asked no more than £100 with an apprentice. Lippeatt took on the son of William Hayward of Appleford, gent., in June 1730 for £105, and even fifteen years earlier it had cost a Suffolk gentleman £107. 10*s*. to place his son with Habakkuk Layman of Diss, Norfolk. *Diary of a West Country Physician*, p. 99 and n. 2; PRO IR 1/48/29; IR 1/12/75; IR 1/4/102.

[3] B. Hamilton, loc, cit., p. 163 n. 1. For typical London examples in 1711–12 see PRO IR 1/1/14, 1/1/24, 1/1/106, 1/1/109.

[4] For the former see, e.g., IR 1/1/98, 1/1/120, 1/42/2, 1/42/6, 1/42/66, 1/42/68; for the latter, 1/42/44, 1/42/72, 1/1/148.

[5] IR 1/4/135.

and on a seller's market in the provinces there was a comparable rise above the old very modest levels, even as late as this it was perfectly feasible to get the first toehold on the professional ladder for £40 or less, and at the end of eight years' training to fit out one's shop and invest in a small medical library, even in London, for another £20 or £30.[1]

An education for the 'practick part' of the law could only rarely be as cheaply acquired as this; and after qualification, if the hope was to proceed beyond mere clerkship, it was desirable to have some capital in reserve. As early as 1683 John Aubrey had observed that many attorneys of his day 'will take a hundred pounds with a clerk'.[2] By Anne's reign, according to his own reputation and the purse of an applicant's father, a top-flight London attorney-at-law might charge as much as £200, even £220,[3] and a Chancery solicitor up to £250 for taking a youth into his office for five years;[4] while just occasionally a really prestigious and well-connected local practiser (such as James Long of Wootton Bassett, attorney of the Queen's Bench, and most probably a member of a wealthy and well-connected Wiltshire family) was able to put his price a trifle above the normal £100 to £105 ceiling which held firm in the provinces right through to 1730.[5] But these were very definitely

[1] 'Fitting out' could of course cost a great deal more, if means allowed it and self-consequence or ambition prompted it—as Dudley Ryder discovered in the case of his apothecary cousin, Watkins. W. Matthew (ed.), *The Diary of Dudley Ryder 1715–1716* (1939), p. 30. A more general contemporary verdict, however, was that 'there is no branch of business in which a man requires less money to set him up . . .; ten or twenty pounds, judiciously applied, will buy gallipots and counters and as many drugs to fill them with as might poison the whole island'. R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman* (1747), p. 64.

[2] John Aubrey, *Collections for the Natural and Topographical History of Wiltshire* (ed. John Britton, 1847), pt. ii, ch. cxi (unpaginated).

[3] e.g. Samuel Mason, attorney of the Queen's Bench, June 1712; Charles Bernard, attorney of the Common Pleas, Mar. 1715; Nathaniel Hickman, attorney of the King's Bench, May 1716; Thomas Dugdale of Tokenhouse Yard, Feb. 1730; James Cock of Dowgate Hill, Apr. 1730. PRO IR 1/1/105, 1/4/42, 1/4/188, 1/12/4, 1/12/17.

[4] Twice in one month in 1712 leading Chancery solicitors, Thomas Paratt and William Bedford, took sums as high as this, as did John Mills of the Six Clerks Office in Chancery in 1713. IR 1/1/103, 1/1/112, 1/4/14. Paratt took £250 with the son-in-law of a London surgeon, William Timme: an interesting commentary on the means of the surgeon, as well as one of many illustrations of cross-fertilization between the professions, and not least between the newer professions.

[5] In his case, £110 in Feb. 1712 (IR 1/42/62). Sir James Long, 5th bart. of Draycot, nr. Chippenham, was MP for Wootton Bassett, 1715–22. John

the upper limits. As Dr Robson has said, most London articled clerkships by the early decades of the eighteenth century involved an outlay of between £50 and around £160,[1] on average less than the cost of a single year at the inns of court; while in the provinces £60 was not a freakishly low sum even for a gentleman to pay for establishing his son in a lawyer's office in the last years of Queen Anne. In the north it is striking to find so outstandingly successful a local figure as Isaac Greene of Prescot and Liverpool asking only £80 of a county squire's son in 1712,[2] and even in the late 1720s, north of Trent, in Wales and in the south-west beyond Wiltshire, the £60–£90 premium remained the convention for a five-year training.

The point at the heart of all these figures is I hope obvious enough, though it has rarely been grasped. They mean that the vast majority of young men between 1710 and 1730 who were trained for the junior, but now socially acceptable branches of these two 'great professions' did so for an investment of from £5 to £15 a year in the case of medicine and of from £8 to just over £20 a year in the case of the law. We are thinking, in fact, of sums that were within the horizons of families of many different social backgrounds above the massed ranks of the wage-labourers. Not even the clergy (although the Church remained easily the most accessible of the traditional professions for families of modest means) could hope—except in the most exceptional circumstances—to scrape a training on less than £30 a year by the early eighteenth century. It cost a fairly poor Lancashire parson £278 to keep his son at Oxford from his matriculation in 1687 until 1695, shortly before he was ordained deacon.[3]

Cox of Great Coggeshall, Essex—an *esquire*, and therefore a very rare bird among provincial attorneys—asked £107. 10*s*. in July 1715 for only four years of articled clerkship, the same terms as those required by John Read, a Plymouth lawyer, in June 1712. The most expensive country attorney I have come across in the two decades before 1730 was another Wiltshire practiser, Anthony Martyn of Chippenham. He received £120 when he took Richard Wastfield, a local gentleman's son, into his office in June 1715. For the above cases see IR 1/4/49; 1/42/129; 1/4/44.

[1] Robert Robson, *The Attorney in Eighteenth-Century England*, pp. 56–7.

[2] IR 1/42/64. Across the Pennines William Buck of Rotherham, a member of a very solid and reputable family of south Yorkshire attorneys and solicitors which handled plenty of London as well as local business, was content to take only £65 from the father of James Burnett of Lofthouse in Dec. 1711, IR 1/1/130.

[3] R. Trappes-Lomax, *The Diary and Letter Book of Thomas Brockbank, 1671–1709* (Chetham Society, 89, 1930), p. vii. The yearly amounts varied

I shall not labour the implications of all this for the maintenance, from the Restoration through to the very eve of industrialization, of an 'open' yet an integrated social order. But I have analysed one sample of 50 persons who were articled to attorneys or solicitors in London and the provinces between April 1711 and October 1712; and of the 45 whose background is firmly documented, fractionally over half had fathers who were styled either esquires or gentlemen, three of the five esquires being of county families and including a Wiltshire Ernle.[1] Of the rest, eight were widows' sons, two had a clerical and three a medical background,[2] while the other identifiable parents were a goldsmith, a yeoman, a mariner, two London mercers, a bookseller, an innkeeper, a London joiner who put up £45. 7*s*. 6*d*., and a Norwich baker who found an attorney willing to take his boy for £40. How many of the 'gents' were themselves lawyers it is impossible to say; but since the amount of professional in-breeding going on in the law by this time was already considerable there must have been some. Otherwise the only really untypical feature of the sample may be the rather low proportion of clergymen's sons in it: for it has been established that ten per cent of all the 610 children of the cloth apprenticed between 1710 and 1720 were, in fact, articled to lawyers.[3] The Augustan attorney was not in general a man of lowly origin; it is the variety of his social background, not its humbleness, which is striking. Quite often he was only one step away from the tradesman's counter or the craftsman's workshop; but the trades tended on the whole to be substantial ones, like

from £40 in the first year to £19 in 1690–1 and averaged just over £33 a year for nearly 8 years. For a commoner with *any* sort of appearance to keep up £30 a year was cutting it extremely fine at Oxford or Cambridge back in the 1620s. J. T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (1969), p. 76.

[1] The Ernles were one of the leading families in Wiltshire, and it is clear that by the early 18th century a very small but significant element among trainees for the 'lesser degrees' of the law was now being drawn from the élite of the squirearchy. For example, John Borlase of Pendeen, Cornwall, MP for St. Ives 1710–15, articled a son to a St. Austell attorney in 1715; and in 1716 one of the knights of the shire for Gloucestershire, Thomas Stephens of Upper Lypiatt (MP 1713–20) paid a £200 premium to have his son, George, trained in London by a successful King's Bench attorney: IR 1/4/33, 1/4/188.

[2] The sons of a surgeon, an apothecary, and a druggist, respectively.

[3] Robson, op. cit., p. 55 n., citing P. A. Bezodis, unpublished Fellowship dissertation (Trinity Coll. Cambridge), 'The English Parish Clergy, 1600–1800', p. 483.

mercers and victuallers, and the crafts superior ones like watchmakers.[1] Similarly, there was a steady trickle of recruits from the respectable yeomanry into lawyers' offices throughout the years 1711–30,[2] but virtually nothing from landed society below that level. Nevertheless, there was no lack of comets in the sky to inspire them all: the Bensons of York and Bramham—the father, according to Reresby, 'one of no birth, and that had raised himself from being clerk to a country attorney', the son, a peer of the realm by 1711; or Isaac Greene, son of a bankrupt merchant, who bought his first south Lancashire manor (and by no means his last) at the age of 34; or Thomas Brereton, whose father was an alehouse keeper, but who used an articled clerkship in Chester as the first rung on a ladder that led to marriage to a brigadier's daughter, an estate at Shotwood Park, and 26 years as MP for Liverpool.[3]

For the junior branches of the medical profession the starters contained fewer pedigree specimens than those bound for lawyers' offices and more mongrels of dubious ancestry. I have taken at random intervals from the Stamp Office records of 1711–12 and 1730 a sample of 66 men of ascertainable background who entered the profession as trainees through apprenticeship either to apothecaries or to surgeons. In one respect it is an untypical sample; only a tiny three per cent of the entrants in it came from families with an existing connection with medicine, and there is plenty of other evidence to suggest that internal recruitment was at a higher level than this.[4] Otherwise the message is clear and convincing enough. No parent was higher in rank than 'gentleman'; but it was this elastic category which supplied the largest proportion of recruits, 27 per cent, with a slight bias in favour of surgery.[5] It is very evident that the other profession

[1] A further small group of entrants I have looked at for 1730 contains no one with a father lower down the social scale than a saddler from Chippenham.

[2] Some of them picked up bargains: e.g. John Marsh of Hampstead, yeoman, placed his son in April 1713 with Henry Courthorpe of London, an attorney of the Court of Common Pleas, for a £50 premium. Moreover, the articles were for the unusually long period of 7 years: IR 1/4/50.

[3] A. Browning (ed.), *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (Glasgow, 1936), p. 90; Stewart-Brown, Isaac Greene, p. 6; *VCH Lancs* iii, 110; Hist. MSS Comm., *Egmont Diary*, i. 87; [R.] Sedgwick [(ed.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1715–1754* (1970)], i. 484–5.

[4] e.g., a second sample, taken from a more limited period—the years 1715, 1716 and 1719—shows 6 apprentices with a medical family background (the fathers being a druggist, 2 surgeons, and 3 apothecaries) out of 42 entrants.

[5] Ten out of 42 in the second sample, but this group contained at least one esquire and possibly two.

which benefited most from the rising status of the apothecaries and surgeons was the Church. There are seven clergymen's sons among the 66 apprentices, the majority carrying premiums of between £50 and £61. 10*s*., though two were accommodated for as little as £25 and £30. The gentleman's town or country house and the parsonage apart, the farm was the commonest source of supply. A fifth of the whole group, in fact, came from vicarages or farms,[1] the father of one country lad being described as a plain 'husbandman'. Otherwise their backgrounds were astonishingly diverse. Their parents ranged on the one hand from Norwich and Whitehaven merchants, two master mariners, a Ripon mercer and a Norwich brewer, through a group of superior craftsmen (a London tinplate worker, a clockmaker, and a herald-painter from Exeter) to textile workers, a small innkeeper, three bakers (one a man of means), two blacksmiths, a carpenter, a gardener, and a cook.[2]

It was at this very time, too, that the composition of the English medical profession was being reshaped at a higher level still, that of the physicians. From 1700 to 1740 Oxford and Cambridge suffered a dramatic loss of ground at the hands, first, of a number of continental universities, whose medical faculties were enjoying a golden period at this time, above all Boerhaave's Leyden, and then as a result of the establishment between 1720 and 1726 of what was soon to become the great Edinburgh medical school. Leyden, Rheims, Utrecht, and Edinburgh attracted many dissenters' sons debarred from Oxford and Cambridge;[3] but also, because they offered a much more

[1] Much the same is the case with the recruits of 1715–16 and 1719 sampled (8 out of the 42)—though the proportion of 6 clerical to 2 yeomen parents was more heavily weighted in favour of the cloth.

[2] It is interesting that in neither of the two samples examined, 108 cases in all, was there a single explicit instance of a lawyer's son going into medicine, despite the traffic the other way. Clergy and medical men apart, one writing-master is the only professional parent in the 1715–16 sample In the second sample, as in the first, trade, manufacture, and the crafts were well represented—by a Virginia merchant, 2 goldsmiths, a prosperous coachmaker, a small clothier, a linen draper, and a brazier. The lower end of the spectrum was made up of a butcher (paying £28), 2 cordwainers (one of whom paid only £10. 15*s*. to a surgeon), and a barber.

[3] e.g. John Oldfield and Robert Nesbitt, who graduated at Leyden in 1718 and 1721 respectively, were both the sons of Nonconformist ministers and their later success as London physicians and election to fellowships of the Royal College represent notable feats of social mobility. Among the early English-born graduates of the Edinburgh school were the Lancashire dissenter, Samuel Kay—the uncle of Richard Kay of Baldingstone (see

intensive, as well as a far better training (it has been recently shown that a hard-working young man with a classical grounding but without previous medical training often got a doctor's degree at Leyden and Rheims in 18 months or less) hundreds went to these universities, including many Anglicans, who could not have afforded the lengthy Oxbridge route to a practice in 'physic'.[1] The fact that 746 English-speaking students of medicine, 352 of them English nationals, trained at Leyden under Boerhaave from 1701 to 1738 gives some idea of the scale as well as the social character of the infusion that resulted.[2]

Although I have chosen to illustrate my argument about the professions and social mobility mainly from two of the old professions, perhaps I might reinforce it, in conclusion, by a briefer reference to two of the newer ones, the army and navy. At first sight they appear to present a complete contrast: the former the only one of the newer professions in which recruitment and training by apprenticeship played scarcely any part, and generally considered by historians of the eighteenth century a stronghold of social privilege, the latter more flexible in its attitude on both scores than any other contemporary profession. Yet if one digs down into the social amalgam of the two officer corps which took shape between the 1680s and the 1720s, the differences that come to light are less pronounced than one might expect. Not surprisingly the most numerous beneficiaries by far of the army's unexpected expansion between 1685 and 1712 were the younger sons of the country gentry. The purchase system was a built-in guarantee that men of good family, or at least influential connections, would benefit most. But one must not write off as ill-informed prejudice that obsession with the *nouveau* element in the army which characterizes so much Tory and Country Whig opinion during the Spanish Succession War.

above p. 333 n. 1) and a young Quaker from across the Pennines, John Fothergill, who was later to enjoy a London career of exceptional prosperity. E. A. Underwood, *Boerhaave's Men*, pp. 73, 131, 170–1; *Kay's Diary*, pp. 2, 18, and *passim*; Anon [MacMichael], *Leading British Physicians* [1830], pp. 183–4, 192.

[1] See the graphs and tables in Underwood, op. cit., pp. 37–9, 75.

[2] Ibid., p. 24. Leyden-trained physicians who returned to practise or teach medicine in early 18th-century England spanned a wide social range from the sons of well-to-do country squires, such as Dr Cromwell Mortimer and Dr Nathan Alcock, to the Devonshire butcher's son, John Huxham. There is much valuable biographical information in R. W. Innes Smith, *English-Speaking Students of Medicine at the University of Leyden* (Edinburgh, 1932).

It was not coincidence that in his first devastating issue of *The Examiner*, in the winter of 1710, Swift used not only the new, overweening 'monied interest' but also the army officers, the 'generals and colonels', as his classic examples of unhealthy social mobility: 'a species of men quite different from any that were ever known before the Revolution', whose coaches now choked the streets of London in the long winter hiatuses between campaigns.[1] Almost twenty years of warfare created avenues of opportunity which were rarely glimpsed in the stabler conditions of a small peacetime army. In wartime the initial demands of the purchase system were not excessive, so far as the ordinary foot regiments were concerned—especially when colonels were frequently having to raise new regiments hastily—and (as one MP reminded the House of Commons in 1709), 'promotions may be made every day in the old regiments', as junior officers stepped up without the usual payment into dead men's shoes.[2]

Such circumstances changed the social structure of the army in a way that some even thought reminiscent of the bad old days of the New Model. What was often overlooked was that the wars proved a particular boon to many poorer gentry families, who would have been ill equipped to compete before 1685 and were to be disadvantaged again not many years after 1720.[3] But at the same time the new officer corps absorbed not only the sprigs of the aristocracy, on the one hand, but parsons' sons and a surprising number of officers of bourgeois stock as well. It was a Staffordshire clergyman named Wood who, perhaps with the help of a relative, got his son Cornelius into Queen Catherine's Troop of Life Guards as a private in the 1680s: and it would certainly have cost him much less than the £100 price of a 'gentleman trooper's' place in the mid eighteenth century. The Irish and Flanders campaigns of 1689–95

[1] *The Examiner*, No. 13, 2 Nov. 1710. Cf. the comments of two Country Whigs. James Lowther and Edward Wortley Montagu, on a similar theme in Cumbria RO Carlisle, Lonsdale MSS: James Lowther to William Gilpin, 12 Feb. 1708; *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, vi. 889, 4 Feb. 1709[–10].

[2] E. W. Montagu's speech, loc. cit.

[3] The Wightmans of Kent are a good case in point: hard hit by the land tax, and with at least 3 boys to provide for on a very straitened income. Their son Joseph in 18 years' service became a major-general, active in mopping up the Highlands after the Fifteen. Charles Dalton, *George the First's Army, 1714–1727*, i (1910), 48–9. More remarkably, if socially less acceptably, Charles Wills, the general who thwarted the Scots at Preston in 1715, was one of six sons of a debt-ridden Cornish yeoman. Ibid. 59–70.

gave Wood his chance and by 1704 he was a major-general.[1] By the reign of George I the most traditionally *un*military families could reflect with pride how

> in the late wars between England and France . . . was our army full of excellent officers who went from the shop, and behind the counter, into the camp, and who distinguished themselves by their merits and gallant behaviour! as colonel Pierce, [Generals] Wood, Richards, and several others that may be named.[2]

The navy's very different history before 1689, the far more testing technical demands it made on its officers (one excepts the artillery and engineer officers of the army from the comparison), and above all its less uniform methods of recruitment made it inevitable that of the two professions it would display the greater variety of social origins. Eager as it was to attract the scions of good families, the Admiralty was taught by the harsh experiences of the Nine Years' War the folly, in a profession where experience and seamanship counted for so much, of developing a system of admission and promotion that seemed to offer 'a very great discouragement [as their Lordships put it in 1702] to such persons as have . . . served many years as mates and midshipmen, and in every respect qualified themselves to perform the duty of lieutenant'.[3] As a result, during the Spanish Succession War the 695 men newly commissioned as lieutenants included no fewer than 303 who had previously seen service in the merchant fleet and then transferred to the navy, usually as petty officers in the first place;[4] the rest being those drawn from the two streams of direct 'apprentice' entrants, the 'King's Letter Boys' and 'servants'. But one major difference between the situation and prospects of all these entrants and the rough 'old tarpaulin' officers of the 1670s was that by the early 1700s almost all shared a common aspiration to a secure social status, and increasingly to the manners and life-style of gentlemen. The other decisive difference was the facility with which promotion came in the wartime navy to the man of true merit—

[1] C. Dalton, *English Army Lists and Commission Registers, 1661–1714* (1892–1904), v. pt. ii, p. 3.

[2] Daniel Defoe, *The Complete English Tradesman* (1745 edn., but written 1726), i. 247. General Sabine's family had been in trade in Canterbury. Three of Marlborough's favourites, Maccartney, Cadogan, and Whetham, came of either mercantile or lawyer stock.

[3] Commissioners of the Admiralty to the Navy Board, 6 Jan. 1702, printed in Merriman, *Queen Anne's Navy: Documents 1702–1714*, p. 319.

[4] D. A. Baugh, *British Naval Administration in the Age of Walpole*, pp. 97, 98 (table 5).

a condition which did not by any means disappear even in the predominantly peaceful decades from 1719 to 1739, though the pace was obviously slower by then.

Two cases of spectacular social mobility via the late Stuart navy are often quoted: those of Cloudesley Shovell, who became a rear-admiral at 31 after being a cabin-boy at 14, and David Mitchell, whose road to a flag began in the merchant marine in Charles II's reign as ship's boy and later mate. But they were neither freakish exceptions nor stereotypes. The tally of those appointed admirals, to go no lower, between 1689 and 1713 includes a long list of men who were able by seamanship and leadership to transform their social prospects out of all recognition. John Baker, the stepson of a Deal carpenter, learned his skills, as Mitchell did, on a merchantman. Admiral Hopson, knighted in 1702, may not (as was once thought) have started his working life as a tailor's apprentice; but he certainly rose from the lower deck, as did Sir George Walton.[1] Almost total obscurity shrouds the parentage of Sir John Norris, who vaulted from lieutenant's to full admiral's rank between 1689 and 1709,[2] and of Admirals Thomas Swanton and Sir George Saunders, except that they are known to have been Londoners. In such company Sir Charles Wager, despite his unpretentious upbringing in Cornwall, did have a point when he explained to Walpole many years later that he was 'not altogether an upstart'.[3] Even senior officers of gentry stock, like two of Anne's most distinguished admirals, Jennings and Byng, sometimes reveal on closer examination struggling or impoverished backgrounds.[4] Without doubt there were still some extremely

[1] The bulk of the biographical information in this paragraph is drawn from J. Campbell, *The Lives of the Admirals and other eminent British Seamen* (4 vols., 1742–4); J. Charnock, *Biographia Navalis [from 1660]* (London, 1794–8), especially vol. ii; Sedgwick, vols. i and ii, on those officers who held parliamentary seats; and sundry articles in *DNB*.

[2] Norris's very slow promotion during his first 9 years in the Navy (he joined as a cabin-boy in 1680 and was still rated 'able seaman' in the books of the *James Galley* in 1686) suggests few if any social connections of value at that time. Dr Aldridge, who has thrown useful light on his early career, believes he was born and brought up in Ireland but his precise family background remains a matter for speculation. D. D. Aldridge, 'Admiral Sir John Norris 1670 (or 1671)–1749: His birth and early service . . .' *Mariner's Mirror*, 51 (1965), 173–5.

[3] Sedgwick, ii. 503. Cf. W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Life and Administra of Sir Robert Walpole* (1798), iii. 116–17: Wager to Walpole, 12 July 1731, and enclosure, for Wager's own version of his origins and connections.

[4] To say, for instance, that Sir John Jennings was the younger son of a

rough diamonds in high posts in Queen Anne's navy along with some highly polished ones; and none rougher than John Benbow, the son of a Shrewsbury tanner, who in 1702 was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the West Indies fleet. But when Benbow died of his wounds in the Caribbean early in the Spanish Succession War, the days of the quintessential seventeenth-century 'tar' admiral—of the Hopsons, the Berrys,[1] and so forth—were almost over. Most successful officers even of Benbow's generation,[2] and not least those who had worked their way right up the ladder with the minimum of advantages, no longer doubted that captaincy of a first or second rate should give a man ingress into good society; or that a flag, if he so wished, should be his passport into county society.

Nevertheless, the fact that, say, Cloudesley Shovell became a big landowner in Kent and Mitchell a Shropshire squire at the height of their naval careers did not destroy those common interests which, as 'sea officers', they shared with the most junior lieutenant in the fleets under their command. And there is, surely, a general moral here which might be drawn in conclusion. Because of the way the professions recruited and trained their members in the years 1680–1730 they were able, as we have seen, to recruit remarkably widely. Not only for the reasons I have mentioned, but because also of the still relatively moderate expense of training for the Church and for school-teaching; because of the apparent indifference of the new revenue departments to social status when appointing their local officials at least; because even the bar, the highest rampart of social privilege in the professions, could be stormed by money and talent without birth: for all these reasons it was possible for men of the most diverse social backgrounds to enter the professions *and then be welded together*. Within bodies which, despite some internal tensions, tended by their very nature, their mutual concerns and respect, to foster community of interest and at times a very high degree of *esprit de corps*, social prejudice

Shropshire gentleman, is true; what it does not tell us is that he was Philip Jennings's fifteenth child!

[1] Sir John Berry (d. 1691), who rose to vice-admiral's rank from 'poor boatswain's boy' and whose widow later married an apothecary at Mile End, was a particularly unambiguous specimen of the old school. Sir G. Jackson and G. F. Duckett, *Naval Commissioners . . . 1660–1760* (Lewes, 1889), p. 62, quoting G. W. Marshall, *Le Neve's Pedigrees of Knights* [1660–1714], Harleian Soc., 1873.

[2] John Benbow was only just 36 when the war with France broke out in 1689: he was slightly younger, in fact, than Shovell and Mitchell.

would be defeated sooner or later by the pressure towards fusion. Professional status itself thus became a bond that helped more closely to integrate many units of local society as decade succeeded decade after 1680, and as English society in general left behind its seventeenth-century traumas and moved towards the relative calm of 1730.[1] In short, that same transformation of the professions which was so influential an agent of social change became, almost by the same token, a powerful tranquillizing force as well. When, therefore, Lord Chesterfield wrote to a friend in George II's reign, 'I entirely agree with you in your resolution of breeding up all your sons to some profession or other',[2] he was not simply advocating a well-trodden route to individual security or to social advancement; he was also (whether he recognized it or not) endorsing a recipe, tried and tested by then over many years, for maintaining social stability in pre-industrial England.

[1] For a fuller discussion see my essay 'The Achievement of Stability', referred to above, p. 335 n. 4.

[2] Written in 1755. Quoted from the correspondence of the 4th earl of Chesterfield by E. Hughes, 'The Professions in the Eighteenth Century', loc. cit., p. 47.