and viewed illness as an occasion "for scrutiny of the soul" (203-4). This German example confirms Jewson's insights, for practitioners could interact with these groups only in so far as their therapeutics conformed to either enlightened or pietistic beliefs.

Diaries, advice books, and the periodical press provide a varied and rich introduction into the meaning of illness in the eighteenth century. These sources also can prove elusive. Joan Lane's essay on diaries and correspondence of eighteenth century patients provides a rich, if somewhat unfocused, picture of the eclectic response to illness. Her conclusion that "patients' own ideas of why they were ill or well seem to have been curiously unrelated to their education, class, or sex" (241), appears to be contracted by her assertion that "the patient's attitude to the medical practitioner depended almost wholly upon his or her own social standing as the recipient of attention" (245). Ginnie Smith's admittedly preliminary review of self-help and advice books does not resolve the key issue of readership and influence. Implicit is the dilemma of to what extent advice books reflected actual behavior as opposed to the desire of their authors to offer alternative belief systems. The most successful of these three essays, Roy Porter's, relies on a single source, the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Drawing on the correspondence and articles from this journal Porter provides confirmation for Jewson's model of Georgian medical relations. "Exactly as Jewson's argument would predict," writes Porter, "the *Gentleman's Magazine* encouraged the public to judge practitioners for themselves individually, on their own merits, rather than in terms of corporate affiliation. The public would pick and choose as it pleased" (304).

Final testimony for Jewson's thesis comes not from early modern England, but from the contemporary Middle East. Ghada Karmi finds that the surprising resilience of Arab folk medicine is due to the "sharing of management between the practitioner and the patient. The practitioner is part of the community" no better no worse" (337). This ancient tradition is only now being replaced by the doctor-patient relationship that earlier transformed Western medicine. "Ironically enough," Karmi concludes, this transformation "has come about just at the time when Western medical thinkers have begun to analyse and criticise the phenomenon of the passive patient created by scientific and social changes in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" (338).

In his introduction, Roy Porter insists that this volume has "resisted the temptation of conjuring up a nostalgic, Rousseauian myth of a medical world we have lost," where "the medical profession hadn't medicalized life or planted anxiety and iatrogenic disorders" (19). Yet, in choosing to end with Karmi's essay, it is difficult for a reader not to feel that something valuable was lost when patients and practitioners ceased to be partners in combatting illness.

Howard I. Kushner
San Diego State University

* * *

Wilfrid Prest, ed. — *The Professions in Early Modern England*. Beckenham, Kent: Croom Helm, 1987. Pp. 232.

It has long been assumed by historians that the professions, as we understand them, are a product of the modern, post-industrial world. The 1933 study, *The Professions*, by Alexander Carr-Saunders and P.A. Wilson, established an interpretative framework from which historians have scarcely deviated down to the present day. According to this view, the professions prior to the industrial revolution were "genteel parasites" (3) which were dependant upon their connections with the landed elites and lacked "any sense of corporate solidarity or the exercise of socially useful expertise" (3-4). Only the 1982 study by Geoffrey Holmes, *Augustan England: professions, state and society, 1670-1730*, made a case for the existence in pre-industrial England of a vigorous and influential professional group. The conclusion of Holmes' book was radical and extremely important for he challenged the orthodox view that only an industrialised and urbanised society could sustain

a sophisticated professional element. And not even Geoffrey Holmes abandoned completely the traditional paradigms for it could be argued that he accepted the discontinuity between the recognisably modern professions and their pre-modern precursors but simply moved the dividing line a hundred years back beyond the industrial revolution.

It is the purpose of this valuable book of essays to attack the "myth that the industrial revolution constituted the single crucial turning point in the history of the professions in England" (7-8). As the editor, Wilfrid Prest, well-known for his work on lawyers in early modern England, points out in his clear-minded summary of the problems addressed by the contributors to the volume and of the conclusions they reach, the professions in England between the fourteenth and the eighteenth centuries were much more important that they have previously seemed. Once one recognises this fact, Prest points out, "the qualitative differences distinguishing professions before and after 1750 or 1800 seem far less clear-cut and straightforward than has hitherto been assumed" (8).

There are six essays in the volume, the first three of which focus on the best known professions in early modern society, the church, the law and the medical profession. The other three essays deal with school teachers, estate stewards and the army. Inevitably there is an unevenness to the work and the essayists have not always addressed the problems as clearly as the editor suggested in his introduction that they would. Nonetheless it is a valuable collection that demonstrates the importance of groups which are often ignored and, incidentally, provides invaluable bibliographic and source notes.

Rosemary O'Day's contribution describes the way in which the medieval clerical estate was transformed into the early modern clerical profession. While the democratic and levelling tendencies of Protestantism might have been expected to eliminate altogether the need for clergy (33) the needs of Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts for a hierarchical church, subject ultimately to monarchical control, ensured the development of a clerical profession that was recognisably modern though its autonomy was limited. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the English clergy had become a "graduate profession" (47) with a clearly developed "sense of corporate identity," (48) two of the marks of a modern profession. At the same time, O'Day points out, the clergy were financially impoverished and, lacking "control of its own means of recruitment, training and placement," (50) clergymen did not belong to a profession as we understand the term.

Similar conclusions have been reached by the authors of the other essays in this volume. Wilfrid Prest, for instance, in a neat essay on the professionalisation of the law between 1500 and 1750, describes the simplification of the legal system during this period, the emergence of a clear distinction between barristers and solicitors, the enormous increase in the number of individuals practising law and the acceptance of a distinction between lawyers and laymen. Nonetheless, like all of the other authors in this volume, Prest cautions against accepting too simply a developmental model that sees the professions in the early modern period as developing evenly and inevitably towards their contemporary form. The demographic explosion and the possibly related increase in the volume of litigation that was a feature of the late Elizabethan and Jacobean period caused changes in the practice of law that were halted and even reversed in the half century following the Civil War. Not that Prest is entirely consistent in his resistance of Whiggish and developmental paradigms. The concluding sentence of his essay offers a stirring celebration of the role played by the legal profession in bringing about the brave new world we call the present. "Although the foundations were laid before, it was during the enormous transformations of the economy, government and the social order which marked the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the common lawyers first acquired their remarkable dominance, and thereby helped bring a new world into being"(86).

Margaret Pelling' essay on the medical profession and that by David Cressy on the teachers are both refreshingly critical of the inflexibility that is often inherent in the sociologically oriented usage of the concept "profession". While both scholars point out the changing importance of their professional group in the early modern period, neither is comfortable with the notion that there is such a concept as a "profession" with shared objective characteristics even in our own time. Each is also insistent that both medical practitioners and teachers in the early modern period have much

more in common with their contemporary counterparts than scholars — often non-historically minded sociologists — have assumed. After a brief analysis of comments by and about teachers in pre-industrial England, Cressy cites from a 1980 journal article on the professionalism of contemporary teachers and concludes: '' Teachers today display an insecurity of status, an anxiety about professional position, akin to that of their predecessors in early modern England'' (149).

The articles by D.R. Hainsworth on estate stewards and by Ian Roy on army officers are less informed by theoretical considerations or by the questions raised by Prest in his Introduction than are the others in this volume. They do, however, oblige us to pay attention to two occupational groups that were undoubtedly important and are frequently neglected.

In general, the editor of this volume and the authors of the essays have performed a valuable service to scholars of early modern England by providing us with information of professional groups at least some of which have been fairly obscure and for placing the scholarship on these groups in a broader theoretical and historiographical context.

Michael G. Finlayson
University of Toronto

* * *

James Pritchard — *Louis XV's Navy, 1748-1762. A Study of Organization and Administration.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987. Pp. xiv, 285.

The navy of Bourbon France has long been a neglected and little understood institution. The historiography of naval warfare in the age of sail, in fact, has been dominated by studies written from a British perspective, and French fleets, sailors and maritime organizations have generally only appeared as the unfortunate and usually inferior victims of the Royal Navy's fighting expertise.

Recent work by such scholars as P.W. Bamford and E.H. Jenkins has begun to even the balance, and this new contribution by James Pritchard will provide invaluable organizational and administrative underpinning for the ongoing process of reassessment. Pritchard is concerned neither with the sea campaigns themselves nor with the erratic strategic ideas which guided the navy in peace and war; rather he sets out to analyze how the French navy functioned as an institution and how its administrative structure affected its operational performance. Intensive archival research and a sound grasp of general scholarship on the Bourbon monarchy have enabled him to perform his task admirably, with the result that historians need no longer scratch their heads in puzzlement at the dismal battle performance of the naval arm of an outwardly impressive military state.

French naval policy in the mid-eighteenth century was hamstrung by a confused, almost baroque institutional framework. Political heads came and went with disruptive frequency, the various operational and administrative branches of the service overlapped in function and competed for control of poorly defined responsibilities, and the ramshackle procurement system not only failed to extract the necessary logistical and manpower requirements from the available pool of resources, but did serious damage to sources of supply in the process. An antiquated financial system doomed the navy to crises of liquidity and credit, denying it access to badly needed funds under the strain of war. Finally, French naval institutions themselves interacted with the crumbling administrative organs of Bourbon absolutism in such a manner as to render the pursuit of coherent policy functionally impossible.

Pritchard develops his case through a careful sequential analysis of each of the major components of the French naval organization: the secretaries of state, the central bureaux, the Officers of the Pen and the Sword, sea and land-based manpower, naval arsenals and the vessels they built and maintained, ordnance and stores procurement, and the financial structure within which the entire operation was forced to function. If there is a problem with this manner of treatment it is simply that it postpones consideration of financial practices until the end of the book, despite the fact that the