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Abstract

This study has three principal aims: to research the circumstances of mid-eighteenth-century ships' boys, to look at the role the sea service played for contemporary youths with no family connections to the maritime world, and to deliver an institutional history of the Marine Society in its early years. Though present in significant numbers on board eighteenth-century vessels, ships' boys have rarely been considered by historians. The lack of research can partly be explained by the lack of source material, which is why the records of the London Marine Society, a charity that had made it its task to recruit boys for the sea service, are so valuable. The Marine Society was one of the most prominent charities in the wave of voluntary associations that emerged in the mid-eighteenth century, and this thesis aims to add to the historiography of the charity movement by investigating the Society's origins, how and by whom it was run and financed, and how successful its work was.

To fulfil the first two aims, the backgrounds, motives and fates of the Marine Society's Seven-Years-War recruits were explored, drawing on the Society's registers of recruits and minutes, and the Royal Navy's muster books. The Society's institutional history was traced with the help of its minutes of committee meetings and its subscription lists, through contemporary newspapers and journals, and pamphlets written by the key figures.

Going to sea as a boy during the Seven Years War was extremely dangerous, as the high casualty rate among the Marine-Society boys shows, yet if the youth managed to survive, being a sailor promised him a faster route to the (economic) independence of an adult than most land-based apprenticeships available to the children of the lower strata. The sea service could take on a dual character for such children: it could be a (near-)coercive institution where authorities or relatives sent a destitute or troublesome boy, but at the same time to the impoverished or non-conformist youth himself the sea could appear as the escape from his misery or from a society to which he was unable to conform. The Marine Society itself was not merely a recruitment project, but something that was deeply rooted in the concern about London's troubles with youth unemployment, misbehaviour and crime. The Society's impact on naval manpower during the Seven Years War has hitherto been overestimated; however, its contribution to the preservation of sailors through the effective typhus prevention measures it undertook has never received due recognition.
Engraving by Samuel Wale, picturing Marine-Society Boys, Britannia and Charity
(in Hanway, *Three Letters* [1758], and others)
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Introduction

City of London, 1758: Outside the Royal Exchange a small group of boys has gathered, most of them only fourteen years of age, all neatly dressed in blue peajackets and canvas trousers, which they have just received from an organisation named the Marine Society. Their attendant, Thomas Tyson, tells them to line up in pairs; then they start marching. Tyson leads them through the City's busy centre, for everyone to see what clean and orderly appearance previously perhaps rather ragged or even disorderly boys now have, then he takes them across the Thames via London Bridge. While Tyson might take a critical look at the sky, wondering whether bad weather will slow down their intended four-day march to Portsmouth harbour, the thoughts on the minds of the youths following him would have been incomparably more dramatic. Some might have turned their heads to take a last look at the City; for too many it would indeed turn out to be the last look, as they were about to embark on a new life at sea, as ships' boys on board His Majesty's ships of war.

When thinking of ships' boys in the mid-eighteenth century the first that usually comes into one's mind is Jim Hawkins, the narrator in Robert Louis Stevenson's Treasure Island (1883). Compared to such colourful stories of boys at sea in literature, however, historiography has not much to offer on juvenile eighteenth-century sailors, particular on those coming from humbler backgrounds and not aiming at an officer's career, and that despite the fact that boys made up a significant share of the crew of an

---

1 Throughout the study the terms 'boys', 'youths', 'youngsters', and 'servants' are used interchangeably. A general note on quotations, numbers, and citations: In all quotations the original spelling and italicisation has been kept. Numbers are given in figures in case of high (exact) numbers, percentages, monetary sums, measurements, and wherever it appeared that the sentence gains in clarity when figures are used (e.g. age groups are given in figures, while ages are otherwise spelled out). Footnote references to literature are given in the author-date system; works by the same author published in the same year are distinguished by an a or b. When a later edition has been used, the date is also given. Only Hanway's publications include a short title, since there are so many, and since many of them were published in the same year.
eighteenth-century warship. Partly the lack of studies can be explained by the available source material: eighteenth-century records telling us about boys aboard who were trained to become ordinary sailors are scarce. A rich exception is the records of the Marine Society, a society that made it its task to collect and equip impoverished boys (and initially also *landmen*, as they were then called)\(^2\) for the Royal Navy and later also for the merchant navy, and whose committee minutes and recruit registers are stored at the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich.\(^3\) So far, no study of the Society itself has been written. However, biographies of the Society's founder Jonas Hanway, by John H. Hutchins (1940) and James S. Taylor (1985),\(^4\) have made use of the Society's committee minutes and the numerous pamphlets Hanway wrote in the name of the Marine Society (presumably largely on his own, albeit after discussing the topics with other Marine-Society members). Studies of eighteenth-century voluntary charity organisations in general, notably by Donna Andrew (1989), have brought to light many of the ideas and methods of the men who ran the Marine Society and similar organisations, yet neither Hanway's biographers nor the historians of the philanthropic movement have been much concerned with the objects of the Society's charity, that is the thousands of boys, where they came from, if they went to sea voluntarily and what happened to them at sea. The heart of this study is an attempt to fill this gap, and in a more general way to explore the status and careers of those ships' boys in the eighteenth-century Navy who were, unlike the classical captain's son on board, trained to become ordinary seamen. In a wider sense, the thesis looks at the Marine Society and its teenaged sailors in the context of youth history and youth culture, to show what role the sea service played in the plans of

---

\(^2\) Since the Marine Society used the term *landman*, not *landsman*, the original term has been kept.

\(^3\) See bibliography for available records of the period. Unfortunately, no correspondence is preserved from the Society's early years.

\(^4\) See also N. Merrill Distad's (1973) very readable article; and the biography by John Pugh (1787, 1788), Hanway's secretary; as well as R. Everett Jayne's (1929) popular-history book.
authorities and concerned private individuals for youth education, as well as in the minds of the youths themselves.

However, this study also writes and rewrites the Marine Society's institutional history by tackling aspects that have been left out by Hanway's biographers and the chroniclers of eighteenth-century philanthropy, and by reassessing the Society's manning impact during the Seven Years War, mainly regarding the recruitment of landmen volunteers, which has in terms of sheer numbers hitherto been greatly overestimated, while the Society's contribution to the preservation of sailors has never received its due recognition. Thus this thesis comes as a case study, a dip into history that adds to the study of eighteenth-century naval, philanthropic and youth history, rather than a mere institutional history or a single argument being chased throughout the century. The concession that had to be made to be able to look at various different aspects is the limited time frame from 1756 to the Society's incorporation in 1772. I would have liked to follow the Marine Society over a longer period, yet that would have meant not having the time to research the boys' careers, and in the end feeling the same regret Ruth McClure expressed in her study of the Foundling Hospital, which is – after having traced the Hospital's institutional history throughout the eighteenth century – to begin the conclusion by stating that the question everyone always asks, 'what became of the foundlings?', remains unanswered.5

The first chapter begins with an overview of the Royal Navy's struggle to find enough sailors at the start of the Seven Years War, the ignition for the foundation of the Marine Society, which hoped to attract landmen volunteers and boys to the Royal Navy by providing them with free clothing and, just for the boys, also with bedding. War showed how much eighteenth-century Britain depended on its seamen. Shipping had

been the means of transportation and communication that enabled European powers to spread their influence around the globe, and hence the profession of a sailor took centre stage in the development of the European overseas commercial and political empires. William Petty called the seaman the pillar of the Commonwealth,\(^6\) being relied upon for the running of commerce as well as of warfare. The superiority of a fleet depended not just on the quantity and quality of available ships, often the far greater problem was to find a sufficient number of seamen to fight the war. To fill an army in times of war was comparatively easy, the newcomers only had to be trained in drill and the use of weapons, but to train a sailor took much longer, and some doubted whether a man could ever be turned into a good sailor unless he had been brought up as a seaman since boyhood. Whenever military conflicts broke out in the eighteenth century the Royal Navy struggled to recruit the seamen it needed quickly and in sufficient numbers.

The Navy's manning problem is well covered in the secondary literature, for the Seven Years War foremost by Stephen F. Gradish (1980)\(^7\) and by N.A.M. Rodger (1986, 1988), whose 'anatomy' of the Royal Navy also provides a reference point throughout the thesis; for the decade preceding the Seven Years War by Daniel Baugh (1965); in form of an overview over two centuries by J.S. Bromley (1974/6); and in the context of the eighteenth-century labour market for sailors by Ralph Davis (1962), Markus Rediker (1987), David J. Starkey (1990, b), and Peter Earle (1998).\(^8\) One aspect that despite all these studies would still be worth more research is the overall ratio of pressed men and

---


\(^7\) Gradish's work is hampered by the fact that he died before he could finish and edit his study.

\(^8\) See also Christopher Lloyd (1968, 1970), and for the Navy's impressment J.R. Hutchinson (1913).
volunteers in the Seven-Years-War Navy.\(^9\) Here chapter three will show that those equipped by the Marine Society cannot simply be counted as part of the latter group, and, regarding the boys, chapter four will illustrate how difficult it can be to distinguish between volunteers and recruits forced into the Navy. Chapter one’s first section draws upon the literature on the Navy’s manning problems, adds examples from contemporary journals, pamphlets and Admiralty sources, and then argues that the Navy’s bounty payments were a very inefficient way of trying to attract sailors. Naturally, special attention is paid to the ways in which landmen and boys could voluntarily or involuntarily join the Navy and make up for the missing sailors. In the second section the chapter moves on to describe the London merchants’ interest in solving the manning problem, which led to the foundation of the Marine Society. Conflicting claims as to the origin of the Society’s idea to collect boys were made in later years by the Society and magistrate John Fielding, and, by using contemporary newspaper articles and comparing the accounts of both parties, this section also aims to give the due credit to Fielding’s pioneering work, as well as to prior attempts by legislators to channel pauper children into the maritime world. Regarding the latter, the writings of Hanway and John Fielding give us an idea of the neglected state the laws regulating maritime apprenticeships were in.

Providing the Royal Navy with boys was of higher importance than one would initially think. Within a few years the youths could be turned into men, and thus they not only eased the Navy’s manning problem, but were also much better prepared for the

---

\(^9\) Stephen Gradish (1980), p. 70, reckons only one in four of all recruits who served between 1755 and 1762 were volunteers (however, his estimates have to be cited with caution for the above reason). N.A.M. Rodger (1984), p. 57, criticises Gradish’s calculation for ignoring turned-over sailors, who could be either volunteers or pressed men. Based on a study of individual crews Rodger argues that the share of pressed men had been much lower, and that 5\% to 10\% would have been a more typical ratio for a ship (officers are probably included among volunteers in this estimate; Rodger [1984], p. 57, however, acknowledges that there were some exceptional ships with a much larger share of pressed men – see also higher averages in appendices to Rodger [1984], p. 73, and Rodger [1986, 1988], p. 353).
service, since they had become accustomed to the sea service from a young age. The boys went on board as captains’ or other officers’ servants, but rather than being employed like a personal servant or a servant in some business on land, their actual position is better described as ‘trainee sailors’, though they nevertheless also had to perform personal services for their officers. A servant had to be at least thirteen years old, or eleven if he was the officer’s son. The Navy regulations allowed a captain four servants for every hundred men of the complement; while lieutenants, masters, pursers, surgeons, chaplains, and cooks were allowed one if the complement was at least sixty and otherwise none; boatswains, gunners, and carpenters could take two servants for a complement of a hundred or more, and one servant for a complement of sixty to a hundred; and an admiral, depending on his rank, had ten to sixteen servants due.  

For each of their servants they received the pay of an ordinary seaman, while being only obliged to spend a fifth of this wage on the boy for clothing and other necessities. This was how the Navy hoped to raise its future sailors, that is by giving each individual officer a financial incentive to take care of one or more boys – the servants were, in the words of the Admiralty, the Navy’s ‘nursery’ for seamen. Thus between 5% to 10% of the crew would have been servants. But the actual percentage of boys on board would have been even higher, for we have to expect that there were also boys on board who were mustered as men (either as a preferential treatment of boys from better connected families, or because no servant position was available), as well as the occasional underaged sons of officers not kept on the muster lists. This might to a degree explain the astonishment of the Spanish sailors of the gold galleon *Nuestra Señora de Covadonga*, captured on Anson’s voyage around the world in 1743, who, when coming

---

10 *Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty’s Service at Sea* (1757, 9th ed.), pp. 151-152. The officer-servant model was ended by an Order-in-Council on 16 April 1794, which introduced the ratings of first-, second-, and third-class boys instead, and a monetary compensation for the officers who thus lost their servant-pay bonus (see for example Lewin [1960], pp. 90, 152-154).

11 See for example ADM 2/81, 30/08/1758, pp. 62-63.
on board the *Centurion* as prisoners and seeing her crew for the first time from close-up, cried out with anger that they had been beaten by a handful of boys.\textsuperscript{12}

Chapter one’s third section focuses on youth in mid-eighteenth-century London, and shows that the Marine Society was not merely a naval aid project, but was deeply rooted in the concern about the state of the youth of the lower strata. As a by-product of this section’s analysis, and to provide the background for chapter four’s discussion of the boys’ motives for going to sea, the question how far the youth of the mid-eighteenth century can be compared to modern youth is tackled. Contrary to ideas originating from works by Philippe Ariès (1960) and John R. Gillis (1974) of youth, as we know it today, being non-existent in pre-industrial Europe,\textsuperscript{13} this section will argue that there are plenty of parallels between both generations, which should encourage us to transfer observations and models from the study of modern youth further into the past. Nevertheless, as urbanisation and modernisation loom behind so much of what this section will say about London’s mid-century youth, both shaping and concentrating the age group’s culture, the theories of Ariès, Gillis and others shall not be entirely discarded.

Chapter one finishes with a longer analysis of the charity movement in mid-century London, to show that the Marine Society has to be seen as part of a whole range of organisations advocating social reform, and furthermore to provide the background information for many other sections, in particular chapter two’s analysis of the Marine Society’s members and donors, as well as of the Society’s advertisement campaign.\textsuperscript{14} The charities of mid-eighteenth-century London have been tackled by various authors: in

\textsuperscript{12} Anecdote in Glyn Williams (1999), p. 168.
\textsuperscript{13} See Roger Thompson (1984) for an overview of how other historians followed the theory of youth being a product of the last two centuries.
\textsuperscript{14} For the overlapping definitions of ‘charity’ and ‘philanthropy’ see Cunningham & Innes (1998), p. 2. In this study they are applied interchangeably, though charity being the predominantly used term by the Marine Society, is generally preferred, while the men running a charity are usually referred to as philanthropists.
form of a general overview foremost by Donna Andrew (1989); for the whole of England comprehensively by Michael Roberts (1998), as well as through the earlier works of David Owen (1964), Betsy Rodgers (1949), and B. Kirkman Gray (1905); and in the form of studies of individual charities by Ruth McClure (1981), and R.H. Nichols and F.A. Wray (1935) on the Foundling Hospital; on the Magdalen Hospital by H.F.B. Compstone (1917), and - under the influence of Michel Foucault's writings - by Stanley Nash (1984) and Miles Ogborn (1998); and on the medical voluntary hospitals most recently by Kathleen Wilson (1990). Furthermore, the field has been covered by biographies of leading philanthropists of the time, such as the already mentioned biographers of Jonas Hanway. My aim in this section is to summarise the wealth of studies, and to give a comprehensive picture of the mid-century philanthropist, naturally with a slight emphasis on the Marine Society, and, what I consider central to the movement, the multiple ways in which these philanthropic organisations were created by the city, London.

In chapter two we move from the general history into the detail - details the studies of eighteenth-century philanthropy and Hanway have brushed over: how did a mid-eighteenth-century charity such as the Marine Society operate its daily business, who did the work, who gave only his name and took the fame, and who and how many were really sacrificing their time for the poor, who brought the money in, who were the generous donors, and how did the Marine Society sell itself? Chapter two finishes with the Society's conflict with one particular member, the magistrate John Fielding. His case adds in two ways to aspects that have already been discussed in the first chapter: it illustrates how the new type of associated charity was unable to tolerate more traditional approaches to charity, and also reveals that the unity of charity and policy, celebrated by

Furthermore, Peter Clark (2000) has recently delivered a study of British clubs and societies in general, for the period from 1580 to 1800.
the mid-century philanthropists, had its rifts. John Fielding would certainly deserve a new biographer, being only dealt with by a slightly dated biography by R. Leslie-Melville (1934), and by Patrick Pringle’s (1955 & 1968) popular but nevertheless well-written books on Fielding’s work as a magistrate. To investigate Fielding’s difficult relationship to the Marine Society requires a lot of reading between the lines, as the Marine Society’s documents generally avoid mentioning controversial issues, and Fielding’s own papers were burned in the Gordon riots in 1780. James Taylor has written in general about the antagonism between Fielding and Hanway; in the 1980s George Hewlett Joiner investigated Fielding’s particular relationship to the Marine Society, but unfortunately his unpublished papers have not been available to me, hence this last section of chapter two has to fill this gap and explore why the parties were unable to recruit boys together.

Chapter three looks at the Marine Society from a naval point of view, something that the studies of eighteenth-century philanthropy and philanthropists have naturally neglected. It begins by showing how the recruitment of the ships’ boys was much more the Society’s own business, and occupied the Society far more than the recruitment of landmen. The search for any pre-sea training or education organised by the Marine Society, however, reveals little: apart from brief general moral instructions and a few selected boys receiving musical tuition, nothing was done to prepare the young recruits for their life at sea. The chapter then continues with a discussion of the Society’s recruitment efforts and impact – here the biggest reassessment, or correction, of what has been written in the above-mentioned studies of the eighteenth-century Navy and philanthropy, as well as of what has been reported in contemporary newspapers, has to

16 Thus, John Fielding today suffers a little from the overwhelming shadow of his half-brother, magistrate and novelist Henry Fielding. The only consolation for John Fielding’s reputed vanity would be that he has recently gained some fame in fiction as the hero in historical detective novels by Bruce Alexander (Bruce Cook) and Deryn Lakes.

17 The Society’s food provisions and accommodation for the boys, as well as their transport to Portsmouth, are also described in other studies, for example by Betsy Rodgers (1949).
be undertaken. The Society's sheer numerical impact has so far been greatly overestimated, and furthermore the recruits were by no means all landmen volunteers. However, on another level the Marine Society's manning impact has never received its full recognition, as chapter three's last section argues, and that is regarding the Society's contribution to the preservation of the lives of sailors. With the Marine Society clothing not only its landmen, but also all other recruits dressed insufficiently or in filthy clothes, and with its advocacy of personal cleanliness, the Society can claim a great share of the successful prevention of fever epidemics, which were usually responsible for most deaths of naval sailors in times of war. As the Marine Society was furthermore not discriminatory when giving out its clothing and bedding to boys, equipping even boys who were already serving, and probably even the majority of the servants employed during the war (at least of those that were not aiming at an officer's career), chapter three's most positive result is that the boys studied here have a much more representative character than they appeared to have at the outset.

Chapter four turns the attention to the Society's boys, drawing upon the detailed registers kept by the Marine Society. As dealing with boys was a little more complicated – the interests of parents, former masters and local authorities had to be respected, and it had to be checked by the Society itself if the boys were fit enough, old enough, and could be trusted to stick to their commitment – the registers recorded a much greater wealth of background information than they did for the landmen. The registers have so far been left untouched by historians, though registers of later decades have been used by Floud, Wachter and Gregory (1990) in a fascinating investigation into

---

18 See MSY/H/1-4, and enclosed database on disc.
19 For an overview of all the Society's registers of recruits see Pretsch (2001).
the relation between average heights and the standard of living in Britain, and by Voth and Leunig (1996) to study the possible effects of smallpox on the boys' height. The debate following Voth and Leunig's article has underlined how carefully one has to interpret such registers, especially when giving meaning to blanks, the difficulty here being to assess whether a blank in a column is a sign of the registrar not having the information, not taking care to record it, or a statement that whatever is named in the column heading is not the case, or non-existent. There are additional pitfalls specific to the Marine Society's registers, which should be mentioned here. One of the biggest is the likelihood of boys giving wrong answers (knowingly or not), such as the boy Thomas Brown, who had run away from his parents in 1759, assumed the name John Chapman, and declared himself fatherless at the Marine Society's office. Further weaknesses are possible errors or carelessness of the registrar, in particular the inconsistencies when recording information on parents in an abbreviated form, which are described at length in appendix one. Furthermore, for any conclusions about lower-class boys in general one has to keep in mind that the Marine Society's boys represent by no means a random selection: on the one hand stout and tall boys, for example, would have been more likely to enlist, or to be asked if they would like to, while boys that did not seem to have the

20 Floud, Wachter and Gregory (1990), p. 164, wrongly assumed that the Society only started to record the boys' heights from 1770 onwards, which is why their study did not cover the Society's early years. They have deposited computerised versions of parts of the registers at the Data Archive of the University of Essex (see Floud [1986], SN: 2132 & SN: 2134). However, the information about names, professions and geographical backgrounds are only recorded for samples of recruits. I am indebted to the Data Archive for allowing me to use both databases.


22 Voth and Leunig based their findings that smallpox reduced height on a column in the Society's registers recording a p if the boy had had the smallpox. However, it does not seem appropriate to interpret all blanks as boys that had not had the smallpox, for especially when there are pages full of blanks (the column-headings are pre-printed) it is more likely that the registrar did not record the information at all. This case also serves as an example of the dangers of using the computerised source alone, without inspecting the original documents.

23 MSY/A/1, 08/11/1759; and MSY/H/2, no. 3511.
appropriate stature and health were returned home. On the other hand many of the orphans can be expected as having been among the most deprived in the country.

Chapter four begins with an examination of the typical Marine-Society boy: how old was he, was he the age group the Marine Society and Navy had hoped to attract and considered as being of the right age for a ship’s boy, how was his physique, and did he show similar growth-deficiencies to those observed in Floud, Gregory and Wachter’s study of boys in later periods, and do the Marine Society’s other documents tell us anything about his character? The second section leads the investigation into the social and geographical background of the Society’s boys, looking at their families, their fathers’ professions, and their home counties. One particularly interesting aspect is how many of the boys came from families and communities with no connection to seafaring. Sea service in the eighteenth century is regarded as having been largely self-recruiting, with the sons of seafaring fathers and communities making up the next generation of sailors; however, the analysis of the Society’s boys’ backgrounds will show that, given the opportunity through the Marine Society and increased wartime demand, many boys from non-seafaring communities were willing to go to sea, and that they were even outnumbering those from seafaring families. The final section investigates the motives that drove all these boys to sea. First, a question left uninvestigated for far too long has to be tackled, and that is whether all the Society’s boys went indeed voluntarily to sea, as the Marine Society claimed, or whether some were forced to enlist. The section then moves on to analysing more positive motives, by working out the boys’ relative economic benefits of enlisting, and, in a novel approach to the subject, by attempting to interpret the sea service and the role it played for the Society’s boys from a youth-

24 Hutchins (1940) and Taylor (1985) believed the Society’s assurances that it would not accept any boys sent against their will, while Gradsh (1980), p. 85, Pinchbeck & Hewitt (1969), p 113, and Lewis (1960), p. 90, all expressed doubts, without investigating the question further.
cultural angle. Here, chapter one's description of eighteenth-century youth, and the parallels drawn to modern youth, provide a helpful background. While chapter one has shown that the Marine Society was not merely a private manning enterprise for the Royal Navy, but also an attempt to educate and police a youth that irritated contemporaries, and whose problems appeared to get out of hand in the concentration of poverty in the growing metropolis, chapter four now argues that for the youths themselves the idea of becoming deep-sea sailors could appear as the escape from an environment they perceived as restrictive, inhibited and impoverished. To understand the fascination the public image of the sailor could exert on eighteenth-century youths with no maritime background, and furthermore to interpret the peculiar behaviour of some eighteenth-century sailors who lived up to this stereotype, I wish to show that seafaring had the characteristic that its workforce was made to keep some 'youthful' elements, or at least elements that preindustrial Europe normally connected with youth. Isaac Land's (1999) recently completed doctoral thesis is, to my knowledge, the only work that has so far gone in a similar direction.

Chapter five follows the Marine-Society boys on board their naval vessels. Little has been written in historiography about what it was like to be a servant on board a mid-eighteenth-century warship, particularly about those who were not intended to become officers. Partly this is because the official documents of the time also often neglected them. Even the Marine Society’s surviving records tell us little about how well their recruits performed as sailors during the war. Again one has to regret that none of the Society’s correspondence from the war years is preserved, and we only know the contents of letters when they were mentioned in the minutes. The main sources to follow the boys’ careers are the Navy’s muster and pay books; however, though it has hitherto

been thought that with their help one could easily follow any sailor's naval service, regarding boys it turns out that the muster and pay books also very often neglect them. Hence chapter five has to start with a detailed description of the possibilities and limitations one faces when attempting to follow servant careers with the help of muster and pay books. Next the three sample sets of Marine-Society boys, whose careers were traced, are introduced, and the following three sections attempt to fill the gap in historiography regarding the ships' boys, by exploring in detail what it was like to be a servant in the mid-century Navy, and by following the service years of the sampled Marine-Society boys. Among the main points of interest are to observe the boys' integration on board, to assess the dangers they were exposed to, and to show if and how they could progress to ordinary or able seamen.\textsuperscript{26} Exploring these aspects will also enable us to give a good assessment of the success of the Marine Society's operations. Additionally, further particular facets of the servant's life will be discussed, such as the boys' schooling on board, the need to distinguish the naval servant from a common apprentice, and the question – the one that was asked after every paper I gave in the course of my research – about cases of (sexual) abuse of ships’ boys.

Chapter six, the final chapter, looks at the post-war years until the Society restarted as an incorporated society. The focus is again on the boys, and the Society's attempts to find employment for them after they were discharged from the Navy. In a way the end of the war questioned the long-term success of the Marine Society's operation, for there was the danger that the newly 'nursed' sailors would be thrown back on land and into poverty. The Society realised that, contrary to what it had thought originally, its work did not stop with the coming of peace. And even taking care of the war-returnees was

\textsuperscript{26} According the Navy Regulations able seamen had to have served at least three years at sea (\textit{Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty's Service at Sea [1757, 9th ed.],} pp. 29-30), while ordinary seamen had usually spent at least one year on a ship.
not to mark the Society's end: encouraged by a large bequest\textsuperscript{27} the Society continued over the following decades and centuries to equip, and soon also to train, impoverished boys who wished to make a career in the merchant navy, while sponsoring in times of war an equally large number of boys for the Royal Navy. Despite all the criticism that will be bestowed upon the Society's founders over the following pages, this study also serves to remember these men, who undertook great efforts to improve the fate of the poor in the way they thought most proper. Something similar, by the way, goes for the authors of the historical studies that have accompanied me during my research: often enough, the more I criticise them testifies only the intensity with which I used their works and how fruitful these were for my research.

The study contains three appendices: Appendix I includes an enclosed disk, containing a database (on \textit{MS Excel 2000}) with the transcribed boy registers of the Marine Society, together with the various categories according to which the fathers' professions and the boys' hometowns were grouped for this study. The wealth of information recorded in the database made it impossible to submit it as a printed appendix in a reasonable format. Furthermore, the computerized version holds many advantages: any statistics given in the thesis can easily be verified, and, even more, it is hoped that this database provides a useful tool for other researchers wishing to make their own investigations into the material, such as exploring further from which parishes the London boys hailed, integrating the information on the boys' heights into a larger study of average heights in the eighteenth century, or just searching for individual recruits. It is envisaged that a copy of the database will be deposited at the library of the National Maritime Museum together with the Marine-Society records, so that readers

\textsuperscript{27} As Hanway's biographers Hutchins (1940) and Taylor (1985) have already covered much of the Society's fight for the Hicks bequest, which occupied most of its attention during that time, the chapter touches the affair only briefly.
can make use of it.\footnote{If possible the database will also go online.} The text to Appendix I is intended to act as a reference while working with the database, rather than to be read from beginning to end. Appendix II gives an overview over the traced careers, and Appendix III lists in alphabetical order all the boys whose careers were followed, their service years and stations, and the respective references to the Admiralty sources. Both appendices enable the reader to retrace all statements made about the boys' careers in this study, and at the same time they free the text from numerous footnotes.
CHAPTER ONE:
Navy, City, Youth and Charity: The Origins of the Marine Society

I.1. The Royal Navy's Manning Problem

Arguably the most serious administrative weakness of the eighteenth-century Navy was not to have an effective system of recruitment for times of war. It is very doubtful, though, whether there would have been any way of raising as many trained sailors as were needed for the war period, without compulsory service and without seriously disrupting the economy. The French navy at the time had similar manning problems despite compulsory service, and on top of that found it hard to pay the men raised. The Marine Society began as an attempt by private men to find a solution for the Navy’s manning problem, and it was probably the most successful private manning enterprise ever undertaken. Before identifying who these private men were, what their various motivations were, and whom they had in mind as recruits, a few remarks on the nature of the Navy’s manning problem are required.

The Royal Navy possessed only a small peacetime fleet in the 1750s; cuts in the budget after the War of the Austrian Succession had reduced the Navy’s manpower to 10,000, leaving many naval vessels unused and unmanned. Unlike today, the Navy’s sailors were not permanent employees, and a naval reserve did not exist. The Royal Navy had to compete with the merchant navy for sailors on the labour market. Nevertheless, filling its peacetime numbers was never a great problem for the Navy. The troubles only started when the outbreak of hostilities dramatically increased the demand for sailors. The first difficulty was to actually get hold of seamen, as the very nature of their profession meant that they were spread around the oceans. In 1696, Parliament had initiated a registry for sailors to facilitate the recruitment process, but it was soon abolished as ineffective, being based on voluntary registration. After three further failed
attempts the plan for a registry was taken up again during the Seven Years War, together with the idea that each seaman should only be required to serve a maximum of three years in the Navy. But once more the initiative failed, according to Stephen Gradish because of the resistance of overseas merchants, afraid of losing their sailors, and of country gentlemen, worrying about the costs of the whole enterprise.¹

To satisfy its additional wartime demand for men the Royal Navy had to rely on the attractiveness of temporarily offered bounty payments to volunteers, the lure of prize money, and its infamous press gangs, as well as, if necessary, on those unfortunate persons sent by magistrates under the anti-vagrancy laws. The Navy's impressment was directed at sailors only, and with the manpower requirement rising from 10,000 to over 80,000 during the war, not to mention the need to replace losses due to deaths and desertions, the Navy's recruitment task seemed hopeless, or 'ridiculous', as one reader of the London Magazine called it,² considering that in all there might have been merely between 35,000 to 80,000 sailors outside the Navy, from proper deep-sea merchant sailor to fisherman, who could have been pressed.³ The task was made even more difficult as at the same time the demand for sailors on board privateers rose, and many sailors, fearing for their safety, retreated inland or stayed overseas to avoid the press and the war completely.⁴ On top of that, the press gang was so unpopular, that it occasionally encountered the violent resistance of a whole community, which refused to let its sailors go, or of a whole ship's crew when trying to come aboard a merchantman. In 1760, for example, several hundred people, carrying firearms and other weapons, 'inhumanely

¹ See Gradish (1980), pp. 107-110; and Bromley (1981), pp. 149-150.
³ Estimating the numbers of seamen outside the Navy is difficult, especially because many were only seasonally or temporarily employed. David J. Starkey reckons that in 1754 there were 39,000, and in 1755 44,000 sailors outside the Royal Navy (Starkey [1990,b], pp. 28-29, 40-41); Davis (1972), p. 323, suggests that there were about 70,000 to 80,000 sailors outside the Navy on the eve of the Seven Years War); and Rodger (1986, 1988), p. 149, 34,000 to 80,000.
⁴ See Starkey (1990,b), pp. 28, 30.
treated' the press gang in Greenock, destroyed the King’s boats, and threw the lieutenant and part of his press gang into gaol. The Navy asked local authorities to assist with the recruitment efforts, and offered them rewards, yet despite this the press gang occasionally not only encountered the opposition of the mob but was even hindered by civil magistrates, who were keen on keeping their community content, and frequently also influenced by bribes or physical threats. In the summer of 1762, for example, magistrates in Suffolk committed several officers of the press gang to prison.

The great injustice of impressment was that it placed the entire burden of war service on one group, sailors, and more specifically on those unfortunate enough to cross the press gang’s path. The reasoning of advocates of impressment, such as William Butler’s claim that if necessary government had the right to employ particular members of society, however hard and dangerous the work, and that this reflected the natural inequality of mankind, seemed incompatible with the sailors’ ideas of a Briton’s liberties. A rule of three years of service for every sailor, as proposed during the Seven Years War, would at least have erased the inequality among sailors. Even the Navy disliked impressment, as it filled the ship with unwilling sailors, likely to rebel or desert, but with the tight manning situation the Navy had no other choice.

When in January 1755 the first signs of another war with France appeared, the Navy’s mobilisation went comparatively smoothly. Yet, recruiting sailors was one thing, keeping them alive and on board was another. There was a steady loss of manpower, regardless of whether battles were won or lost: in 1755, the Navy saw its manpower reduced through 4,310 desertions, 1,227 discharges of unfit men, 2,162 deaths caused by

---

5 ADM 2/1056, 28/11/1760, p. 330 (also pp. 337, 341, 356-357, 366). See also ADM 2/1056, 20/11/1759, p. 192 (mob in Stockton freeing pressed sailor), ADM 2/1057, 08/03/1762, pp. 1-2 (rioters destroying the house where Captain Fortescue kept his rendezvous), or the massive opposition William Spavens (1796, 1998), pp. 21-22, recalls when his gang tried to press men during the Seven Years War.

6 ADM 2/1057, 20/07/1762, p. 59. For civilian collaboration see also Bromley (1981), pp. 151-152.

7 See for example the pamphlet by Nauticus (1772).

8 William (Charles) Butler (1777), pp. 9-23.
various diseases, and 74 men killed by the enemy or accident; similarly in 1756, 3,339 men deserted, 1,326 had to be discharged, 2,845 died through sickness, and 155 were killed by the enemy or through accidents. Replacing these losses became difficult: in January 1756, altogether 168 ships were commissioned, which would have required manpower of almost 50,000 men, but only 36,000 thousand had been mustered, and perhaps 6,000 of these were too ill for immediate service. The loss of Minorca in May 1756 was the first visible effect of the lack of seamen. Admiral Byng, who was tried and executed for his actions at Minorca, in vain defended himself by claiming that his ships had been the worst manned of the entire Royal Navy.

The bounties offered to able seamen (£3), ordinary seamen (30s), and even to landmen volunteers (also 30s), which had been paid for most of the time between late 1755 and early 1756, appear to have been an insufficient incentive. They had no impact on the two main factors which – together with the most obvious deterrent of having to go to war – made any experienced sailor reluctant to volunteer for the Royal Navy during wartime, that is the comparatively low pay and the fact that naval service robbed the sailor of his personal freedom; nor did bounty payments lower the temptation for

---

9 Adm/B/161, 10/01/1759; also in Neal (1978), pp. 48-49; and Gradish (1980), p. 33. Even in 1757 the Navy recorded 4,647 deserters, 1,478 discharges, 2,370 deaths through sickness, compared to only 192 killed by the enemy or accident.

10 Gradish (1980), p. 34.

11 Bounty payments were later also offered to released British prisoners of war (who had no legal obligation to rejoin the Navy), and to prisoners of war from neutral nations. As the Navy mistrusted the latter recruits, it preferred to pay their bounty in clothing (see Navy Board direction in ADM 2/223, 20/01/1758, p. 248). However, see also ADM 2/78, 27/05/1757, for a case of German and Swiss prisoners who refused to go on board without their bounty, and who were eventually given clothing without having it deducted from their bounty.

12 ADM 1/5164, 18/12/1755, 27/01/1756, 28/02/1756, 30/03/1756. For bounties offered in later war years see Gradish (1980), p. 72.

13 In peacetime, as particularly more recent studies have concluded, service in the Royal Navy was not less desirable than in the merchant navy. Peter Earle states that in peacetime serving in Royal or merchant navy was for sailors largely a matter of indifference, with the regions the ships were sailing to playing a much more important role (see Earle [1998], pp. 129-131, 185-187). N.A.M. Rodger has furthermore argued that service in the Royal Navy had some advantages over the merchant service, such as a lower workload, since the crews were larger, better food, better medical treatment and insurance for injuries and old age, as well as better legal provisions to fight against mistreatment and better prospects for advancement (see Rodger [1986, 1988], pp. 113-137).
those already serving in the Navy to desert. Since 1653 Royal-Navy wages had remained at 24s per month for able seamen, 19s for ordinary seamen, and 18s for landmen.\(^{14}\) In the merchant navy in comparison, where peacetime wages also remained remarkably steady around 25s, the extra demand for sailors in wartime put seamen in a much better bargaining position, and wages could rise up to 60s or even 70s per month.\(^{15}\) Thus wars provided realistic opportunities for sailors in the merchant navy to double their wages and perhaps even to put some money aside for life after their seafaring days – an opportunity few would have wanted to miss. The special wartime appeal of the Navy on the other hand, the prize money, might have appealed only to younger, less settled and more aggressive men, and even for them service on board private men-of-war, which regularly advertised for seamen and even for inexperienced landmen, appeared perhaps more lucrative.\(^{16}\) Despite the rise of nationalism and the transformation from war as a ‘private retribution’ into a public affair, war was still also a business activity, an opportunity to enrich oneself, for a sailor as much as for a shipowner.\(^{17}\)

The fact that service in the Royal Navy was indefinite was another major disadvantage. Sailors could be prevented for years from seeing and assisting their dependants. Moreover, with the Navy’s practice of turning its crews over from one ship to another at the end of a voyage, not allowing any shore leave, in order to prevent them from deserting, their lives were threatened by diseases – the other main factor continuing

\(^{14}\) The pay is per lunar month, as N.A.M. Rodger has pointed out (Rodger [1986, 1988], p. 125). 6d towards the Greenwich Hospital, and 1s for the Chatham Chest were subtracted from the pay. The Navy’s wages stayed unchanged until the mutinies in 1797 (interestingly, the year 1797 also saw a big jump in inflation and the suspension of the Pound’s gold convertibility through the Bank Restriction Act [37 George III, c. 45]).

\(^{15}\) Davis (1972), pp. 135-137.

\(^{16}\) For privateers advertising also for landmen see for example Public Advertiser, 25/06/1756, 10/07/1756. For privateers in general see David J. Starkey (1990, a). See Rodger (1986, 1988), pp. 128-129, for a comparison of the distribution of prize money in Royal Navy and privateers.

\(^{17}\) Europe’s most recent wars, in Yugoslavia, have shown once again how nationalism and the war as a private business can co-exist.
to deplete the Navy's manpower. The danger of such diseases increased dramatically in wartime, as the men were crowded together with destitute men, who had been driven to sea by poverty or local authorities, and whose rags often carried infection. Employment in the merchant service, on the other hand, lasted only for the time of the voyage.

Much has been written about the harsh discipline that ruled on board naval vessels, which also scared sailors away – one letter-writer to the Gentleman's Magazine in 1759, for example, called the Navy's ships 'floating houses of correction' in which sailors were treated like slaves. More recent studies, notably by N.A.M. Rodger (1986, 1988), have taken away much of the traditional view of the Navy as a wooden hell, or at least emphasised that life on board a naval vessel during the mid-century was not the same as it was at the end of the century. Nevertheless, managing a crew that to a degree consisted of men who did not really want to be there, meant that the enforcement of discipline would always be in danger of escalating, and with the ship often being isolated from society and authorities ashore there was always the possibility that a particularly incompetent or brutal captain would misuse his authority, being – unlike the captain of a merchantman – protected by marines. In view of all these comparative disadvantages of naval service, experienced seamen were reluctant to volunteer for the Navy enticed by its bounties, which is why it is no wonder that the bounties were not renewed in the second half of 1756, and the number of desertions inevitably remained high. Crimps were operating in the harbour towns, luring away the Royal Navy's sailors with promises of high wages in the merchant navy. In July 1758, for example, Captain William McCleverty of the Gibraltar, then anchored at Cork, complained to the Admiralty about his men

---

18 See for example the complaint by an anonymous Sea-Officer (1758) printed in Bromley (1974/6), p. 114.
21 Captain Cummings, featuring in William Spaven's memoirs of the Seven Years War, is such an example (Spavens [1796, 1998], p. 11).
being lured away to privateers and merchantmen by local publicans, house-keepers, and crimps, and that even the soldiers at the fort in Cork did not make any effort to stop the deserters.22

In its desperation for seamen, the Navy also sent its officers on tours around London’s prisons, to see if they could free sailors by paying their debts or by providing legal aid.23 Contrary to Samuel Johnson’s much-quoted comment, that life in the gaol would be better than being on board one of his Majesty’s ships, since in the former one would at least be safe from drowning, prisoners preferred naval service to the gaol. Recruited inmates were predominantly seamen in prison for unpaid debts (naturally, as most other offenders would only be in prison for the short time until their trial) or smugglers, this being a common crime in seafaring communities. If the recruitment officers came at the right time some offenders were able to avoid transportation,24 and, though Stephen Gradish, N.A.M. Rodger and others have discarded the prejudice that the Navy was filled with all sorts of felons,25 one also finds convicted pirates who had been sentenced to death receiving His Majesty’s Pardon on condition of joining the Royal Navy.26

Another option to fight the shortage of seamen in the Royal Navy was to recruit landmen, either as volunteers or by taking men offered by local authorities. There was, however, a traditional hostility in the Navy towards recruiting landmen, from both sailors and officers. For the officers the main concern was that the landmen’s inexperience in handling a ship endangered everybody. Unlike on today’s ships of war, almost all crew

---

22 ADM 1/2210, William McCleverty, 11/07/1758.
23 See for example ADM 2/1056, 04 & 05/01/1760, pp. 207-208. ‘Hey, Jack, what Newgate galley have you boarded in the river as you came along? Have we not thieves enow among us already?’, joked the sailors on board Roderick Random’s ship, when Roderick was brought on board (Smollett [1748, 1999], p. 142).
24 ADM 2/1057, 13/03/1762, p. 8.
26 See for example the cases of Muller and Dring in ADM 2/1056, 21/12/1759, pp. 202-203 & 02/04/1760, p. 244.
members on board eighteenth-century ships had to take part in the sailing of the ship, and especially in emergency and combat situations it was crucial that every man knew his task, to enable the ship to manoeuvre more quickly than the enemy. Being a seaman was widely regarded as an occupation that one was better accustomed to since boyhood. Marine-Society founder Jonas Hanway reckoned that it was ‘beyond all contradiction, that those who are bred to the sea from the earliest part of life, generally become the ablest mariners’, and that by ‘being inured to hardships, they are not only rendered the more active and intrepid, but they can also bear long voyages, winter cruizes, and change of climate’. Life aboard was very different from life ashore, and seamen were usually suspicious as to whether a landman could fit into and cope with the hard life at sea. Landmen not only faced the difficulty of having to learn a sailor’s duty and to endure the hardships, but also of having to find a way into the sailors’ community, to learn the crew’s way of communicating and acting. Sailors were often described as a very distinct group, with an almost separate culture, making it hard for outsiders to enter this community. Many contemporary commentators watched them with curiosity as something exotic, in the way they dressed, spoke, and behaved. John Fielding, one of the key figures in the early days of the Marine Society, recorded in his visitors’ guide to London:

The seamen here are a generation differing from all the world. When one goes into Rotherhithe and Wapping, which places are chiefly inhabited by sailors, but that somewhat of the same language is spoken, a man would be apt to suspect himself in another country. Their manner of living, speaking, acting, dressing, and behaving, are so very peculiar to themselves.

This ‘otherness’ of the sailors will be of importance in the fourth chapter, when investigating the sea service’s attractiveness to young men. Surely there is a certain exaggeration in this sailor stereotype; nevertheless, part of the reason why the system of

27 Hanway, Reasons (1759), p. 92. See also Hanway, Two Letters: Letter IV (1758), p. 21
impressment could work was because sailors were easily identified by their appearance ‘both in Manners and person’; although if not then at least the hands ‘accustomed to handling Ropes’ could expose the mariner. As stated earlier, impressment only targeted sailors, and not landmen. Nicholas Rogers has argued, though, that those who ‘used the sea’ was a very vague definition and could make many men victims of the press gang, who did not consider themselves as sailors. However, if one looks at the opposition the press gang received from communities and local authorities when taking sailors, pressing properly employed and settled landmen would have certainly caused an uproar that the small gang could hardly have cope with. Nevertheless, there were without doubt also plain landmen who were forced into the Navy, not so much by the press gang, but by local authorities, and these were generally men who communities wanted to get rid of. The laws and customary rights that were at the disposal of local authorities, such as civil magistrates or mayors, were remarkably wide; one of Queen Anne’s acts, for example, gave them the right to press all those men, and even boys, considered as petty offenders, rogues, or ‘lewd and disorderly’ servants, sturdy beggars and vagabonds (not felons though) into the Navy, which theoretically meant that any unemployed man or boy could be handed over to the Navy, though the Army (or the marines) might usually have been the first choice. Although Stephen Gradish and N.A.M Rodger write that such recruits were usually rejected by the Navy — mainly on physical grounds, as many magistrates

---

29 See Captain Graham’s defence for pressing a man in ADM 1/3681, 05/01/1779, p. 135; also in Nicholas Rogers (1998), p. 110.
31 Wandering actors of illegal performances jugglers and street entertainers were also considered as vagabonds (see 17 George II, c. 5 [1744]).
32 See 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. xvi (1703) (building on 39 Elizabeth, c. 4 [1597-8]; and 11 & 12 William III, c. 18 [1700]). For the Seven Years War period see public notices for hot press allowing the impressment of any idle and disorderly landman, in London Magazine, March 1756, p. 145 & August 1761, p. 446. In the Admiralty’s correspondence see, for example, letter to regulating captains in ADM 2/718, 18/08/1761; or letter to magistrate James Forster in ADM 2/716, 17/09/1760, pp. 189-190; also Admiralty Board minutes in ADM 3/65, 21/12/1756. The famous Navy surgeon James Lind always mentions ‘impressed landmen’ (as well as ‘idle fellows’ picked up from the streets and prisoners) as the great source of fever infections in the fleet, though there is the possibility that he was just referring to seamen pressed on land (see Lind [1757]).
apparently sent sick and crippled men\textsuperscript{33} – the fact that, as we shall see, the Marine Society decided to provide such recruits with a free set of clothing indicates that nevertheless a number of them must have entered on board.

The recruitment of volunteers among landmen usually took place on a personal level, that is such landmen were drawn to the sea through personal connections with men serving on board the ship. When manning their vessels, captains would often try to persuade some inhabitants of their home parishes to join them.\textsuperscript{34} The difficult manning situation in the 1750s, however, demanded more co-ordinated and large-scale efforts to reach landmen, and to put worries about their inexperience aside, which is why the bounty for young landmen aged between twenty and thirty-five had been introduced in 1755. The bounty payments were, however, not renewed after April 1756, contrary to what Stephen Gradish states, and, despite the acute manning problem, they were only reintroduced in January 1757.\textsuperscript{35} The ‘occupational hazards’ apart, the Navy’s 18s for landmen did not compare badly with shorebased occupations (also taking free food and accommodation into account). On land, a weaver, for example, would earn 15s, and labourers only around 12s, or less.\textsuperscript{36} The problem remaining for the landmen was having to buy suitable clothing and bedding, which were expensive.

Finally, there was the option to solve the Navy’s manning problem by ‘nursing’ boys to become sailors, which the Navy did by allowing its captains and other officers a specific number of servants on board. Remarkably, it appears that there had never been

\textsuperscript{33} Gradish (1980), p. 84; Rodger (1986, 1988), p. 170; and as an example ADM 2/525, 30/03/1759, p. 81. See also Hanway on rejection of magistrate men in Letter from a Member (1757, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed.), pp. 22-23.
\textsuperscript{35} See ADM 1/5164, 04/02/1757 & 01/03/1757; and Gradish (1980), p. 73. The Society’s documents explicitly say that at the time of its foundation no bounty was paid to landmen, which was one reason for its foundation (see for example Hanway and Thornton, Three Letters: Motives [1758], p. 5; also Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III [1758], p. 21; and Hanway, Account of the Marine Society [1759, 6\textsuperscript{th} ed.], p. 45).
\textsuperscript{36} For wages see for example Schwarz (1992), p. 170; or George (1925, 1992) p. 166.
any organised attempt by the Navy itself to raise these boys; it used to be left to the individual officer to find his servant(s). There had also never been a bounty-payment for servants. The boys could be turned into able seamen within a few years, and thus they would not only soon ease the Navy’s manning problem, but probably also make better sailors, since they had been accustomed to the sea service from a very young age. The Marine Society reckoned that in peacetime most servant positions were occupied by the sons of officers and gentlemen aiming at an officer’s career; perhaps this explains the Navy’s inactivity regarding the recruitment of boys. At war, however, the number of servant placements multiplied with the additional captains, officers and seamen employed – in the middle of the Seven Years War the Marine Society estimated that there were at the time a total of 4,500 servant posts, of which only 1,000 were occupied by the sons of gentlemen and other ‘reputable persons’. It is therefore surprising that there was no centrally co-ordinated recruitment of boys by the Navy, particularly when it was also known that officers frequently sailed without being able to fill their servant quota.

I.2. Merchants and the Royal Navy: the Birth of the Marine Society

Britain’s overseas merchants suffered under the Navy's excessive demand for sailors by having to pay higher wages to their crews, or even losing their men to the press gang. No wonder that some of the numerous proposals to solve the manning problem came from merchants, such as the Russia merchant Jonas Hanway. On another level, the merchants were of course also concerned about the Navy's war strength, as the Navy was vital in securing trading areas. British naval power and trade reinforced each other;

37 See Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), p. 10.
38 MSY/A/1, 22/03/1759.
39 According to Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 3rd ed.), p. 10. Even in 1759, it appears that the Marine Society thought that up to one thousand out of 4,500 servant positions were left unoccupied (see MSY/A/1, 22/03/1759).
the Navy conquered and secured spheres of influence for British businesses and
guaranteed the safety of the sea-ways, while in return British trade, benefiting from the
Navigation Acts that gave exclusive rights to British merchants, produced the wealth
necessary to finance the Navy through taxation and public credit. Hence there was
willingness in the merchant community to cooperate with the Navy. Jonas Hanway
warned his colleagues that 'Even our darling trade had better be suspended for a short
time, than lost for ever.' And hence there was also the willingness to support war if
trade gains could be expected and losses be feared. Daniel Baugh once described the City
as the Navy's most reliable partner and the driving force behind eighteenth-century
wars.

Jonas Hanway himself had realised the importance of a powerful Navy to protect
'darling trade' right at the start of his career: as a young merchant in Lisbon in the 1730s
his business suffered from the frequent attacks by Spanish privateers. In vain did Hanway
write a petition to the Secretary of State, the Duke of Newcastle, asking for more
protection - the Navy did not have enough ships to guard the coast. After his time in
Lisbon, Hanway returned to London, where he joined the Russia Company. Dealing
with a distant empire involved some years of travelling, which, apart from giving rise to
Hanway's fame as a travel-book author, convinced him even more of the necessity to
have a large Navy as a safeguard of British trade. For an overseas-trade company like the
Russia Company it was vital to establish a good relationship with the Admiralty, which
the Company certainly did. The Admiralty arranged convoys to and from the Baltic
whenever the Company desired it; and when, for example, Russia merchant John

43 For a history of the Russia Company at the time see David S. Macmillan (1971/3). For the Company's
earlier history see T.S. Willan (1968).
44 See Hanway, *Historical Account of the British Trade* (1753).
Jonas Hanway (ca. 1779), painted by Edward Edwards, The Marine Society (reproduced in Taylor [1985], pp. 112/3)
Thornton requested a warship to be sent to Cadiz, in order to transport money from there to London, the Admiralty did so.45

As long as the Navy tackled its manning problem merely by attracting or impressing experienced sailors, it was passing the manning problem on to the merchant navy. Jonas Hanway and John Thornton warned that 'if all our seamen were employed in war, the source of our riches, as derived from commerce, would be cut off, and the sinews of war itself would be broken.'46 Russia merchant Robert Dingley went as far as writing a pamphlet on the *Pernicious Practice of Impressing Seamen* (1760), yet his business colleagues and Marine-Society founders Hanway and Thornton, though they agreed that impressment ‘stained the purity of the country’s constitution’ and was incompatible with the idea of an English man’s liberty, still acknowledged that during war there was no alternative to impressment, unless someone would introduce a more effective and humane method.47 To man the Navy’s ships sufficiently without harming the merchant navy could have only been done either by taking more care of the preservation of those already serving, or by turning landmen into seamen. Hanway thought about the latter that ‘nothing can be so well calculated as this design to prevent the stagnation of trade, and the destructive effects of war, at one and the same time; especially if such landmen are immediately clothed as Seamen, and so divided among the Messes of Seamen, as to learn their language and duty.’48 In order not to damage any other parts of the national economy by buying out their workforce, John Thornton and Hanway reasoned that these new sailors were best drawn from the unemployed.49 Naturally, there would be the additional bonus of lowering social expenditure for supporting the jobless.

45 ADM 2/705, 18/09/1756, p. 432 (to Dingley); ADM 2/713, 11/09/1759, p. 147 (to Thornton); ADM 2/715, 24/04/1760, p. 103 (Dingley); ADM 2/718, 22/05/1761, p. 67 (Dingley).
49 Hanway and Thornton in *Three Letters: Motives* (1758), p. 3.
On Friday, 25 June 1756, Jonas Hanway organised a meeting at the King’s Arms tavern in Cornhill, London, to discuss the foundation of a Marine Society to provide the Navy with landmen volunteers and to thus ease the shortage of sailors. Twenty-two merchants and ship-owners attended. The Society’s original goal was to raise 2-3,000 men for the Navy, and to attract these landmen, for whom at the time no royal bounty was paid, the Society offered a free set of seaman’s clothing (and initially also bedding). The clothes were entirely financed by the Society, and even when the royal bounty for landmen was reintroduced none of that bounty was used in exchange for the clothing – a fact that has occasionally been confused in the secondary literature. What the Society did after the royal bounty for landmen was reintroduced, though, was to provide the men with only a single set of clothing, whereas before they had also given a change of clothing.

It appears at first sight remarkable that private business men would set out to take such an active part in the Royal Navy’s affairs, and indeed the Marine Society seems to have been criticised by some people for taking up a matter that should be in the hands of the government. However, it was not unusual for the time, as private men and

---

50 MSY/A/1, 25/06/1756.
51 See for example MSY/A/1, 13/01/1757 & 26/05/1757; or Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 1st ed.), pp. 16-17 and in 3rd ed., p. 24; also Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 50.
52 Peter Kemp (1970), p. 130, wrongly states that the men had to hand over their bounty to the Marine Society in exchange. Betsy Rodgers (1949), p. 48, writes that the Society apparently stopped clothing men, and equipped boys only, when the 30s bounty was reintroduced. As we shall see later, the recruitment of men only stopped when the war was drawing to a close and the Society’s funds ran low, although it may well be that at times of low finances the Society became more selective as to who qualified for the clothing gift (in later years the Society equipped the men on board the tenders, where all new sailors were gathered, and only there would the secretary make the selection of those who qualified for the clothing bounty).
Kemp and Rodgers might have been misled by two sources: firstly, a comment by Hanway in his publication Christian Knowledge (1763), p. 4, which indeed gives the impression that the clothing-provision stopped when a bounty was paid to landmen; and secondly, a misunderstanding of Hanway’s biographer John Hutchins: he mentions the Society’s decision, taken in January 1757, to clothe any landman recommended by a Regulating Captain to the value of only 35s, and his passage could be misread as saying that this was a reaction to the reintroduced royal bounty (Hutchins [1940], p. 81).
53 See for example Hanway, Christian Knowledge (1763), (account after p. 56); also MSY/A/1, 07/04/1757 (’Men single clothed since the Royal Bounty of 30s’).
organisations often got involved in military affairs, be it by offering extra bounties to volunteers, as some towns and corporations did, or by fitting out privateers, behind which occasionally a large number of small shareholders stood, all hoping to gain a share of a prize, but also wishing to make a small contribution to the war effort. What was more remarkable about the Marine Society's initial resolution is that it was only about landmen, while boys were not mentioned, despite the fact that Hanway had in a newspaper advertisement a month earlier called for subscriptions for fitting out not only young landmen but also boys.\(^{55}\) The idea of recruiting boys was probably initially declined by the Society's founding meeting because impoverished boys were already being recruited by John Fielding, the Covent Garden magistrate.\(^{56}\) In later years, when the relationship between Fielding and the Marine Society deteriorated, there was to be an argument between the two parties as to who could rightly claim to be the inventor of the scheme of sending impoverished boys to the Navy, with the result that we do not really know when the Society's founders turned their thoughts towards the boys. In the first edition of the Society's regulations, for example, we read already in the second paragraph the following:

The Society has always deemed a contest, with regard to the Founder of their Institution, entirely foreign to the good intended: but for as much as many have been led to false opinions in relation to this subject, justice demands that some mention should be made of facts, which may set the matter in its true light.\(^{57}\)

Arguing about the inventor was to a degree pointless, since the general idea of sending the sons of the parish poor to sea had already been turned into law at the beginning of the century.\(^{58}\) These laws were mainly about apprenticing boys in the merchant navy and

---

\(^{55}\) See *General Evening Post*, 29/05/1756, in Distad (1973), p. 435.

\(^{56}\) *The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society* (1770), p. 5.


\(^{58}\) See 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6 (1703); 4 & 5 Anne, c. 6, 19 (1705).
other waterborne businesses, and not as servants in the Royal Navy, though among the later minor sections of Queen Anne's Act was also the provision that disorderly and vagabond boys could be ordered into the Navy. The end was in both cases the same, which was that juvenile paupers were to be 'bred up' at sea to be readily available as mariners in times of war. Queen Anne's law enabled churchwardens, overseers of the poor, justices of the peace, mayors, aldermen, bailiffs, and other chief officers and magistrates of any city, borough or town, to arrange a maritime apprenticeship in the private sector for boys of at least ten years of age until the age of twenty-one, building upon older laws which allowed them to order compulsory apprenticeships for the children of the parish poor. Peter Earle reckons that perhaps thousands of poor boys entered maritime apprenticeships after the laws were introduced. However, although the laws had even ordered masters of ships to take on one or more parish apprentices, Hanway complained in the 1750s that these provisions were widely neglected, in his view mainly due to the carelessness of the parish officers, and because custom did not allow any compulsion on parish officers and on the masters. John Fielding agreed that no good effect had arisen from the Act, though he blamed it on the law having a too compulsory character; rather than threatening masters with fines to force them to take on parish boys, he thought the Act should provide rewards, and also ensure that the boys were better dressed and taught arithmetic and navigation.

---

59 Such apprentices were even forbidden to volunteer (or be pressed) for the Royal Navy till the age of eighteen (2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. iv [1703]).
60 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. xvi (1703), building on 39 Elizabeth, c. 4 (1597-8); and 11 & 12 William III, c. 18 (1700).
61 See 27 Henry VIII, c. 12 (1530/1); 1 Edward VI, c. 3 (1547); 3 & 4 Edward VI, c. 16 (1549-50); 5 Elizabeth I, c. 4 (1562); 39 Elizabeth I, c. 3 (1597-8); 43 Elizabeth I, c. 2, s. v (1601), 21 James I, c. 28, s. i, par. 33 (1623), 3 Charles I, c. 4, s. 22 (1627), and for a fine to force masters to accept parish apprentices see 8 & 9 William III, c. 30, s. v (1697). See also Thomas (1977).
63 One boy for the first 30-50 tons, one for the next 50, and one more for every subsequent 100 tons (2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. viii [1703] – note: tons not crew members, as wrongly stated by Pinchbeck & Hewitt [1969], p. 154).
64 Hanway, Reasons (1759), pp. 94-96.
65 John Fielding (1769), pp. 7-9.
Whatever the law’s defects, its existence, and the fact that other charitable institutions also sent boys to the merchant navy, as we shall see below, suggest that the dispute between Fielding and the Marine Society for being the originator of their recruitment scheme was primarily a part of the petty jealousies and sneers that were exchanged between the two parties as the two operations got into conflict, a conflict that will be tackled in the final section of the second chapter. What is undeniable is that Fielding had started to recruit boys before the Marine Society was founded. According to his own account, he received a letter from Lord Harry Pawlett, later Duke of Bolton, in January 1756, asking him if he could collect 30 boys, who would be clothed by Pawlett and serve on board his ship, the Barfleur.⁶⁶ Fielding, who, before losing his eyesight, had been at sea himself as a youth, claimed that Pawlett’s letter in January gave him the inspiration to turn the idea into a large-scale operation, and thus to find a solution for the ‘numberless miserable, deserted, ragged, and iniquitous pilfering Boys that at this Time shamefully infested the Streets of London’.⁶⁷ Magistrate Fielding’s objectives were clear: his boys were not only to strengthen the Navy, they were more importantly taken off the street, and thus prevented from being dragged into crime through poverty and bad company.⁶⁸ Fielding realised that the boys had first of all to be clothed properly, and also cured of the ‘various Distempers which are the Constant Consequences of Poverty and Nastyness’,⁶⁹ for which he needed money. His solution was to open a public subscription. What Fielding does not mention in his recollections is that the actual initiative to open the subscription probably came from Fowler Walker, a

---

⁶⁶ John Fielding (1758), pp. 20-21. In other sources the later Duke of Bolton is also spelled Henry/Harry Paulet/Powlett.
⁶⁷ John Fielding (1758), p. 21.
⁶⁸ See Fielding’s report in Public Advertiser, 15/03/1756.
⁶⁹ John Fielding (1758), p. 21.
barrister at law from Lincoln's-Inn who later became a member of the Marine Society, and who had accidentally met the Fielding-boys on their way to the Barfleur.

Fielding's subscription operation started with a public meeting at the Bedford Coffee House in Covent Garden, and Fielding writing to the Admiralty informing them of the project. The Admiralty told him that 150 boys were immediately needed and the sooner he sent them the better — another indication how badly the Navy needed an organised recruitment of servants. The boys were provided with clothing and bedding, also a bible and a prayer book; they were welcomed with a hearty meal, and even presented to Lord Anson at the Admiralty. Fielding and his partners clothed around 400 boys, whereby, as Fielding tells us, 'our Streets were cleared from Swarms of Boys whose Situations made them Thieves from Necessity'. They collected a little over 100 subscriptions, among them £15 from the Lords of the Admiralty, £30 from the Society of Antigallicans, about £240 from members of the nobility collected at coffee houses, and even a standard one guinea-donation from the later Marine-Society members Joseph Hankey, Jonas Hanway, Henry Shiffner and Robert Nettleton. However, in July 1756 Fielding ran short of funds and eventually approached the newly established Marine Society for financial aid to clothe some of his boys. He later claimed that he always saw Hanway's Marine Society as a project that had sprung directly from his pioneering work, as he writes:

About July 1756 Mr Hanway, struck with the great utility of this scheme, to which he had originally subscribed, collected a number of respectable merchants, and other persons of rank, together, and, to

---

70 See Public Advertiser, 29/03/1756; Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), pp. 1-2; also John Pugh (1788), pp. 139-140. Fielding also hardly mentions the contribution of his fellow magistrate Saunders Welch, with whom he had collected the boys, but had later quarrelled.
71 See Public Advertiser, 29/03/1756, 10/04/1756, 27/04/1756, and 03/05/1756.
72 ADM 2/704, 20/04/1756, p. 227; also ADM 1/922, Henry Osborne, 09/05/1756.
73 See Public Advertiser, 10/04/1756, 27-28/04/1756, 16/06/1756, 09-11/07/1756.
74 Also confirmed in The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society (1770), p. 6.
75 John Fielding (1758), p. 22.
76 See also Public Advertiser, 03/05/1756.
77 See John Fielding (1758), pp. 60-64 (Nettleton gave five guineas).
use his own expression, adopted this Plan, under the name and title of the Marine Society, with intent to cloath men and boys for the sea.78

The Marine Society's Historical Account, in contrast, claims that Jonas Hanway had developed his idea for the Marine Society independently of Fielding's project.79 Undoubtedly, Hanway had taken concrete steps to start a scheme of recruiting boys already prior to Fielding's official approach: on 26 April 1756 he had written to the Admiralty, informing the Lords of a plan to form a society of merchants and other gentlemen for fitting out boys from London's workhouses for the Royal Navy.80 Furthermore, according to the Marine Society's *Fair Minute Book*, the provision of clothing and bedding for boys was mentioned already in the Society's introductory letter written to the Admiralty a week after the founding meeting. Hanway himself claimed in his *Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society* to have drawn the inspiration for the Society's foundation from Russia merchant Charles Dingley, who had previously attempted to gather support for a society that would recruit boys for the sea service and had asked Hanway for help.81

When, in July 1756, John Fielding asked the Marine Society for financial assistance, the Society provided what he asked for, but it also, from then on, considered the recruitment of boys as its own business.82 Fielding joined the Society, as he later wrote, to avoid confusion between the two funds, though he also admitted that his funds had been exhausted.83 Thus, both Fielding and Hanway's Marine Society had their share in introducing a scheme, which had never been undertaken before on this large and organised scale, and was evidently so much needed if the Navy's 'nursery' was to

---

80 ADM 2/704, 28/04/1756, p. 274 (to Jonas Hanway).
82 Fielding received £60 from the Society, see MSY/A/1, 29/07/1756, and John Fielding (1758), pp. 22-23; also *Public Advertiser*, 30/07/1756-04/08/1756.
function. Yet, as initially stated, the general idea of sending impoverished (or delinquent) boys and young men to the sea service – merchant and naval – had a long tradition. Not only had respective laws been introduced already under Queen Anne, sending the poor to sea service was a Europe-wide phenomenon, and its roots lay long before the eighteenth century. But also closer to Fielding and the Marine Society the idea was present in other institutions: the governors of the Foundling Hospital, established in 1739, for example, had reckoned that their boys had a ‘Destination to Navigation’. A career at sea was often used as a threat to those of their boys who made troublesome apprentices, urging that if they would not improve they would be sent to sea. Between 1752 and May 1756 the Foundling Hospital had arranged 29 maritime apprenticeships in the merchant navy for their boys. Jonas Hanway had joined the Foundling Hospital as a governor in April 1756. Christ’s Hospital School (Marine-Society founding member Sir John Barnard was one of the Hospital’s presidents), and the Royal Hospital School were two other existing institutions that prepared impoverished boys, and sons of deceased or disabled sailors, for sea service, though in both cases most students probably came from better connected families. There was also the Stepney Society, established in 1674, which provided a small number of apprenticeships in maritime trades for impoverished boys from Stepney – Marine-Society members George Colebrook, Henry Shiffner, and

---

85 An Account of the Hospital (1749), p. xvii.
86 McClure (1981), p. 150. Even nearly a century later Charles Dickens still had the board of the workhouse threaten the orphan Oliver Twist that if he would not be a good apprentice they would send him to sea (Dickens [1838, 1992], p. 24).
88 Hanway mentions Christ’s Hospital briefly in Letter from a Member (1757, 3rd ed.), p. 17. For Christ’s see also Rudolf Kirk (1935); for the Royal Hospital School see Turner (1990) and Newell (1984). The Royal Hospital School taught around 100 boys at the time of the Seven Years War. They were meant to be the sons of disabled and deceased seamen, but the intensive teaching and the expensive navigational instruments and other equipment the boys were provided with, as well as the entry-requirement that they had to be able to read, suggest that most of these boys were not the sons of ordinary seamen. Nevertheless, Newell (1984), p. 66, reckons that the school provided a great opportunity for the sons of humble seamen.
Jonas Hanway had all at one point been annual stewards of the Stepney Society; Hanway also became its treasurer in 1759.\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, some charity schools established during the school boom in the first quarter of the eighteenth century instructed their boys in navigation.\textsuperscript{90} All these institutions had undertaken similar schemes, though on a much smaller scale. To turn the recruitment into a large-scale operation, however, it not only needed the inspiration of Fielding and the members of the Marine Society, but of course also a large supply of boys from whom the ships' boys could be recruited – and this supply was certainly there, as the next section will show.

\textbf{1.3. London's Youth-Troubles and the Sea as the Remedy}

Who were the large numbers of boys that the Marine Society had in mind as their likely ships' boys and future sailors? Answering this question will not only form the background for the discussion of the boys' motives for going to sea in chapter four, but will also make clear that there was another side, a non-naval end, to the Marine Society's activities, and that was to relieve and police boys and young men. As with the landmen, the Marine Society thought that with regard to the economy it was best to recruit only those boys with no occupation or apprenticeship.

But whilst the Society are attentive to the important concerns of war, they also endevor to support the arts of peace, that Agriculture and Manufacturers may not droop or languish for want of proper hands. Therefore they seek for these young recruits among those who are most destitute; whose parents have left them in extreme poverty, or friendless and exposed to those complicated miseries which are most disgraceful to human nature.\textsuperscript{91}

Those who came first into the minds of the Londoners involved in the Marine Society were the numerous young boys and youths they encountered on the streets. Often

\textsuperscript{89} *Public Advertiser*, 25/05/1757, 27/04 1758. In 1759, the Stepney Society rented the Marine Society's offices. For the Stepney Society see Charles McNaught (1911/2).

\textsuperscript{90} Kirkman Gray (1905), p. 110.

\textsuperscript{91} Hanway and Thornton, *Three Letters: Motives* (1758), p. 3
enough, it appeared that there was no parent, no master, no authority, nor any other adult responsible for them – ‘distressed orphans, who wander about like forsaken dogs’. Indeed, a great proportion of the boys the Marine Society was to recruit during the Seven Years War were not only orphans, but also entirely ‘friendless’, as the Society termed it, with no adult at all being responsible for them. Compared to child mortality, parent mortality has received less than its due attention in the historiography of the eighteenth century. Losing one or both parents as a child was by no means an exceptional experience. Other boys were simply abandoned by their parents at an early age; John Fielding wrote of London being full of ‘Shoals of Shop-lifters, Pilferers, and Pickpockets, who, being the deserted Children of Porters, Chairmen, and low Mechanics, were obliged to steal for their Subsistence’, boys that were ‘Strangers to Beds’ and ‘lay about under Bulks and in ruinous empty houses’. Children were often abandoned when they were illegitimate. As illegitimate children or foundlings they not only had to endure poverty, but also the widespread prejudice that they were not worthy of compassion. Henry Fielding, in his novel Tom Jones, reflected the common antagonism against such children: Mrs Deborah commented upon the discovery of the foundling Tom that ‘it is, perhaps, better for such creatures to die in a state of innocence than to grow up and imitate their mothers, for nothing better can be expected of them’; and Captain Blifil rejected Tom’s adoption by stating that bastards like Tom should have to suffer the punishment for their parents’ crime, and that ‘at the best they ought to be brought up to the lowest and vilest offices of the commonwealth’.

John Fielding identified the biggest problem group as those boys whose fathers had moved to London and then died – with the Poor Law restricting relief to those with a

92 Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), p. 41
93 See for example Mitterauer (1986), pp. 102-103.
94 John Fielding (1758), pp. 17-19.
settlement in the parish, and son and mother being incapable of establishing settlement in a London parish, there was no safety net to take care of the boys. As a consequence the children of migrants appeared most frequently in Fielding's court charged with delinquent acts.\textsuperscript{96} John Fielding felt that these young offenders had to be rescued not punished, since many had been thieves out of necessity, and Fielding complained that 'for want of a seasonable relief, carts full of these unhappy wretches have ended their days in the vigour of their youth, at the dreadful tree.'\textsuperscript{97} Fellow magistrate Saunders Welch found, when investigating the reasons for the increase in robberies, that there was not only a lack of material relief but generally a need for more supervision and education for pauper children.\textsuperscript{98} Ideally, all the older boys in their teens and early twenties, orphans or not, should have been busily employed and supervised in an apprenticeship, or working as servants in some business, and not wandering around the streets. For boys in the care of the parish, that is those pauper children who had a settlement in that parish, or who were found wandering and had no other settlement, this apprenticeship was even compulsory, and the parish had to pay the apprenticeship fee.\textsuperscript{99} Failure to follow an order into a compulsory apprenticeship could get a boy into the house of correction or workhouse. However, parish officers sometimes neglected their duty, or were unwilling to pay the apprenticeship fee, or simply could not find a placement, so that the boy remained without an apprenticeship. An unruly boy could furthermore make any officer and master reluctant to take care of him.

Once the boys found an apprenticeship, the problems did not necessarily stop. Many of the older youths, whom the Marine Society's members noticed as 'lurking around'\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{96} See also Peter Linebaugh's figures for the birthplaces of the London hanged, 1703-1772, showing that only 38.9\% of those executed were born in London (Linebaugh [1991], p. 92).
\textsuperscript{97} John Fielding (1769), pp 2-5.
\textsuperscript{98} See A Letter upon the Subject of Robberies (1753), published in Welch (1758). Interestingly, Saunders Welch himself had grown up in a workhouse and had been a parish apprentice.
\textsuperscript{99} See fn. 61.
\textsuperscript{100} Quote from MSY/A/1, 19/04 1759.
in the streets, might have actually been in an apprenticeship, but were either neglected by their masters, or neglected their duties as apprentices. Others were former apprentices who had run away from their masters,\textsuperscript{101} and subsequently found themselves unemployed, not least because they were unable to pay the fee for another apprenticeship. To an extent the problem of having these unsupervised apprentices and runaways populating the streets goes back to the insufficiencies of the eighteenth century apprenticeship system itself. Jonas Hanway, John and Henry Fielding, and Saunders Welch, were all actively involved in projects which attempted to improve the apprenticeship system. The faults of the system will be outlined briefly at this stage, as a better understanding of the troubles of London’s apprentices also paves the way for chapter four’s enquiry into the youths’ motives for going to sea. Furthermore, this excursus will make it apparent that, in order to fully understand the Marine Society’s teenaged sailors, we have to position their age group in the wider historical context of youth history.

The quality of apprenticeships differed greatly, depending on trade, master or mistress,\textsuperscript{102} and on the financial background of the apprentice’s family, i.e. the apprenticeship fee the parents paid to the master. Eighteenth-century apprenticeships were very personal. The master was very much a paternal figure; rather than just apprenticing the boy he was also responsible for housing, feeding and ultimately policing him. Wages were paid only in better apprenticeships and in the later years of the boy’s service – though this became increasingly the case as the century went on. The long binding of the apprentice was one major problem of the system. Apprentices had to serve for up to seven years; boys placed by the parish by law had to serve until they reached

\textsuperscript{1} See the numerous advertisements by masters offering rewards for finding their runaway apprentice, for example in Public Advertiser, 26/04/1758, 13/07/1756 & 26/11/1756.

\textsuperscript{102} In the further analysis only the male term will be used.
the age of twenty-four. 103 In most trades the youth would be able to fulfil all the tasks of his work long before his apprenticeship was over, which was a reward for the master for training the boy. The apprentice, however, grew impatient in the meantime, longing to work, live, and earn money on his own. For the cyclical world of economic fortunes the long commitments were sometimes deadly, for when trade was booming a master would take on many apprentices, but when recession struck he often found it impossible to train, employ or provide for all of them. The apprentices, in return, would, in view of the bad prospects in their trade, become reluctant to carry on with the apprenticeship. John Fielding complained that too many got apprenticed to a trade where there was no economic future. 104 Jonas Hanway began to campaign against the long apprenticeship of parish boys after the Seven Years War, until finally, in 1767, the Act for the better Regulation of the Parish Poor Children, one of the so-called 'Hanway Acts', included the reduction of the binding time for parish boys to seven years or till the age of twenty-one. 105 The fee that had to be paid to the master for apprenticing a boy, either paid by the boy's parents or by the parish, was another source of evil, as it tempted masters to take on apprentices merely in order to cash in the fee. According to M. Dorothy George such masters would afterwards try to get rid of the boy by ill-treating him, thus either encouraging him to run away or provoking a reaction, which would justify the cancellation of the indentures without an order from the magistrate to return a part of the fee. 106

Analysing apprenticeship court cases, M. Dorothy George discovered regular complaints about masters that had no work in which to employ the apprentice, or who misused the apprentice as cheap labour without providing any industrial training on

103 See 43 Elizabeth I, c. 2, s. v (1601); parish boys bound to maritime masters under Queen Anne's act were bound until the age of twenty-one only.
104 John Fielding (1769), p. 9.
105 7 George III, c. 39, s. xiv (1767).
which the boy could build in the future. Boys placed by parish officers were particularly likely to end up in such apprenticeships. Furthermore, masters physically abusing apprentices, or even leaving them begging on the streets were among the court complaints, though it is difficult to say if these court cases were the tip of the iceberg or common phenomena that only rarely made it to court. There were legal ways to end an apprenticeship by appealing to a justice, giving the apprentice the opportunity to regain the fee for another apprenticeship. In practice, however, it seems unlikely that a young apprentice without any adults supporting him, and with little education, would make the way to court; he would probably rather react by running away or neglecting his duties and thereby forcing the master to cancel the indentures.

The master did not have to be evil-minded to neglect the apprentice, some masters might simply not have been able, economically or pedagogically, to provide for and supervise all of their boys sufficiently. And of course misbehaviour of one side in the apprenticeship provoked misbehaviour of the other: an unruly apprentice, or a particularly idle one, played his part in making a master desperate to get rid of the boy. Stealing from the master’s stock appears to have been a very common crime among apprentices. Boys that had grown up without a father might have found it particularly hard to subordinate themselves to the patriarchal power of a master. The ‘idle apprentice’ was a familiar eighteenth-century stereotype, immortalised by Hogarth’s *Thomas Idle* in his series of prints entitled *Industry and Idleness* (1747): Tom Idle, a

---

108 The chimney sweeps, for example, were frequently left begging during the summer. In 1773, the Marine Society collected nineteen chimney sweep apprentices; washed, clothed and encouraged them to report about their background. It turned out that the boys were not parish children, but mainly poor and illegitimate children who had been sold to their masters.
109 To make an appeal easier, an act was passed in 1747 (20 George II, c. 19, s. 3), stating that any parish apprentice (and those whose fee had been below £5) could appeal to any two justices and achieve a discharge without having to pay a fee.
111 See also the play *The Apprentice* opening in 1756, advertised as a satire on those young mechanics that neglect their trade (*London Magazine*, January 1756, pp. 3-5).
Plate 5 of William Hogarth's series *Industry and Idleness* (1747):

The Idle 'Prentice turn'd away, and sent to sea - A Foolish Son is the Heaviness of his Mother
fatherless child (like so many of the Marine Society's boys), being idle at work and gaming on Sundays rather than attending church service, is eventually 'turn’d away and sent to sea'; after his seafaring days Tom begins a career in London's underworld, robbing his old master, and finally ending up on the gibbet of Tyburn. Yet it was not only idleness that apprentices were commonly accused of, but also proneness to drink, party, and riotous behaviour - rather sailor-like stereotypes. Many Londoners considered apprentices in general as a threat to public order, they seeming to be at the forefront of any riotous disturbance, from playing football to political demonstrations. If we read the rules of proper behaviour in a publication like Samuel Richardson's *Apprentice's Vade Mecum* (1734), one of many guide books for apprentices, from the other direction, that is as a catalogue of frequent 'wrong doings' among apprentices, the behaviour of apprentices shows an astonishing and amusing resemblance to the behaviour of today's youths. This leads to the question of how far we can indeed compare the age group, from which the boys and young men of the Marine Society were drawn, to modern-day Western European youths, and whether this comparison helps us to understand their actions.

Some historians have argued that the concept of youth, as we know it today, is a product of the late eighteenth century and did not exist in pre-industrial Europe. However, there are a number of aspects that would justify describing these eighteenth-

---

112 His mother is dressed as a widow.
113 See for example Earle (1989), p 104, or Stone (1977) p. 376. It is difficult to say how political the London apprentices were. While they sometimes appear as the harbinger of the workers' movements, all too often the border between political protest and merely letting off adolescent spirits and aggression is too blurred (as in so many cases of youth actions). The weaver apprentices, to which Hogarth's Tom Idle belonged, gave a good example for 'semi-political' riotous behaviour. Kocka, for Europe in general, points to the lack of any fundamental political critique among the apprentices (Kocka [1990], p 184).
114 See for example advertisement for a similar work in *Public Advertiser*, 09 01/1756.
115 Incidentally, eighteenth-century literature used the terms 'the apprentices' or 'prentices' often as a synonym for youth in general (see Earle [1989], p. 104).
116 The main works are by Philippe Ariès (1960, 1996), and John R. Gillis (1974, 1981), the latter acknowledging concepts of youth in preindustrial Europe, but arguing that they are not comparable to that of the past two centuries. For an overview of how other historians followed the theory of youth being a product of the last two centuries see Roger Thompson (1984), p 127-129.
century urban apprentices as youths, as we use the term today. With regards to exogenous influences, apprentices form a distinctive intermediate stage between childhood and adulthood. They have left their family home, but rather than living on their own they live under a father-like supervision of the master and his wife; they are still in education, but they are occasionally already earning wages; they are working with adults, acquiring adult abilities at work but not full responsibilities; they do not own any means of production; they are reaching their sexual maturity but do not have children and are not married. John R. Gillis, however, objected that if one defines youth as a stage of (semi-)dependence it would have to include all the unmarried and propertyless, and thus stretch up to a very high age, without any distinction within the group as we know it today. Yet including such exogenous factors and allowing youth to extend to higher ages appears even for today's society a useful concept, and this would not deny that there are also subdivisions within a such defined youth. When discussing the seafaring life's attractiveness to boys in chapter four such a definition of youth will be applied. With regards to an endogenous factor such as age charting youth, Gillis objected that preindustrial Europe lacked universal age distinctions, such as those imposed today by schooling. However, Gillis admitted that preindustrial Europe held some views as to what should be the right age for joining the local youth group or for marriage. The case of the Marine-Society boys will show in chapter five that at least the Marine Society

---

117 Smith (1973) has argued the same for seventeenth-century London apprentices. See also Davis (1971) for French sixteenth-century adolescents, and Yarbrough (1979) for sixteenth-century Bristol apprentices as adolescents. Such case studies suggest that adolescence/youth may be a constant feature in history.
118 Admittedly, many boys in preindustrial Western Europe might have moved out of their homes much earlier, finding a home and work in another family's household.
119 Indentures could forbid marriage (see for example Instructions to Apprentices placed out by the Stepney Society [1759], p. 91, and Smith [1973], p. 150)
121 Gillis (1981), p. 4. The example of marriage is rather counter-productive to Gillis' theory, as today the proper age for marriage is probably less determined than it has ever been.
and the Royal Navy of the mid-eighteenth century had fairly universal age-orientated ideas of where to draw the line between child and youth, and youth and adult.

If we accept that conventional age concepts and exogenous factors were forming a youth (at least among males) in the mid-eighteenth century that can be compared with modern youth, then we can also expect that the extensively observed mental turbulences (anxiety, search for identity etc.)\(^{122}\) of today’s teenager would have been present in a modified form in the mind of his eighteenth-century peer, and chapter four will show the special role seafaring took in this teenage mind. Creating a link from modern to eighteenth-century youth, however, does not mean that the theories of Gillis and others, of youth as we know it today being a product of modernity or at least greatly remodelled by it, should be dumped into the historiographical dustbin: the following analysis, for example, will show how much London’s growing youth troubles were indeed linked to urbanisation.

Eighteenth-century observers watched London’s youth with concern. In the Marine Society’s advertisements impoverished boys were always portrayed as potential criminals. With some contemporary estimates stating that up to 90% of those hanged in early eighteenth-century London were under the age of twenty-one, London clearly had a problem with youth crime.\(^{123}\) Later, in 1775, Jonas Hanway wrote that the greater part of those that went to the gallows were boys aged between sixteen and twenty-one.\(^{124}\) Surely, in part this shocking proportion of teenagers stemmed from the fact that the youngsters were often framed by older criminals, or seduced into committing a crime by

---

\(^{122}\) See also Smith (1973), p. 157.

\(^{123}\) See Pringle (1955), p. 49; and Moore (1997) p 192; also Linebaugh (1991), pp. 95, 97, for the large share of apprentices among the London hanged. Studies of court records from the rest of the country, however, suggest that there the share of juveniles appearing in court was not as large as it is today, although it is difficult to estimate how often youths were punished informally rather than being taken to court (see Beatte [1986], p. 246). Peter King writes that in latter eighteenth-century England the main problem group were those aged 18-25, which he explains with the older apprentices being most dissatisfied with the prolonged stage of dependence (King [2000], pp. 170, 176ff., 288).

\(^{124}\) Hanway, Defects of Police (1775), p. 31.
the thief-catchers, the Jonathan Wildes, themselves. Yet, this reinforced the authorities’ belief that London’s youths needed stricter supervision. The various pleasure activities enjoyed by the youths – many of which we would regard today as youth-typical, innocent, as an all too understandable escape from a very demanding working life, and after all no different from what the upper classes were enjoying – were blamed as one of the major reasons for the high crime rate. Only work could keep the youths busy, productive and on the right side of the law, thought magistrate John Fielding, and he therefore considered it the duty of the magistrate to remove all temptations to idleness.

Fielding identified the city as the major problem:

In the Country, the Plowman, the Labourer, and the Artificer, are satisfied with their Holidays at Easter, Whitsuntide and Christmas. (...) But in this Town, Diversions calculated to slacken the Industry of the useful Hands are innumerable: To lessen therefore the Number of these is the Business of the Magistrate.\textsuperscript{125}

The multitude of rules of behaviour imposed on youths by indentures, company guidelines or the London Common Council, which could forbid them to visit bowling alleys, dances, tennis courts, even to wear their hair long or clothes other than those provided by their masters,\textsuperscript{126} appear to have been often violated. Jonas Hanway claimed that some JPs had told him ‘that there are very few mechanics or shop-keepers in these vast cities, whose apprentices can be kept at home in the evening’.\textsuperscript{127} Hanway was sure that the ‘habit of such profuse indulgence of the labouring part of our youth, must necessarily injure their morals, and accelerate the progress of our national misfortunes.’\textsuperscript{128} Magistrate Saunders Welch, like his fellow magistrate Fielding, also saw

\textsuperscript{125}See John Fielding (1758), p. ix.
\textsuperscript{126}For seventeenth-century regulations regarding clothes and haircuts of London apprentices see Smith (1973), pp. 150-151.
\textsuperscript{127}Hanway, Observations (1772), p. 15.
\textsuperscript{128}Hanway, Observations (1772), p. 15. One of Hanway’s proposals to restrain unruly apprentices and crime on the streets was to close all taverns in London at eleven o’clock (Hanway, ibid., p. 74) – a proposal only taken up in the twentieth century, yet to the foreign visitor this law seems so harsh that he can only imagine it being a left-over from at least Hanway’s days.
a direct link between the pleasure-activities of London’s youth and the rising crime rate. He emphasised the importance of suppressing ‘the debauchery, excesses and immoralities of the numerous fairs’, which had been ‘the bane of the youth of both sexes, and a great cause of robberies.’ Welch asked for the public’s assistance for a general campaign against gaming,

(...) and other disorders on the Lord’s day, carried on in the fields adjoining to the town, most Sundays in the summer season, and that too in the time of divine service. Indeed, great is the scandal which arises to the parents and masters of youth thus employed; (...) here they are associated with gamblers, pickpockets, and other abandon’d wretches. And what can be the product of such commerce, but a race of thieves, fatal to their masters, who have basely deserted the truth reposed to them, or to their parents, who, I may say, with a hellish cruelty neglecting their own offspring, leave them an easy prey to vice and misery; and, in time, objects, perhaps, of dread and terror to ferocity? Do you, as fathers, masters and guardians of youth, co-operate with the magistracy, and give your utmost aid to suppress such glaring enormities.

Gaming during the hours of church service had, by the way, also been Tom Idle’s misdemeanour, which, together with his idleness at work, was the reason for sending him to sea. Remarkably, Hogarth did not show that Tom had committed any serious crime apart from these ‘offences’. Magistrates Fielding and Welch together went on a campaign to stop youthful entertainments; on one occasion the two arrested a great number of persons ‘of both Sexes’ in a house known as Baron’s Hop in Soho’s Wardour Street,

(...) where Music and Dancing was carried on for the Lucre of Gain, contrary to the Statute. They were all examined at Night, and dealt with according to the Law. This Kind of Amusement must certainly appear harmless to the Unwary, otherwise reputable young Women would never be found mix’d with Strangers of the lowest Order at these Hops. Whoever can raise a Shilling gains Admittance here; the Ladies indeed, by Way of Encouragement, pay n thing: but alas, these Hops are the very Seminaries of Debauchery.

---

130 Welch (1754), pp. 27-28.
131 Public Advertiser, 24/06/1756.
Welch and Fielding expressed their hope that members of the public would always inform the magistrates whenever and wherever such Hops were held.

The magistrates alone certainly could not control all London apprentices and youths. To police urban youth, society had to rely on the masters, since the boys had left the supervision of their parents, and since the city of more than half a million inhabitants amazingly still had no proper police force. The long binding of parish apprentices, as well as the master's obligation to house the apprentice, might have partly already been established as an attempt to police young men.\textsuperscript{132} Masters could fine or physically punish an apprentice, and even get him sent to a house of correction for a week, some even went for a month.\textsuperscript{133} Naturally, the master always stood at the centre of the apprentice's rage against authority. Indentures between master and apprentices extended into regulating the apprentice's spare time – haunting taverns and playhouses, for example, could be explicitly forbidden in the contract.\textsuperscript{134} Thus, a master who demanded that his apprentice stick closely to the rules, and who allowed the boy little time for diversions, perhaps even with the good intention of keeping him out of trouble, could drive a teenaged boy, experiencing the common mental turbulences, to the drastic step of leaving the apprenticeship. It would then be difficult for an impoverished boy to pay another apprenticeship fee and so return to a normal life. John Fielding cursed the youthful mind: 'A mind restless, roving and perpetually uneasy, is what brings more young people into these paths of ruin, than even their own wicked inclinations; for when folks have no certain road, but are led by a wandering brain, no doubt they may be easily put into a bad one.'\textsuperscript{135} But Fielding also knew from his experience in court that all too often a bad

\textsuperscript{132} As argued by George (1925, 1992), p. 237.
\textsuperscript{133} See Hanway, \textit{Observations} (1772), p. 23. For the history of houses of correction see Shoemaker (1991), pp. 166-197. Being whipped and put to hard labour were often part of the house of correction, though Hanway found in 1775, during a visit to London's Bridewell Hospital, that the discipline there was very lax (Hanway, \textit{Defects of Police} [1775], p. 35).
\textsuperscript{134} See for example \textit{Instructions to Apprentices placed out by the Stepney-Society} (1759), p. 91.
master, incapable of providing the guidance and provision the boy needed, and a bleak apprenticeship, provoked the youth to behave restless. The conflict between master and apprentice was a regular theme in Fielding’s court. Here may lie the key to understanding why especially among Fielding’s ships’ boys there were a number of runaway apprentices, which was to harm the relationship between Fielding and the Marine Society. M.D. George mentions a curious case tried by Fielding in 1772, involving an apprentice who had been absent from service and had stayed out for a number of nights. Fielding sentenced the youth to a month in Bridewell, kept to hard labour; the convicted, however, reacted by exclaiming he would go for a year if the justices would discharge him from his master. Fielding was aware that sending an apprentice to the house of correction could make matters much worse, for once the apprentice entered the house’s shady company, the relationship to his master at its lowest point, he was likely to leave the apprenticeship entirely and instead find work in London’s underworld. That is why John Fielding, together with his predecessor and half-brother Henry, and Saunders Welch, had set up the Universal Register Office in 1749 to overcome some of the defects common in apprenticeships. The Office acted as an employment agency, for apprentices seeking masters and vice versa, and tried to prevent any improper indentures and protect apprentices from masters who were only tempted by the fee. Ensuring that boys would end up in a trade they liked and with a master who was willing and able to educate the boy appeared as the best way of reducing London’s youth-troubles

---

137 The most infamous example of a failed apprentice turned criminal would be Jack Sheppard from Spitalfields, perhaps London’s most celebrated burglar and suspected of partly being the real-life model for Macheath, John Gay’s central figure in the Beggars’ Opera (1727). Jack left his apprenticeship because he had become ‘weary of the yoke of servitude’, as Daniel Defoe tells us, and he was more attracted by London’s nightlife, despite the curfews that had been imposed on him by the anxious master’s wife (see Moore [1997], p. 192).
138 See for example advertisement in Public Advertiser, 03/11/1756 & 24/01/1758.
However, John Fielding also discovered another safe way out for failed apprentices, as well as for the hundreds of deprived young children populating the streets of London, and that was to send them to the Royal Navy.\textsuperscript{139} Already in 1754 Fielding had complained in the \textit{Public Advertiser} that he had to send young boys to New Prison, while it would be much more useful if they could be collected for the Royal or merchant Navy.\textsuperscript{140} With the outbreak of the Seven Years War and the Navy's increased demand for boys an opening occurred. The concern about deprived or delinquent youths matched the concern for manning the Navy. Fielding saw the opportunity, but so did many supporters of the Marine Society. Thus, the Marine Society was by no means purely naval orientated. What the Marine-Society members thought they were doing was a far more diverse undertaking, a charitable, naval, economic and political way of dealing with impoverished youths:

To feed the hungry, and to clothe the naked, who are unable to support themselves, are virtues to which the blessings of Heaven are promised (...) to rescue numbers of these young persons from the jaws of perdition; to breed them up to the knowledge of social and religious duties; to prevent their being disturbers of the quiet enjoyments of their fellow-subjects; to present them the fairest prospect of everlasting happiness; and at length to teach those, who would have been otherwise totally lost to their country, an occupation on which commerce and naval strength depend: these are objects which constitute the very essence of charity, and include the truest patriotism.\textsuperscript{141}

Hence the motto ‘Charity and Policy United’, which the Marine Society later adopted – ‘Charity’ because the impoverished boys were to be rescued, and ‘Policy’ because of the benefits for Britain's military and economic strength and the stability of the domestic social hierarchy. And on top of that even ‘the blessings of Heaven’ were promised. To understand why the founding fathers of the Marine Society saw their undertaking in such a grand context, why they were so enthusiastic about apparently being able to combine military, charitable and wider economic and political aims in their scheme, we have to

\textsuperscript{139} See John Fielding (1758), p 20
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Public Advertiser}, 16/12/1754.
\textsuperscript{141} Hanway and Thornton, \textit{Three Letters: Motives} (1758), pp. 3-4.
take a closer look at the philanthropic environment they were working in, which will be
done in the next section.

To sum up this section we can draw the conclusion that the traditional means of
policing, guiding and employing youths were inadequate for a youthful population that,
due to the urbanisation and modernisation of London, featured a growing number of
deprived, unemployed and friendless boys. Statutory care that was limited to boys with a
settlement within the parish, and youth-guidance relying on community spirit, religion
and paternal masters, were not only unable to cope with an imperfect apprenticeship
system, but generally unsuitable for a metropolis with more than half a million
inhabitants. The defects of traditional poor relief will be further discussed in the next
section. As a consequence of these defects many boys who fell through the social net
turned criminals. There was little understanding of certain 'troubles' as being youth-
specific, or tolerance of youthful enjoyments, in the way the western world today
tolera tes them. By attempting to stamp out diversions for youths, authorities, such as
magistrates Fielding and Welch, only stimulated escapist dreams, which occasionally
found their expression in crime, or, as will be shown in chapter four, in escaping to the
sea. Society's lack of understanding for youth-specific troubles, combined with a lack of
adequate pedagogical institutions that could take care of the youths, led to such crude
reactions as imprisonment in a house of correction – an institution where an unruly
apprentice was mixed with criminals, and, as Hanway complained, where no attempt was
made to educate and reform the youngsters, so that they usually left the penal institution
more morally corrupted than they had entered it.142 'Voluntary' penal transportation of
children to the plantations of North America was another of these crude reactions.143

Thus, one may argue that ultimately the lack of understanding of youth-specific troubles

143 See act 4 George I, c. 11 (1717).
led to the criminalisation of youths who merely found it hard to fit into their bleak social reality and longed for such diversions, which normally were the reserve of the upper classes. Far too often it also led the teenagers to the Tyburn tree – in these circumstances the sea appeared indeed as a comparatively progressive solution.

The law discovered the juvenile criminal only in the early nineteenth-century, and even then this penal specialisation only came about in the context of a general diversification of the law. Before that, mitigation of punishment was officially only granted to those deemed unable to distinguish between good and evil, that is usually those younger than fourteen, though age had often been an influential factor in the granting of pardons in early-modern English courts. The undertakings of Fielding and Hanway show that, though the mid-century law made no differentiation in the punishment of youths and adults, these men recognised youth-crime as something different, and regarded the young offender not as a regular criminal but also as a victim of poverty and bad company, and thus as an object for compassion, to be helped rather than just punished. Hanway argued that the ‘reason’ of these youths was not yet mature, and urged that the probability of reformation of someone who had never been properly educated must speak in his defence. As the metropolis grew over the following decades, and with it its social ills and teenaged population, society’s awareness of the poor in general and of its younger members naturally grew too, which then brought about changes in the approach to their problems.

---

144 For juvenile offenders in London at that time see Heather Shore (1999).
147 Heather Shore writes that Hanway and Fielding had commented on the policing of the poor in general, but had failed to isolate the juvenile criminal as a specific entity (Shore [1999], p. 23). However, with the writings and projects of Hanway and Fielding mentioned in this section I hope to have countered this statement.
149 See also the foundation of the Philanthropic Society in 1788, to take care of delinquent children. Peter King has found that in the latter half of the eighteenth century there were an increasing number of informal and less harsh punishments applied to teenagers (King [2000], p. 294).
I.4. ‘Charity and Policy United’

For many of the Marine Society’s members recruiting boys for the Navy, or donating to the cause, was not the only voluntary activity they were involved in; they were active in numerous other voluntary associations that aimed to improve the fate of the poor and of the country in general. To many contemporaries it seemed that the eighteenth century witnessed unprecedented benevolence towards the poor and particularly their children, an age of true Christianity.\textsuperscript{150} While it appears difficult to compare degrees of charity between centuries, it is undeniable that the eighteenth century, particularly in London, saw the emergence of many new institutions and societies concerned with the welfare of the poor. The outbreak of the Seven Years War marked a climax of philanthropic activity, underlining the close link between concern about the poor and concern about the fate of the country as a whole. Like all the numerous other associations that were formed, concerned with the arts, sciences, politics and other public interests, the foundation of these charitable institutions may be regarded as the product of a variety of changes: the early signs of Enlightenment and nationalism (or patriotism), urbanisation (modernisation), and the rise of merchants and businessmen to wealth and greater numbers.

Contemporaries had a long list of complaints about the way the Poor Law was administered and parish officers distributed the funds from the poor rate.\textsuperscript{151} Parliament produced some amendments to the Poor Law, but their effects were limited. Donna Andrew argues that a thorough revision would have meant a change in the balance of power between parish officials, JPs, and guilds or private executors of charitable

\textsuperscript{150} See Donna Andrew (1989), p. 11.
\textsuperscript{151} For a comprehensive overview over the history of the Poor Law, and a discussion of the secondary literature, see Paul Slack (1990, 1995).
bequests, and that English society was as usual unwilling to allow the creation of any new government agency with extra powers of taxation and control. While the legislators could not agree on improvements, philanthropists and other politically minded men saw private charities as the only way out. Moreover, there was the hope that private charity would be more efficient, as it was expected that those running a voluntary charity would be less corrupt than parish officers, and that only effective charities would receive continuous donations.

Setting up large charitable institutions by collecting subscriptions was the great innovation of eighteenth-century philanthropy. The joint-stock methods, to which the business world had become accustomed in the seventeenth century, were transferred into the philanthropic world. The result was 'subscription charities': instead of running and financing the charities as one-man businesses, philanthropists worked jointly in committees to manage the charity's affairs, while the main donations were made by subscribers from outside. The task of the committee members was to attract new subscriptions and to 'invest' them in their philanthropic work, which they usually did with the help of paid employees. Care was taken that the enterprise had a positive account balance, any charitable payment had to be covered by incoming subscriptions. The joint-stock operations made larger projects feasible, and guaranteed the durability of the charity by making its fate less dependent on individual philanthropists. Philanthropy was thus institutionalised and professionalised. This process was by no means limited to activities in support of the poor: cultural production, for example, also shifted in the mid-eighteenth century from personal patronage to subscription projects.

Professionalisation of philanthropy also meant specialisation. each charity picked its

---

153 Joanna Innes argues that the shift to voluntary charity also expressed an acceptance of a more progressive form of taxation (see Innes [1996], p. 146).
specific field and acquired expert knowledge and thus further persuaded other philanthropists to leave the execution of the charity to the association. This, however, did not happen in the relationship between the Marine Society and John Fielding, as we shall see in chapter two.

Basing charity on permanent financial support from the public also directed philanthropy towards a more pragmatic approach, both in the way it was promoted and in the objects it chose. In order to guarantee a maximum support the subscription charities needed to show that their work benefited not only the recipients, but society in general. This entrepreneurial requirement of having to make the charity attractive to as many people as possible, though, went hand in hand with the philosophy of eighteenth-century philanthropists who anyway believed that their charity towards the poor also had to be a service to the whole country. National society was recognised to be one body, where the suffering of one part (or a part which did not fulfil its duties) would in the long run affect all other parts of the body, through the economic and political veins – thus service to the poor ultimately had to be service to the entire country (leading Hanway to talk about 'national humanity')\(^{155}\), and to the donor himself. Merely donating without conditions, and without the hope that the donation would cause long-term improvements that would remove the necessity of having to make such provisions in the future, did not satisfy the eighteenth-century philanthropist. The poor did not just have to be rescued; they had to be turned into productive members of society. Education, training and employment of the poor were crucial. Aiming at long-term investments, the children of the poor became the favourite objects of philanthropy. The first decades of the

\(^{155}\) MSY/A/1, 27/10/1757.
eighteenth century had already produced the foundation of numerous charity schools, sponsored by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) and other organisations mostly with religious backgrounds. In a sermon for Oxford's charity school, in 1755, William Sharp explained to his audience that it was not only one's Christian duty to look after the children of the poor, but that it was in the interest of public safety and welfare that the children were taught and employed. ‘If Compassion cannot move you, let Considerations of Interest prevail with you’, Sharp preached, ‘for neglect this poor Man’s numerous Family, leave them to follow their own Imaginations, and (...) they will grow up soon into public Nuisances; (...) fill your Streets with Vice and Violence; break in upon your Comfort and your Security: take the same Persons under your Patronage, teach them what is right, find Employment for their Talents in suitable Professions and Occupations, and hear how you will be repaid.’ In this manner the mid-century philanthropist hoped to turn even the least compassionate into a donor. A more drastic example was Jonas Hanway campaigning for the betterment of the children of the parish poor by publishing a calculation of the costs of keeping the children alive, from which he then subtracted the children’s estimated lifelong contribution to the national product, with the result that ‘every child that perishes for want of Care, is a pecuniary Loss to the whole Community (...) of at least 151l. 11s. 4d. to say nothing of

156 Only a few were established before the turn of the century. In 1707, London had 55 such schools, and the country 216; in 1734, there were 132 in London, educating 5,123 children, and 1,329 in the country, educating 19,506 children. From then on the growth rate slowed down until they stagnated in the 1750s (see Kirkman Gray [1905], pp. 106-107). Next to religion and reading (sometimes also writing), great emphasis was placed on occupational training; in fact many schools experiencing financial strains turned increasingly into charitable workshops, resembling workhouses.

157 The S.P.C.K. was founded in 1698-9. A model not only for its schools, but also for the Foundling Hospital later, was the school and orphanage established by August Hermann Francke in Halle, Prussia. Francke’s publication on the subject was edited in English by Josiah Woodward (Pietas Hallensis [1707]). Woodward is the author of the Seamen’s Monitor, a book that the Marine Society valued so much that it gave a copy to each of its recruits. The institution in Halle also spurred the interest in orphanages of the composer, and later governor of the Foundling Hospital, George Frederick Handel, who spent some years at the University of Halle.

our defence, upon which our very Existence depends.'\textsuperscript{159} This was 'economic charity', or 'political humanity', down to the penny, but, whatever the philanthropist's personal motivations to campaign for a charity, this approach promised him the maximum financial support.

With so many of the new philanthropists in the eighteenth century having made their fortunes in the business world, it was natural that their ideas of charity (and politics) focussed on the requirements of the national economy. The ideological basis for their attitudes had been built by the 'Political Arithmetic' of the beginning of the century, and such writers as Sir William Petty. 'Political Arithmetic' laid much emphasis on the belief that the wealth of a country would increase with the working population. By the mid-century, even a non-businessman like John Fielding embraced such thinking: 'The Riches and Strength of a Nation are the Number of its Inhabitants; the Happiness of that Nation, their being usefully and constantly employed',\textsuperscript{160} and the duty of the magistrate was hence, in Fielding's eyes, to lessen the number of diversions and to make sure that the labourer made most of his time by being productive. The increase in the national population, the preservation of human lives, and the provision of employment had therefore to be the main concerns of philanthropy and politics. Population growth was regarded as purely positive, Malthusian fears about limited resources were yet unknown.

One result of the concern for the growth of the working population was the foundations of numerous hospitals in London. The city had entered the eighteenth century with only two general hospitals, St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's. Five new general hospitals were founded: Westminster Hospital in 1720, St. George's in 1733; the London Hospital in 1740, the Middlesex Hospital in 1745, and Thomas Guy's in 1746. Furthermore, the Lock Hospital for venereal diseases was established in 1746, and St.

\textsuperscript{159} Hanway, \textit{Serious Considerations} (1762), pp. 5-6.
\textsuperscript{160} John Fielding (1758), pp. viii-ix
Luke's Hospital for lunatics in 1750. To aid poor women giving birth and to combat the horrifying infant mortality rates the Lying-in Hospital\textsuperscript{161} (for married women) was founded in 1749; the City of London Lying-in Hospital in 1750, Queen Charlotte's Hospital for unmarried women in 1752, the Royal Maternity Hospital in 1757, and the Westminster Lying-in Hospital in 1765. The London Hospital promoted itself by pointing out that it ensured that injured and sick East London workers returned to their workplace in full strength, rather than becoming the objects of charity.\textsuperscript{162} The full name of the London Hospital was actually 'The London Hospital, or Infirmary, for the relief of sick and diseased persons, especially Manufacturers and Seamen in Merchant-Service'. A sufficient supply of seamen was regarded as essential for the functioning of the economy. The 'political arithmetician' Sir William Petty reckoned the seaman was one of the most important pillars of any 'common-wealth', being also a merchant and a soldier.\textsuperscript{163}

Overseas merchant Jonas Hanway echoed that credo in the mid-century:

\begin{quote}
(...) as a nation whose chief strength is their ships of war, and whose opulence is derived from commerce; to secure the very foundation stone in which our glory is built, we ought to be more careful and industrious in breeding up a race of mariners, as well for the King's, as the Merchant Service.\textsuperscript{164}
\end{quote}

Even an outsider to the business world, like magistrate John Fielding, repeated the same doctrine:

\begin{quote}
One of the greatest sources of our riches, is commerce; the support of that commerce, and indeed of every thing that is dear to us, is our Navy, the purposes of neither can be answered without a sufficient number of seamen; every method, therefore, ought to be used to encrease, encourage, and cherish these valuable members of society.\textsuperscript{165}
\end{quote}

Growth of population (and seamen) was thus not only meant to increase the country's economic strength, but also its military power. The expected gain in military strength

\textsuperscript{161} Later called British Lying-in Hospital.
\textsuperscript{162} Andrew (1989), pp. 53-4.
\textsuperscript{163} Petty (1690, 1751), p. 23.
\textsuperscript{164} Jonas Hanway, \textit{Letter from a Member} (1757, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed.), pp. 16-17, also \textit{Account of the Marine Society} (1759, 6\textsuperscript{th} ed.), pp. 53-54; and \textit{Regulations of the Marine Society: Introduction} [1772, 1775], p. xx.
\textsuperscript{165} John Fielding (1769), pp. 6-7.
played a vital role in the philanthropic movement. France's superiority in population and soldiers appeared threatening, in particular when the Seven Years War broke out. Hence, the war made it easier to convince the British public of the usefulness of such charities as the London Foundling Hospital. Parliament's decision to financially back the Foundling Hospital's open admission for all children was, according to Hanway, influenced by the concern about the war.\footnote{Hanway, \textit{Candid Historical Account} (1759), p. 24.}

As already mentioned regarding the foundation of the charity schools, the philanthropists' idea of charity was never merely about rescuing the poor economically and physically, they also had to be rescued 'mentally':\footnote{Donna Andrew describes this as an addition to the aims of charity brought in by those mid-century philanthropists that she labels 'political economists', while the 'political arithmeticians' of the beginning of the century had still believed finding employment would be enough (Andrew [1989], pp. 8-9, 199).} the poor had to be educated, to become more virtuous and loyal citizens, to become more productive and less disruptive. Nursing their health and providing employment seemed pointless when the poor damaged their health with excessive amounts of gin and thus ruined not only their lives but also their children's. The mid-century London philanthropist blamed the perceived crime increase, for example, to a large degree on a loss of virtue among the poor.\footnote{See for example Henry Fielding's \textit{Inquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers} (1751), or William Hogarth's \textit{Gin Lane} (1751), and \textit{Four Stages of Cruelty} (1751).} In 1753, Henry Fielding published a pamphlet significantly entitled \textit{A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor, for Amending their Morals, and for Rendering them Useful Members of Society}. Their morals had to be amended, and, as shown by quotations from Saunders Welch and John Fielding in the previous section, the number of their diversions had to be reduced. Samuel Johnson was rather a maverick when he asked why one should disallow those pleasures to the poor, which the rich were so freely enjoying, especially when taking into account how much harder the fate of the poor
was. However, men like John Thornton and Jonas Hanway attempted to live a virtuous life and to set an example, and they, as well as magistrates Fielding and Welch, also criticised debauchery among the rich.

The most important tool in educating the poor to become sober, industrious, virtuous and law-abiding subjects was Christianity. The Marine Society equipped its recruits with a prayer book and a New Testament, and so did John Fielding with the boys he sent to sea prior to the Marine Society's foundation; furthermore the Society gave out Josiah Woodward's *Seaman's Monitor* bound together with Edward Synge's *Essay towards making the Knowledge of Religion easy to the Meanest Capacity*. Hanway and his fellow philanthropists saw Christianity and humanity as being perfectly in line with their economic and political interests. The requirements for a flourishing economy and Christianity, both obliged them to take care of the poor and their children: "If there is a God who governs the world, true policy and true religion must be the same". Hanway, Thornton, Robert Nettleton, Charles and Robert Dingley, and their philanthropically minded colleagues from the Russia Company were strongly devoted to the Anglican Church. James S. Taylor calls them a 'seed-bed' of the Evangelical movement, since the Company included John Thornton, father of Henry; Robert and William Wilberforce, who were father and uncle of William; and Thomas Raikes, the older brother of Robert Raikes of the Sunday School Movement. Teaching the poor to become virtuous, and not to neglect their children, was certainly laudable, and teaching them to respect the laws was certainly necessary in a society where the law enforcement was far behind the

169 "Life is a pill which none of us can bear without gilding; yet for the poor we delight in stuffing it still barer; and are not ashamed to show even visible displeasure, if ever the bitter taste is taken from their mouths!" (Samuel Johnson cited in Rodgers [1949], p. 18).
170 Originally called *The Seaman's Faithful Companion*. See also Chapter III.1.
171 Both works were edited by Jonas Hanway and prefixed with the Society's instructions to their men and boys.
173 Hanway, for example, tells us that they together raised a fund to build a place of worship in St. Petersburg (Hanway, *Historical Account: Vol. I* [1753], p. v.).
development of the metropolis. But religion was also to instil acceptance of the political status quo: the Marine Society wrote ‘that without a sense of religion, it is not possible that peace and harmony, due subordination, and the happiness of social intercourse, can exist.'\textsuperscript{174} Christianity was to stabilise the hierarchical order of society. The Foundling Hospital claimed to take care that their ‘children do constantly attend Divine Service in the Chapel on Sundays, to often remind them of the Lowness of their Condition, that they may early imbibe the Principles of Humility and Gratitude to their Benefactors; and to learn to undergo, with Contentment the most servile and laborious Offices.'\textsuperscript{175} The boys placed out by the Stepney Society were warned that God was watching all their actions and even their thoughts: \textsuperscript{176} ‘GOD KNOWETH ALL THINGS, even the number of the hairs on your head’; they too were taught that rebelling against their underprivileged position in society would mean to offend against God and Christianity, for ‘it is by the WISE APPOINTMENT OF GOD, that some of us are rich, and some are poor; some are appointed to govern, and others to obey'. Christianity was to keep the poor in grateful obedience – a maxim which those institutions concerned with the education of pauper children had to be particularly careful to observe, since they were regularly accused of raising rebellious characters by planting too much ambition and expectations into the minds of those who were destined to fill the lower ranks.\textsuperscript{177} ‘In the mean while it is very obvious, that as the rich are not always happy, nor the poor miserable, happiness must depend either on opinion, which is very changeable, or on health of body, and contentment of mind’ – was the comfort the Stepney Society had for its boys.

To summarise so far, one has to acknowledge that the unity of religious, charitable, economic and political aims was rooted deep in the ideas of mid-century philanthropists.

\textsuperscript{174} Regulations of the Marine Society: Dedication (1772, 1775), p. xv; also p. xix of Introduction.
\textsuperscript{176} See Instructions to Apprentices placed out by the Stepney-Society (1759), pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{177} See also Chapter V.2.
Therefore the members and subscribers of the Marine Society were considering their undertaking not just as a naval, but also as a humanitarian, economic and political benefit to the country, which is why we too should see the Marine Society not just as a reaction to the manning crisis, but to a whole range of worries about the troubles of lower-class youths and young men. Since employment was regarded as such a suitable charity, the overseas merchants supporting the Marine Society had no problem in seeing even their own business interests as being perfectly in line with philanthropy, Christianity and politics. At the end of this exploration into the world of mid-century philanthropy we should take a closer look at those philanthropists, who had the energy to put this philosophy of a union of charity and policy into practice. So far, they have been described as mostly merchants and businessmen, but the easiest label from today's point of view would probably be middle class, or upper middle class. Although it has often been branded a historiographical platitude, that the middle class is always rising, for the eighteenth century it appears an accurate description. The middle class grew in size, wealth and confidence with the rise of Britain's trading empire. With the funds and spare time on hand, merchants and businessmen were able to enter the philanthropic arena. The aristocracy's active involvement in the eighteenth-century charity movement was comparatively low, though financially it still made an important contribution. One major factor that made businesspeople seemingly more concerned about the fate of the poor than the aristocracy was that they were urban. Urbanisation (or modernisation), the development of London, appears to be inextricably linked with the philanthropic movement of the eighteenth century. To start with it needed the geographical concentration of people to enable charitable (or any other) associations to be maintained;

---

178 See for example Hanway on the importance of trade in Historical Account: Vol. 1 (1753), p. vii.
179 The term itself was hardly used before the later eighteenth century, though the division of society in three groups, and terms such as 'middle station' or 'the middling sort of people', were applied as early as the late seventeenth century (see Earle [1989], p. 3).
it needed the city with its public spheres, its coffee houses and taverns, where people could meet and stay in contact. In fact, since urbanisation also brought alienation it might to a certain degree even have promoted a general desire among the urban people to associate each other in clubs. Yet urbanisation brought more evils than alienation: while merchants and businessmen were harvesting the fruits of the expanding empire, they watched with concern how the urban centres, foremost London, bred an unprecedented concentration of poverty right next to their trading headquarters. 'I never should have exposed my Sentiments to the Public Censure, had not my Eyes so often affected my Heart, with the dismal Objects that occur in our Streets, and the miserable Condition of the Poor every where, that I could no longer restrain my Inclination to disclose my Thoughts to my Fellow-Citizens', wrote an anonymous London merchant in 1759 in his *Plea for the Poor*. What apparently drove Thomas Coram to maintain a tiring seventeen-year-long campaign to establish the Foundling Hospital was the misery he directly experienced when walking through the city, seeing babies left dead or alive on the roadside. Rich and poor still lived in close proximity, and men like Coram or Jonas Hanway could hardly avoid being a daily witness of the misery of the poor. Significantly, many of those concerned city-people involved in the charity movement felt anti-urban and had an idealised picture of the healthy and virtuous life of the countryside. With unemployment, crime, mortality, prostitution, alcoholism, and deprived children all growing with the metropolis, it became evident to the philanthropists that the traditional forms of provision had become outdated. The Poor Law, with its Act of Settlement of 1662 ruling that each parish was responsible only for those poor who had a settlement in that parish, was not capable of dealing with urbanisation. Indeed, it did not want to cope,

---

181 As argued by R.J. Morris (1998). For clubs and societies being primarily urban phenomena see also Clark (2000), p. 3.
for the main reason for introducing the Act of Settlement had been to prevent uncontrolled migration. Various historical studies have suggested that the proportion of inhabitants in a parish not settled there was nevertheless very high. There was clearly a need for larger agencies, crossing parish boundaries, and, as the government was inactive, concerned Londoners took it into their private hands. Once such institutions were formed they developed an inner dynamic that dragged the founders further into the cause of the poor. Even more, philanthropy became fashionable, as Ruth McClure has shown in her study of the London Foundling Hospital: wealthy Londoners would come for a visit at the weekend, watching the children work, walking through Hogarth's gallery or listening to Handel's music. An additional interesting aspect is that many of the philanthropists were overseas merchants and had been to other countries. On their travels they could observe how institutionalised charities operated in other countries, and perhaps they were thus spurred to introduce similar measures back home. The earlier mentioned anonymous merchant of the City of London, observing the unemployed poor, wondered about 'the money one would gain if they would be employed, as is done in Holland, Hamburgh, New England and other places.' And the governors of the Foundling Hospital had carefully studied similar hospitals in Amsterdam, Paris and Lisbon.

Looking at the individuals sitting in the committees of the various mid-eighteenth-century associations, we often find the same persons. Moreover, one finds people linked through their business activities, and, as Donna Andrew points out, committee members

183 See Slack (1995), p. 28. The origins of the settlement-regulation go back to the middle ages. In eighteenth-century Germany legislators still even reinforced the principle of settlement with new laws, such as in Holstein in 1736, or in Prussia in 1748, to prevent the influx of poor people (see Kocka [1990], p. 105).
185 McClure (1981), pp. 61-75; as an example of a contemporary commentator see The Idler on charity, in Gentleman's Magazine, May 1758, p. 214.
186 A Plea for the Poor (1759), pp. 35-36.
187 Account of the Hospital (1749), p. vi; also Hanway, Candid Historical Account (1759), pp. 30-32.
who were related through kinship or marriage.\textsuperscript{188} To an extent this is understandable, for, while each philanthropist might have had a favourite charity, he was drawn into other charity organisations through his fellow philanthropists and business partners. Regarding the Marine Society, but also the Foundling Hospital and the Magdalen House for Penitent Prostitutes, the Russia Company connected many committee members. Hanway's biographer James Taylor tried to explain the Russia merchants' extensive involvement in philanthropic associations by assuming that service in a charity organisation had been a form of 'apprenticeship to responsibility within the company', where individuals could show their commitment and get to know other Russia merchants.\textsuperscript{189} Jonas Hanway was elected to the Court of Assistants of the Russia Company on 30 July 1756, interestingly just a month after he had arranged the initial meeting for the Marine Society. Jonas Hanway neither had an impressive family background and education, nor was he an extraordinarily successful merchant. Charity opened the door to fame for him and brought him admittance to London's merchant elite. Hence appears another piece in the puzzle to explain the middle classes' charitable activity, that of personal gain — a phenomenon that lives on in today's voluntary associations and political parties. Some merchants entered charity work to improve their image; others simply enjoyed the fame it offered. The charity organisations knew one of the best ways of marketing was to publish the names of the donors, for being named as a philanthropist together with well-known personalities pleased anyone's personal vanity. An image make-up in private as well as in business life was guaranteed. Meanwhile charity-committee meetings became a forum for business contacts. Meetings of societies usually featured the highest attendance when paid positions were to be appointed, or

\textsuperscript{188} Andrew (1989), pp. 90-91, gives an insight into the multiple family ties among philanthropists. \\
\textsuperscript{189} Taylor (1985), p. 59. David Macmillan describes the Russia Company as a very elitist circle, whose well-functioning lobby work with British and Russian officials ensured that it kept the monopoly rights for the trade with Russia throughout the eighteenth century (see Macmillan [1971/3]).
potential objects of charity selected. This phenomenon was especially frequent at the hospitals, where lucrative posts for doctors were on offer, or where one could place for free a sick servant for whose care one otherwise would have been personally obliged. Whenever the Marine Society had a free post, candidates were quickly on hand, recommended by individual committee members. Thus a little self-charity was mixed under the banner of 'Charity and Policy United'.

A final incentive to become active in charitable associations was that the philanthropists were not only entering the philanthropical arena with their agenda, but also the political stage. Thus charities provided an entry into politics for men for whom entrance to the traditional centres of power, such as Parliament, was not available. This also explains why, as the following chapter will show for the Marine Society, members of the nobility and of Parliament, though they were given posts in the charities, had little to do with running them. There was occasional criticism in philanthropists' circles of the nobility's alleged lack of care for the state of the poor and the country. Most criticism, however, concentrated on the upper class's luxurious lifestyle and preference for foreign culture, but did not question the status quo. There were no open attacks like a William Moss some years later voiced, who thought that 'The titled and opulent, who move in the most splendid and ostentatious paths' were 'too rarely found to quit the allurements of the gay and fashionable world, for the dull irksome task of exploring the melancholy haunts of the lowest and most miserable of their fellow creatures', and that only 'the man of business', the 'British Merchant', 'from the daily opportunities he has of being sensible to the value and necessity of their services; of being witness to the toils and hardships they daily submit to, has his affections kept awake to their sufferings'.

---

190 See for example in Hanway, Defects of Police (1775), p. 142; or Henry Fielding (1751), p. 23 (the 'Great' being under fashion's evil guidance); also Newman (1997), p. 70.
191 William Moss (1784), pp. 63-66.
members of the Marine Society could perhaps best be described as conservative reformers. Jonas Hanway asked in his *Letter from a Member of the Marine Society* (1757): 'What are we all but one great Family, whose Sovereign is their common parent?'\(^{192}\) – to question the authority of the father would have caused political instability, and the middle class dreaded instability as it dreaded anything that could endanger their businesses. Nevertheless, public statements of loyalty may be one thing, but the philanthropist would have at least gained the confidence that he was as capable as the traditional elite to manage affairs of state; a Jonas Hanway would always vacate the committee chair whenever a Lord Romney was present, but he would also have known that he himself had done the main work.\(^{193}\) Ultimately, the mere fact that the charities were regarded as necessary represented an unspoken criticism of the way the country was run.\(^{194}\) Having explored the general motives and background of the mid-century philanthropic movement we now turn to the Marine Society itself, the way it was run, by whom it was run, and by whom and how financed.

---


\(^{193}\) Kathleen Wilson (1990), in her study of the work routine of the voluntary hospitals, has found both, charities that confirmed the traditional order, but also others that served the emancipation of the middle class.

\(^{194}\) Also argued by Linda Colley (1994), p 93.
CHAPTER TWO:
Running a Charity in Mid-Eighteenth-Century London

II.1. Personnel, Posts and Procedures

How did a charity like the Marine Society handle its routine work, what was done by paid employees, and to what degree did people voluntarily sacrifice their time, what was the significance of the chosen post-holders, where did the Society's funds come from and how did the Society attract donations? All these questions will be tackled in the first three sections of this chapter. The men who had followed Jonas Hanway's invitation to the King's Arms tavern on 25 June 1756 agreed to form a committee that would be responsible for running the proposed Marine Society. The committee was to meet on a weekly basis; a general court was to be held every three months, including one annual court where the officers were chosen. Three committee members were to be the minimum to act, while two could do absolutely necessary business. The first task of the Society's committee was to inform the public of its foundation: an advertisement was published in all daily papers for one week, stating that men willing to enter on board his Majesty's ships could apply to the Marine Society for clothing and bedding. Furthermore, two thousand copies of a plan of the Marine Society were printed and dispersed, and the Admiralty was asked to discuss cooperation with the Society.¹

On the first meeting the Russia Company director John Thornton was unanimously elected as treasurer.² Presumably it was not only Thornton's reputation as a businessman and a philanthropist – amongst other charitable activities he was later also to become the treasurer of the Magdalen Hospital and a steward for the City of London Lying-In Hospital – but also his apparent piety and modesty that convinced his fellow

¹ MSY/A/1, 08/07/1756.
² MSY/A/1, 25/06/1756, & 21/07/1757 (re-election).
philanthropists that donations would be safe in his hands. Thornton is said to have had no relish for parade and magnificence, and to have been 'a stranger to the ordinary pleasures and amusements of the world'. Instead, he devoted his money and time to numerous charities, to such an extent, that, according to Thomas Scott's obituary, he occasionally withdrew himself entirely from any kind of socialising, fearing that he might waste time which could be used for more important issues. Nevertheless, we also have to assume that Thornton owed his position to a degree to the circumstance that a candidate from the Russia Company had the best chances of being elected, seeing that eight Company members were at the initial meeting. Being in charge of the finances meant that Thornton was for many years closely involved with the administrative side of running the Society. However, surprisingly he fairly soon withdrew from taking an active part in the committee's meetings. In 1756 he still attended half of the committee meetings, in 1757 he attended little more than a third, in 1758 even less, and in the following war-years he was hardly ever present. One wonders, why somebody so closely involved would so seldom turn up for meetings? Nevertheless, Thornton kept on donating to the charity, and remained the Society's treasurer. He was again elected treasurer when the Society was incorporated in 1772, though then the minutes also recorded that Jonas Hanway had unofficially acted as 'deputy-treasurer' in recent years.

For the first three weeks the committee meetings were held at the King's Arms tavern in Cornhill, but the search for an appropriate meeting place and a permanent office had begun immediately. Thornton, together with committee members William Bowden, a Virginia merchant, and Edmund Boehm, another Russia merchant, arranged to rent the Merchant Seamen's Office over the Royal Exchange as a meeting room. The choice

---

3 Scott (1791), pp. 9, 13.
4 Scott (1791), pp. 4-5, 13.
5 MSY/A/A, 25/06/1772.
6 For twelve guineas rent per year.
comes as no surprise, for the Russia Company had moved already into this room in 1748 for its meetings and it had later even set up its permanent offices in the same building.7

The Merchant Seamen’s Office was to be home to the Marine Society’s committee meetings for the following three years. A month after the Society’s foundation a professional secretary was finally chosen in John Stephens.8 Secretary Stephens’ own two rooms, located in a house in Princess Street, close to the Royal Exchange, also served as a permanent office, where the Society could be contacted and where meetings were held outside the weekly committee gatherings. In 1759, the committee decided to rent a room in Bishop(s)gate Street as a permanent office, since Stephens’ ground-floor rooms were considered extremely dark and inconvenient. The new office in Bishop(s)gate Street could also be used as a committee meeting room and thus replaced the Merchant Seamen’s Office. Renting such an office on a permanent basis cost the Society £18 18s per year, but the costs were reduced by £5, as the room was once a week rented to the Stepney Society.9 Though with the move to Bishop(s)gate Street secretary Stephens had lost the allowance that was paid to him for the use of his rooms, being the secretary was still a rewarding post: in 1759 he was earning £50 per year.10 In March 1757, Stephens got an assistant secretary, George Box, testifying to the Society’s expanding business.11 Box was also paid £50 per year; he had initially been an unsuccessful candidate for the position of the secretary. Box was also secretary to the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, where he earned another £50 a year.12 Evidently, being the secretary left the office-holder with time on hand for other positions, and once inside the philanthropists’ circle it was likely

7 MSY/A/1, 08/07/1756, 15/07/1756; and David Macmillan (1971/3), p. 224.
8 MSY/A/1, 22/07/1756.
9 MSY/A/1, 21/06/1759, 05/07/1759, and 16/08/1759.
10 MSY/A/1, 05/07/1759.
11 MSY/A/1, 03/03/1757; MSY/F/1, p. 95 (salary).
12 Box was secretary, assistant secretary, and later also collector for the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (see D.G.C. Allan [1979], pp. 71-73).
that these other positions were found in the charity business. Thus, the Marine Society
had initially also paid the secretary of the S.P.C.K., for helping to set up the Marine
Society, and for promoting it and recovering subscriptions.13

Assistant secretary Box left in 1758 (perhaps linked to his pay rise at the Society of
Arts), and was replaced by John Franklin,14 who in turn resigned in March 1760, when
friends had procured him a preferment in the country. What was remarkable about
Franklin's resignation was that the committee accepted it only under the condition that
Franklin would find and train a successor - apparently this time there must have been no
member keen to place someone, with whom he had personal, business or charity
connections.15 However, when in 1762 John Stephens left and the post of secretary
became vacant, there were again several members making their recommendations.16
Eventually John Bowbridge Webb received most backing, although, compared to the
salary heights Stephens had once reached, Webb had to be satisfied with £20 per year -
presumably the consequence of a reduced workload at the time, but also of the Society's
reduced funds. Nevertheless, Webb also got an assistant secretary, who was paid £10 a
year and lodged in the building, as the committee found it necessary that somebody
resided at their office.17

Next to a secretary, a doorkeeper was the other employee that had to be found right
at the start. Thomas Rogers was the first doorkeeper, and he was paid £10 per year.18
Presumably his services were required only on the days of committee meetings. When the
Society's finances ran low, in 1761, Rogers was told that the Society could no longer

13 MSY/A/1, 16/09/1756.
14 MSY/A/1, 23/03/1758.
15 MSY/A/1, 06/03/1760, 13/03/1760. William Thomas filled his vacancy.
16 MSY/A/1, 15/01/1762, 29/01/1762, 05/02/1762, 12/02/1762.
17 MSY/A/1, 12/02/1762 (Mr Gibbons). Secretary Bowbridge Webb resigned in August 1762, and was
replaced by Mr Gilchrist, who in turn was discharged in April 1764. For a list of all the Society's
secretaries until 1900 see loose paper collection in MSY/J/3.
18 MSY/A/1, 15/07/1756.
afford to pay him the full £10, but Rogers declared that he would take whatever they offered, and eventually he worked without receiving any payment at all. Later, the Society additionally employed higher-paid porters, who presumably worked all week. Not all of them were as committed as Rogers: one had to be threatened with dismissal if he did not always appear at the office by ten o’clock at the latest and stay until two. The Society knew by experience that it was necessary ‘to keep a strict Eye on the several Persons employ’d’, to prevent fraud. Thomas Tyson, one of the ‘conductors’ responsible for guiding boys to Portsmouth, was twice convicted of overcharging the Society for his expenses. Similarly, the ‘slopman’, providing the Society with the clothes, was found to have overcharged the Society for some articles. The Marine Society also mistrusted its contractor responsible for housing boys until they were sent to their ships – the secretary was ordered to check personally every week whether the contractor lodged and fed the youngsters as agreed. These visits had to be made on different days and without prior announcement. Similar checks were made at the training house for the fife-playing boys.

Ruth McClure in her study of the Foundling Hospital has found that its governors too kept a very strict eye on the employees, leading to a high staff turnover, though only one employee in thirteen years is recorded as having stolen money, while the majority appears to have been dismissed for not performing their duties correctly.

Another person the Marine Society intended to employ was a surgeon to check its recruits. Dr. John James offered his services, and it appears that he did so without any

---

19 MSY/A/1, 16/04/1761, 23/04/1761.
20 See for example MSY/F/1, pp. 104, 173; also MSY/A/1, 10/08/1758 for decision to employ from then on no more than two porters for the committee meetings.
21 MSY/A/1, 07/05/1762, 11/06/1762.
22 MSY/A/1, 09/03/1758, 13/04/1761.
23 MSY/A/1, 10/08/1758 (William Jesser).
24 MSY/A/1, 14/08/1760; also 13/04/1761.
25 McClure (1981), pp. 177-178. The theft was actually a very large sum, so perhaps there were further minor thefts that were not recorded.
26 MSY/A/1, 22/07/1756.
payment, attending the committee ‘from motives of humanity’. However, usually the landmen would have been inspected anyway by Navy captains and, if necessary, also Navy surgeons, so James’ services might not have been required very frequently. Nevertheless, though James was not a member, he hardly missed any meeting from July 1757 to early 1759, during which time he also donated five guineas. However, as the Society withdrew slowly from clothing landmen his skills were probably less demanded and subsequently he never attended any further meetings. Henry Haskey, an apothecary from Lombard Street, examined the boys’ health, provided the Society with medicines at a special rate, and checked the recovery of those boys who had minor illnesses and had been sent to the contractor’s lodging house to be cured. Haskey also donated a small sum to the Society, but he too did not become a committee member. Possibly he still made a profit with his medicines, yet he was nevertheless, according to Hanway, ‘remarkably diligent in his attendance and care’. Since so many boys had to go to Portsmouth, the Society employed an agent there, who was paid a regular salary and also took care of a warehouse that the Society rented. The warehouse was used for storing clothing and bedding, which in turn relieved the Society of the notoriously unreliable Southwark waggoner who used to take to Portsmouth all the equipment that the boys did not need on their march there.

The one post so far not mentioned is the one that one would at first consider the most important, the chairman. The justification for addressing his post so late is simple: he was little more than a figurehead, and indeed, it appears that nobody was elected for

---

27 MSY/A/1, 12/08/1756. The minutes do not mention anything regarding any reward for James’ services; according to the Society he attended ‘from motives of humanity’ (see Society’s rules published in Hanway, *Account of the Marine Society* ([1759, 6th ed.], p. 79).
28 For Haskey see also Mortimer’s *Universal Director: Part I* (1763), p. 62; and Andrew (1989), p. 87, fn. 23.
30 See for example MSY/A/1, 17/03/1757; MSY/F 1, p. 95.
As in similar societies, the choice of a chairman fell not on an active committee member, but on a man of some fame, whose name could be used to promote the society in public as trustworthy, and who could establish connections with rich subscribers. And as in many societies, the middle-class philanthropists chose a member of the nobility as their chairman: Lord Robert Romney. Romney had two years earlier supported William Shipley in founding the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, and had become its chairman too; he later also became a member of the Magdalen Hospital. Romney was only made a member of the committee in March 1757, and one may presume that the post of the chairman was established only then (or later, at the annual meeting), that is almost a year after the Society's foundation. For one year Romney attended about half the committee meetings. But from then on he disappeared completely, attending only two more meetings in the whole war period. In July 1758, he gave the Society permission to open any letter addressed to him arriving at the office.

In addition to Romney eight further deputy chairmen were chosen. The minutes refer to these positions for the first time in February 1758. Secretary Stephens was ordered to approach the Lord Mayor Sir Charles Asgill, the former Lord Mayor and current MP (Tory) for the City Sir Robert Ladbroke, the former Lord Mayor and founding member Slingsby Bethel, the Lord Register of Scotland Alexander Hume Campbell, Sir William Dolben Bart., Sir Joseph Hankey, Robert Nettleton, and Thomas Walker 'to beg leave, that the Committee might name them as Deputy chairmen'. The wording of the minutes

---

31 The Society’s fair minutes actually never explicitly mention any election for a chairman having taken place. There is no mention of a chairman in the Society’s early publications. The first hint in the minutes that Lord Romney had been elected as chairman appears only in December 1757, when Hanway addresses Romney as chairman in a letter (MSY/A/1, 08/12/1757).

32 MSY/A/1, 17/03 1757.

33 MSY/A/1, 28/07/1758.


35 Ladbroke had (presumably) started his business career as a distiller and later become a banker. His parents have not been ascertained (see Narnier & Brooke [1964]).
hints that these too were not contested and influential posts, but that they had a public relations function. Only the last four of these eight men were active committee members. The importance of the other four, however, should not be underestimated, as the representatives of the City were highly important for reaching financially strong subscribers from the business community. Hence the Marine Society was always very keen to gain the current Lord Mayor as a promoter in the City, and in the following year 1759, the then Lord Mayor and MP (Tory) for the City, Sir Richard Glyn Bart., replaced Slingsby Bethel as deputy chairman. In the cases of Sir Charles Asgill and Sir Richard Glyn Bart. the cooperation went even further, as they were also two of the Society’s bankers, as was deputy chairman Sir Joseph Hankey. When Glyn went bankrupt in 1772 he still owed the Society some money. According to the Society’s rules the chairman, one of the deputy chairmen, or the treasurer had to chair the committee meetings, and only in their absence was it left to ‘the oldest member, or he that is most conversant in the business’ of the Society, to preside over the meetings. However, while in the first two months Thomas Walker chaired most meetings, from September 1756 on, and for the many years to follow, Jonas Hanway chaired almost all meetings, despite the fact that he did not hold any post, and despite the presence of postholders such as Thornton, Dolben, or Walker. Only occasionally, as a mark of respect, Hanway vacated the chair when a high-ranking person was present.

From the start the Society’s work routine made clear that this was a project of committed professionals. The weekly meeting on Thursdays, at eleven o’clock, was not once cancelled or postponed in the initial years. Only in February 1759 was there for the

---

36 See for example MSY/A/1, 15/01/1761. Additionally, the Lord Mayor could also provide the Society with recruits (boys and men), who had somehow ended up in the care of the law.

37 See Society’s rules published in Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 78. Glyn was a son of a drysalter, who had worked first in his father’s profession and then co-founded a bank.

38 MSY/A/4, 25/06/1772.

39 Later changed to ten, and then twelve o’clock.
first time no Thursday meeting – it had been moved to a Wednesday, as the Russia Company had asked to use the meeting-room on that particular Thursday.\footnote{MSY/A/1, 28/02/1759.} The proceedings during the meetings followed an established routine. First the officers and their recruits were dealt with, then the previous week’s minutes and all letters written were read and confirmed, then the number of men and boys equipped during the week was announced, as well as the amount of the weekly subscriptions, then any matter brought forward by individual members was discussed, and all letters received were read out. After that any possible visitors were received, the accounts signed, and only at the end were the new boys inspected and assigned to their ships.\footnote{Routine established in MSY/A/1, 15/12/1757.} Allegedly the Society’s meetings lasted for four hours, which, if true, would demonstrate the charitable spirit of its members.\footnote{See Society’s rules published in Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III. (1758), p. 14. Later, in the rules published in Hanway’s Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 81, they are said to last generally for three hours.} Thus, whereas today voluntary organisations arrange their meetings for evenings, after the members have finished their regular work, and limit their meetings to one or two hours, attending the Marine Society’s committee meant having to sacrifice the prime time of a working day. Undoubtedly, being an active member required not only great commitment but also a degree of financial independence.

Also right from the beginning the Society kept various business books, such as a fair-minute book for the resolutions, a copybook for letters, a small ledger for accounts, and an entry book for the recruits. Unfortunately, no correspondence of the Society’s early years has survived. This is particularly regrettable, as we have no feedback letters from captains and officers, which could tell us about their experiences with Marine-Society recruits. However, the Society had very close links to Navy personnel, and many officers and captains came in person to pick up their boys, hence much was anyway discussed face to face. This also explains why there is little correspondence with the Society in the
Admiralty records. Occasionally the Society invited the Lords of the Admiralty to inspect some of their boys, and this offered an opportunity to discuss any important issues.\textsuperscript{43}

To expand their scheme, and to open branches in other parts of the country, was a 'natural' ambition for the numerous overseas merchants in the Marine Society, who were used to organising trade projects across the world. Once again it was particularly Jonas Hanway who tried to win like-minded people in other cities to the idea. In May 1758, the Society was informed that a Dublin Marine Society had been established, and that it was hoping to receive assistance of its London original.\textsuperscript{44} However, Hanway's attempts to found branches in Exeter, Plymouth, and Bristol were unsuccessful,\textsuperscript{45} even though in Exeter a subscription had already been started and an initial meeting had been held. Eventually the Marine Society had to accept that, apart from the Dublin Society, all attempts had failed. Perhaps the Marine Society was, like many other charities, a London society, tackling a social misery among boys and young men that did not appear as threatening elsewhere. Yet, as the next section will show, this did not mean that the London Marine Society was supported solely by Londoners. What this section has shown is that the Marine Society was from the start run very professionally, with a small number of paid staff and requiring little fixed capital, thus being able to react flexibly to a possible drain of subscriptions. The secretary was the most important employee, and even though a charity like the Marine Society did not offer a lifelong career, working closely with philanthropists who were active in numerous charitable as well as business operations would usually open the way to employment opportunities in other organisations. The chairman and the deputy chairmen of the Society, in contrast, had little to do with the running the charity, and even the treasurer's input was less than one

\textsuperscript{43} ADM 2/709, 01/04/1758, p. 470; ADM 2/712, 05/06/1759, p. 330.
\textsuperscript{44} MSY/A/1, 18/05/1758.
\textsuperscript{45} MSY/A/1, 02/06/1757, & 03/11/1757 (contrary to the impression Clark [2000], pp. 98-99, gives).
would have expected; their appointments had more to do with their reputation and connections to potential donors. Hence a list of such posts in a biography should not, as is sometimes done, be taken as proof of a life devoted to charity. Those who really wanted to have an input into the Society had to invest almost a full working day every week, and the next section will show who and how many were willing to donate so much time to charity.

II.2. Members, Subscribers, and Jonas Hanway

Twenty-two men had attended the Society's founding meeting at the King's Arms tavern and formed the committee; the opening page of the Society's fair minute book, however, already lists fifty names as having been appointed as committee members. The first on the list is the Right Honourable Lord Mayor Slingsby Bethel, while Mr Hanway is named last. At least half of those fifty were merchants (eight of them Russia merchants), two were Navy captains, and at least three were bankers. The list contains many names familiar from the membership lists of other charities, such as the Foundling Hospital, the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, or later the Magdalen Hospital. The committee was to act for one year, like all the officers, but, though the minutes occasionally record when men had been accepted as new members, general committee elections are never mentioned. Next to Lord Mayor Bethel, only the Right Honourable Lord Register Alexander Hume Campbell, who was also a vice president of the Foundling Hospital, and one baronet (Sir Joseph van Neck), as well as four knights sported anything more than Esquire on this first committee list. Van Neck was a merchant, and also the knights Sir Charles Asgill, Sir Joseph Hankey, and Sir John Barnard came from the business world: Asgill had worked his way up in a bank from clerk to partner, was knighted in 1752, later becoming Lord Mayor, one of the Society's deputy chairmen, and also joining the Magdalen Hospital. Similarly,
Hankey, also later a deputy-chairman of the Society, was a banker and alderman, had already subscribed to Fielding’s enterprise for recruiting boys, and was a member in other charities such as the Foundling Hospital (as a vice president). The former Lord Mayor Sir John Barnard, son of a merchant, was also a member of the Foundling Hospital and president of Christ’s Hospital, had worked in the marine insurance business and as a Spain merchant, but was also now an ageing long-serving alderman, magistrate and MP for the City.46 No member of the high nobility was in this first fifty-man strong committee, nor were any of these knights just mentioned a driving force in the Society’s committee.

In a publication of January 1757 the committee named six more members, one of them being John Fielding.47 This list still did not include the chairman Lord Robert Romney, nor Sir William Dolben Bart., nor Robert Nettleton, the deputy chairmen. Romney and Dolben joined the committee two months later,48 Russia merchant Nettleton only half a year later.49 The January 1757 list also stated that the committee had the right to choose up to ten more members. However, within the following year the committee grew to almost one hundred members. It seems to have been nowhere laid down what it took to become a committee member. In other charities subscribers became annual members by making a small subscription, or life-members through a very large one. It appears that five guineas per year was the customary minimum subscription for membership of the Marine Society’s committee; however, the Society did not openly demand any second subscription, as it thought that its activities were so obviously necessary that there would always be new subscribers as long as the war lasted.50

Commitment, position and reputation certainly also played a part in becoming a

47 List in Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 1st ed.), pp. 32-33.
48 MSY/A/1, 17/03/1757 (Romney), 31/03/1757 (Dolben).
49 MSY/A/1, 22/09/1757.
50 MSY/A/1, 08/01/1762.
committee member, which is why some Navy captains, for example, were accepted with a subscription of only two guineas.\textsuperscript{51} John Fielding even became a member without ever donating any money personally. Others, like the founding members John Jackson, a merchant, or James Henckel and Josiah Hardy, had initially paid five guineas and remained on the committee for years without making any second donation. There were, of course, also members who gave more than the minimum. Men like Hanway, Thornton, and Romney would pay on average ten guineas each year. Subscribers paying more than twenty pounds would usually be considered as candidates for the committee, though there were also some large subscribers, like Henry Hoare, who three times donated £21, but never joined the committee.

While the committee grew from fifty to almost one hundred members in the first two years, the average committee attendance went from nine in 1756 slightly up to eleven in 1757, then back to ten in 1758, fell to seven in 1759, and then down to five in 1760. In a way the committee attendance mirrored the support of the subscribers, which shrank the more the public felt that the war would be won. The annual and quarterly courts of the committee were then still attracting a two-digit number of people (partly also because the Society sent invitations to some members and advertised the quarterly meetings in the newspapers)\textsuperscript{52}, but the weekly meetings were often attended by only three or four members. In 1761, the average attendance fell to four, despite the fact that it was becoming clear that the war was not going to end as quickly as expected. At the end of the year the Society even took a Christmas break, which today any society would do, but something that the Marine Society had never done before. In 1762, the average attendance fell to three, and in some meetings Jonas Hanway was left alone, until in October a surprising message from Hamburg changed the whole fate of the Society and

\textsuperscript{51} Captains Bollard, Cockburn, Dyve and Craig.
\textsuperscript{52} See for example \textit{Public Advertiser}, 12/01/1757, 04/04/1757, 02-05/01/1758.
attracted numerous members back to the committee meetings, as well as others that had never attended before.

The one man who dominated the committee, hardly ever missing a meeting, was the gentleman whom popular history wants to remember only for allegedly having introduced the umbrella to London: Jonas Hanway. Despite the various authors who have already written about Hanway, notably James S. Taylor and John H. Hutchins, a study of the Marine Society’s early years would be incomplete without sparing a few more words on Hanway’s person and his activities outside the Marine Society. Hanway was the (often anonymous) author of most of the Society’s public statements, and the originator of most of its initiatives. All this he did without holding any official post – only when the Society was incorporated in 1772 did he become deputy treasurer to Thornton – yet there was nothing extraordinary in this, as the posts of chairman and deputy chairmen primarily served public relations purposes. Apart from being an overseas merchant, two aspects of Hanway’s private life connected him to the cause of the Marine Society. The first one was the family connection to the Royal Navy: his father was a victualling agent for the Navy, his brother Thomas was a Navy captain, and it appears that Jonas too had at one point considered joining the Royal Navy. The second connection is the fact that Hanway, like so many Marine-Society boys, grew up without a father, who died two years after his birth.

Starting with the foundation of the Marine Society, and becoming a member of the Foundling Hospital and of the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, Hanway embarked upon a unique career as a philanthropist, while gradually withdrawing from the business world, aided by a small legacy and the success of the publication of his travels as a Russia merchant. Hanway’s biographer John H. Hutchins claims that ‘Hanway’s unquestioned honesty, his intimate knowledge of the problems of the poor, and his wide experience with the administration of charitable
organisations gave him a position almost unique in Georgian London', and James S. Taylor rates him the most effective British philanthropist of his time. Hanway's involvement in charities was certainly impressive. Next to the Marine Society, he was also the co-founder (together with fellow Russia Merchants) of the Magdalen Hospital for penitent prostitutes, which was often portrayed as the female counterpart to the Marine Society, of the Misericordia Hospital for venereal diseases, and of the Troop Society to support British soldiers in Germany and North America, which again provided clothing for men in the armed services. He was also active in the Stepney Society, and, as mentioned earlier, at the Foundling Hospital, where he was one of the most regular committee attenders, and the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce. In later years Hanway moved a little away from the institutional charities towards one-man campaigns. He was among the first to bring the horrible working conditions of chimney sweeps' apprentices into a public debate, but most important was his campaign against the high mortality of the parish infants of London, a campaign that led to the so-called 'Hanway Acts' of 1762 and 1767.

As impressive as his active involvement in charities was the number of publications he produced concerning these charities. Altogether he published more than seventy books and pamphlets - about his charities, as well as about such diverse topics as religion, the uses of music, or the advantages of rising early. In an essay on drinking tea, the 'Chinese drug', he urged his fellow Englishmen not to indulge in this evil habit - arguably his least

---

53 Hutchins (1940), p. xiv.
54 Taylor (1985), p. 188.
55 While the Marine Society removed the boys from the streets, and gave them employment at sea, to avoid the danger of the boys turning to crime, the Magdalen Hospital intended to remove destitute girls and young women from the streets, and to provide them with employment, to prevent the danger of the girls having to turn to prostitution.
56 Over two decades Hanway was the fourth most regular committee attender at the Foundling Hospital (according to David Allin, in letter to author [15/04 2000]; David Allin is currently preparing a PhD thesis on the history of the Foundling Hospital).
57 2 George III, c. 22 (1762), and 7 George III, c. 39 (1767). The first ordered, amongst other measures, the parish to keep a record of the children in its care, and the second arranged that the infants were to be nursed outside London.
effective campaign. Even his clerk and first biographer John Pugh, who painted a
generally positive picture, remembered a 'certain singularity of thought' in Hanway.58
His bibliography also contains less charitable publications against the naturalisation of
Jews, written during the debate on the so-called Jew Bill of 1753.59 His writings usually
played a key role in the advertising campaigns of the respective charities. In the case of
the Marine Society, he donated the property and one thousand copies of his Letter from
a Member of the Marine Society to the Society, to use (and reproduce) in
advertisements. Hanway's writing was occasionally rather wordy and lacked style, as he
himself admitted, which made him a target for Samuel Johnson's mockery - not just for
his style, but also for his habit of criticising so many every-day habits. However, it was
probably this fussiness, his high moral standards and his perfectionism that also made
Hanway such a zealous philanthropist, and his charity activities so successful in bettering
the fate of the poor. Despite being a strong advocate of population increase, always
advising his readers to marry early and to found large families, he never founded a family
himself, leaving him with time to care for public affairs.

Though none of the other committee members came close to Hanway's contribution,
there were a few on whose regular attendance the Society could rely, but they were not
the famous names familiar from the world of philanthropy, business and politics, nor did
they, apart from one, hold any post in the Society. Thomas Walker,60 John Skelton, John
Lodge, Jacob Gonzales61, and John Blake were among the most active. Walker was a
long serving deputy chairman and yet also an active committee member, in particular in

58 Pugh (1940), p. 231.
59 The Christian Hanway feared the cultural influence of the Jews, and the merchant Hanway feared the
Jewish business competition, as the trade with Russia was only allowed to British merchants. For the
debate around the Jew Bill see Thomas Perry (1962).
60 Not identical with Fowler Walker, who had helped Fielding with his recruitment.
61 Also Gonzales. Remarkably, despite his regular attendance and repeated donations he is not listed as a
committee member in the Society's publications.
the Society’s early days. John Blake was a regular subscriber to the Society, and one of the few people other than Hanway that came up with alterations to the Society’s publications. All these regular committee attendants are of remarkably little fame. Lodge, who, together with Hanway, chose the Society’s new office in 1759, and Skelton are even usually named as Mr rather than Esqr. One suspects, however, that some of the most frequently present members were also professionally involved with the Marine Society. John Lodge certainly gained something from being such a regular committee attender: his company was paid for dying the recruits’ clothes. Mortimer’s *Universal Director* (1763) also lists a linen-draper John Blake, and a woollen-draper Skelton, who was based at the Royal Exchange, that is next door to the Society’s first office. The *Universal Director* also records a linen-draper named Thomas Walker, though there is no evidence that this was the Marine-Society member Walker. Some other members must also have profited from the production of the Society’s shoes, as it is said that they were produced in Northamptonshire under the direction of some members whose estates where there. Such business involvements of members might partly explain one question that nobody ever seems to have raised, and that is why the Society got involved at all in ordering their own clothing, rather than just paying the Navy (or the individual ship’s purser), which supplied its ships with clothing and bedding so that the recruits could buy them on board.

---

62 Hanway’s clerk John Pugh even wrongly recollects that Walker, together with Hanway, had been rewarded with a silver anchor for his service to the Society (Pugh [1788], p. 141). In fact it was Fielding, who received together with Hanway an anchor award, and the final section of this chapter will show that Pugh’s error was perhaps a deliberate one.
63 MSY/A/1, 26/06/1760.
64 MSY/F/1.
65 There is also a West India merchant named Thomas Walker.
67 Another explanation could be that the Society could distinguish its recruits by a specific uniform. The Royal Navy received its clothing at the start of the Seven Years War from just one London clothier (Bryant and Simpson), but continuous complaints about poor quality and late deliveries forced the Navy to finish the contract in 1756, and eventually the Navy Board decided to take the distribution under its own control, while being supplied by various different clothing manufacturers.
Next to Walker, Skelton, Lodge, Gonzales, and Blake two Navy captains, Andrew Cockburn\(^{68}\) and Henry Dyve, were among the most regular attenders, though they were also performing their duty as recruitment officers of the Navy. Usually the two resided at their recruitment office in Mark Lane, and there they were for a while regularly joined by the committee member Richard DuHorty, a merchant, who inspected the candidates who might qualify for the Society's clothing bounty.\(^{69}\) DuHorty, next to Hanway, was also one of the members frequently named to certain sub-committees on specialist issues concerning the Marine Society, usually together with George Peters and Andrew Thomson, both Russia merchants, William Wood, a Secretary of the Customs, William Mayne, Royal Exchange Assurance director and Lisbon merchant, and Michael Adolphus, also a merchant.\(^{70}\) Adolphus was a Jew, but nothing suggests that he had trouble in working together with Jonas Hanway. Other members based outside London, or spending long intervals at other places, and therefore not regular attenders, proved very helpful in promoting the Marine Society in their places, such as the De Ponthieus, two general merchants, in Manchester,\(^{71}\) Sam Hough in Bombay,\(^{72}\) or the Colchester MP Charles Gray, who also provided the Society with recruits from his home town.\(^{73}\) Hanway's appreciation of Gray, whom the History of Parliament describes as a cautious, conservative reformer with a great interest in the condition and education of the poor and hence very reminiscent of Hanway,\(^{74}\) is testified by the fact that Hanway published his *Reasons for an Augmentation of at least Twelve Thousand Mariners* (1759) in the form of thirty-three letters to him. There were also very active non-committee members,

---

\(^{68}\) Or Cokburn.
\(^{69}\) MSY/F/1.
\(^{70}\) See for example MSY/A/1, 06/10/1757, 01/12/1757, 27/04/1758.
\(^{71}\) In the minutes spelled Depenthieu.
\(^{72}\) MSY/A/1, 16/07/1761.
\(^{73}\) Gray became a committee member on 14 March 1757, with only two guineas, though he subscribed the same amount in the following years. Occasionally he chaired Marine-Society meetings.
\(^{74}\) See Namier & Brooke (1964).
who organised subscriptions for the Society at their places, or collected boys on a larger scale in their region, such as Francis Grant and Thomas Gairdner in Edinburgh. Grant had written to the Society in March 1758, offering thirty boys he had collected at Edinburgh, and then and in future the Society was happy to pay him for clothing his boys, before they were sent down on board naval vessels. Possibly Grant had initially got into contact with the Marine Society through the Free British Fishery Society, another typical eighteenth-century patriotic association, which also included members and subscribers of the Marine Society, such as William Bowden. In fact, the Fishery Society was even founded in the same London tavern, the King’s Arms.

There are a few noteworthy absentees on the Marine Society’s committee lists. First of all there were no women on the committee, despite the fact that some made considerable donations. It was probably nowhere written down that one had to be male to join the committee, but, as in other charities, female members were out of the question. There were notable male absentees too: despite the strong involvement of the Russia merchants, Charles Dingley’s prominent brother Robert, also a Russia merchant and representing the Company at Parliament and the Admiralty, as well as a director of the Bank of England (1757-67), and a driving force behind the Magdalen Hospital, was not a member. However, he attended the committee a few times, usually together with his brother, and subscribed ten guineas. Also magistrate Saunders Welch, who had

---

75 MSY/A/1, 16/03/1758, 23/03/1758.
76 See Harris (1999), pp. 312-313.
77 The London Guildhall Library holds a satirical print of 1769 entitled ‘The Bat le of Cornhill’, depicting yet another meeting of merchants in the King’s Arms, this time to sign an address to King George III, during which the atmosphere gets so heated up that Mr Dingley is knocked down (Guildhall Library, Satirical Print Collection, p5427967).
79 MSY/A/1, 05/10/1758, 12/10 1758, 19/10/1758 & 09/10/1760. James Taylor suggests that Robert Dingley, though an active philanthropist in earlier days, was concentrating on his business activities, and gave his ill health as a reason for not being more active in charities (Taylor 1985], p. 77).
helped Fielding to run his recruitment enterprise, was not a committee member, nor did he ever donate any money.

As the Navy's captains profited so much from the Marine Society, and since the inspection and distribution of the recruits required that the Society had close contact to Navy captains, it is no wonder that several captains joined the Society's committee, and even more of them made donations. On the Society's first committee were already the captains Thomas Bennet, Robert Craig, and Hanway's brother Thomas. By 1758, six captains and Admiral Broderick had been made committee members. Donors from the Navy included Admirals Boscawen, Broderick, Forbes, Hawke, Hardy, Mostyn, Pocock, Rowley, Saunders, and Temple West, who all subscribed between ten and thirty guineas each; and Admiral Durell, who donated his Chatham pension. Furthermore, Dr. Hay, Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty, gave on two occasions ten guineas, and Lord Anson twice subscribed fifty guineas. Additionally, by 1758, twenty-nine captains of ships had donated between one and ten guineas each. Among these was Captain Hugh Palliser, who in February 1759, together with his officers and company, decided to give their share of the recapture of the Winchelsea to the Marine Society as a donation. The committee reacted by writing to the captains of the other ships involved in taking the Winchelsea, to inform them of this donation, and to express the hope that they would act similarly. This was a rather straightforward approach, and not the only hint that the Society felt that having received donations from merely 10% (roughly estimated) of the captains of ships in commission in 1756-8 was very unsatisfactory. In a letter to

80 MSY/A/1, 21/05/1761.
81 Lady Anson was also among the subscribers.
82 MSY/F/1, pp. 92-93; and Hanway, Three Letters (1758).
83 MSY/A/1, 01/02/1759, 27/03/1760, 21/08/1760; MSY/F/1, pp. 144, 195. Apparently the donation did not materialise, as the Winchelsea was property of the crown. The only consolation for the Society would have been that on the same day Captain Douglas had donated the produce of a dead whale, which he had fished out of the sea.
84 A study of the Navy's List Books (ADM 8/31-32) could produce the exact number of captains that served between 1756 and 1758.
Admiral Saunders in 1760 the Society pointed out how helpful its work was to officers and asked Saunders to encourage his officers to subscribe. Letters were prepared for each captain who had not yet subscribed in which the Society reminded them that without its work many of their ships would have gone to sea with only half their quota of servants, and that 'the Society are happy in thinking, they have been instrumental in putting some Thousands of Pounds into the Pockets of his Majesty's Sea Officers'. Perhaps this very direct tone can be partly explained by the fact that subscriptions were running low at the time, but it nevertheless suggests that the Society was not satisfied with the contributions of those, who, in the Society's eyes, profited most directly from its work.

Despite the disappointing contributions from the Navy, the Society's total of subscriptions was probably unmatched by any other subscription society at the time: by the end of the war, until December 1762, the Marine Society had managed to attract £22,553 11s 2d in subscriptions. Subscribers usually paid straight into the hands of the bankers, who were often committee members. For many charities the main concern was to achieve durability through a long-term financial investment; the Marine Society, however, did not consider this at first, presumably because its founders thought of it as being limited to the duration of the war. Thus the subscriptions were almost entirely spent: £8,948 on clothing for men; £8,440 on clothing for boys; and £5,040 on conveying, feeding, and curing boys, on medicines, rents, and salaries.

---

85 MSY/A/1, 21/08/1760, 28/08/1760.
86 The letters addressed to the Admirals were toned down in the following week: 'instrumental in putting some Thousands of Pounds into the Pockets of his Majesty's Sea Officers' was changed to 'instrumental in Serving his Majesty's Sea Officers'.
87 For subscriptions to the Society for the whole war-period see MSY/U/21 (contains only larger amounts), as well as the quarterly and annual accounts in MSY/A/1&2; for detailed lists for shorter periods see Hanway, Three Letters (1758); Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.) at British Library bound together with subscriptions list of 1760; and Hanway, Christian Knowledge made easy (1763), after p. 56.
The donations that were vital for the Society's take off were those made by the City Companies, which again shows how important it was to gain influential City people, like the Lord Mayor, as allies.88 The Companies of Clothworkers, Grocers, Salters, Drapers, Stationers, Fishmongers, Merchant Taylors, Skinners, Apothecaries, and Vintners all donated £100 each within the first half year. The first five donated another £100 in later years, and the Clothworkers even paid a third £100 subscription.89 As could be expected, the Russia Company, already well represented by individuals among the members and subscribers, also made an early £100 donation. The East India Company, another company with connections to various maritime charities, gave £200 starting aid. In the years to follow further 'Worshipful Companies' subscribed to the Marine Society: the Companies of Saddlers, Cooks, Carpenters, Goldsmiths, Weavers and Coopers gave between £50 and £200 each. In all, the donations of these companies amounted to about 12% of the total of all subscriptions. On top of that, when in 1758 the Society's secretary attended the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen Sheriffs and Common Council of London with a petition, the City of London subscribed £500 – yet another case where it proved useful to have the Lord Mayor as a deputy chairman, and as the Society's banker.90 All such large donations were immediately published, as an advertisement for the Society as well as for the donor.91

Another source of larger subscriptions, though not so numerous, were ten benefit theatre performances. Evidently, it paid for a London charity to have personal contacts

88 See for example Hanway, Lodge, and Skelton visiting the Lord Mayor in January 1761, and the Lord Mayor expressing 'his approbation of the Institution by subscribing & promising to use his Interest with the City & the Grocer's Company for further Subscriptions to this Society' (MSY/A/1, 15/01/1761).
89 Second subscription of Company of Salters only £50.
90 MSY/F/1, 19/10/1758, p. 109. See also donation of city of York's authorities in MSY/A/1, 28/02/1760.
91 See for example Gentleman's Magazine, April 1757, p. 138 (Russia Company donation), December 1758, p. 609 (City of London); Public Advertiser, 15/01/1757 (Company of Salters).
not only to the City, but also to the West End, and here John Fielding was the member with the most useful connections. Two benefit plays by David Garrick and James Lacey, the *Suspicious Husband* and the *Tragedy of Zara*, brought £380; and a benefit show of Handel's *Acis and Galatea* given by the proprietors at Ranelagh House over £500. Furthermore, Mr Rich gave benefits of the *Miser* and *Othello*, Thomas Rosamon a benefit at Sadlers Wells, Signora Mingotti the opera *Rosmira*, and Marine-Society member Michael Adolphus arranged a benefit play at Bath. Together, these benefit performances made up a little over 6% of the total funds. However, as impressive as the sum is, a look at contemporary newspapers shows that such benefit performances were nothing exceptional, and that men like Garrick organised so many that one almost gets the feeling that an organisation such as the Marine Society should have received more than these ten.

The largest individual subscriptions, 7% of the total, came in when John Thornton and Jonas Hanway waited on the King, and on the Prince and the Princess of Wales, to present an abstract of the *Letter of a Member of the Marine Society*. They received donations of £1000, £400 and £200 respectively. The fact that the royal names could be used in advertisements, and thus testify the Marine Society's credibility, probably weighed even more than the monetary donations. The remaining share of the funds, roughly 75%, came from numerous smaller subscriptions between one guinea and twenty pounds. Thus, not only in terms of money, but also in terms of numbers of individual subscribers the Marine Society was probably far ahead of other contemporary societies.

---

92 See also MSY/F/1, 25/10/1759 (p. 191), 08 11/1759 (p. 193), 13/12/1759 (p. 198).
93 See also *London Magazine*, June 1757, p. 305.
95 Further benefit performances were a play at Lynn Regis by Mr Knox, master of the grammar school, a second benefit at Ranelagh, and a concert at Manchester.
96 See *Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1757, p. 235; *Public Advertiser*, 19/05/1757.
97 Donna Andrew reckons that the mid-century London charities analysed in her study only had between 100 and 500 subscribers (Andrew [1989]), p. 87).
According to a detailed list of subscribers covering the period up to July 1760 (and thus almost 95% of all wartime subscriptions) the Society received altogether 1,776 subscriptions.\textsuperscript{98} Around one hundred of these were subscriptions made by the above-mentioned companies (or by businesses, or societies), which did not list individuals, but were representing more than one donor. Only 213 of the 1,776 were a second or further payment made by the same subscriber. Having so many different subscribers was in line with the way the Society liked to style itself, as a movement of all people:

The Society is composed of some of the prime Nobility and Gentry, of the first Citizens and most eminent Merchants and Tradesmen: and because it is intended to be of general Utility, no Mechanic or Labourer is excluded: it is calculated to take in the whole.\textsuperscript{99}

And indeed this meant that there were also donors, perhaps no more than fifty, from the nobility, though none of them played an active part in the running of the Society. They usually donated a more than average sum, or made more than one subscription, such as Lord Maynard or Viscount Lord Folkestone, who made five subscriptions each. Folkestone, together with Lord Romney, had already helped Shipley to found the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce. Donna Andrew writes that the Marine Society received little aristocratic support,\textsuperscript{100} and indeed their percentage was small. However, we have to see their participation in relation to the extraordinarily widespread support for the Society, and then their number becomes less marginal. Having widespread support also included – unlike the Society’s committee – female subscribers, though, like the nobility, their share remained below 5%.

Among the more modest subscriptions were some donors who donated rather unwillingly: John Fielding had passed on the fines several bakers had to pay for selling

\textsuperscript{98} Counting those contributing to a collective subscription as individual donors, whenever they are listed as individuals. The list of 1760 is bound together with Hanway’s Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6\textsuperscript{th} ed.) held at the British Library.

\textsuperscript{99} Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed.), pp. 7-8.

\textsuperscript{100} Andrew (1989), p. 88.
bread of inferior quality, as well as ten guineas from three gentlemen, ‘being the
Restitution for an Insult’. A Mr Benjamin De Israeli donated four guineas, ‘being so
much received as a Composition for an Injury received in a Fray at the Playhouse’.101
The Society even profited from reckless driving on London’s streets, as a hackney
coachman had to pay for damage done to a gentleman’s chariot. Smaller subscriptions
often found their way into the Society’s accounts through collections made at clubs or by
societies. There were collections by the Robin-Hood Society, the Gentlemen of the Beef-
Steake Society, and the Society of true Protestant Britons of the City of Norwich. The
Society of Antigallicans, already a sponsor of Fielding’s enterprise in 1756, and having as
their grand-president Lord Blakeney, one of the few Marine-Society members from the
nobility,102 arranged five collections worth £223.10.0. Particularly for people outside
London such collective subscriptions were the only practical way to make their
contribution. Unlike most other London charities, the subscriptions for the Marine
Society came not just from London, but from throughout the country and indeed
throughout the world, wherever Britons lived or worked.103 London’s youth problems
may have been a local cause, the support of the Navy, however, was of great concern for
those living in the whole of Britain, and even more so for those in the colonies.104 It is
testimony of the degree of globalisation of the mid-eighteenth-century overseas
merchants that the Society received subscriptions from distant places, despite the fact
that it had such a short time to become known and to build up trust. Large subscriptions
came from Salisbury, Liverpool, Leeds, Hull, Norwich, Chester, York – collections

101 Probably the Italy merchant da Israeli.
102 Blakeney became a Marine-Society member somewhere between 1757 and 1759, and all the
Antigallicans’ collections were passed on by him (for Blakeney and Antigallicans see London Magazine,
103 Ruth McClure has shown that the Foundling Hospital too received support from abroad (see McClure
[1981], pp. 179ff.).
104 And, as we shall see in chapter four, even the aspect of sending unemployed or troublesome boys
away to the sea via the Navy was something that appealed to parish officers and community leaders
throughout Britain – more than the Marine Society would have liked.
organised by local mayors, local clubs of gentlemen, assizes, or groups of merchants. Furthermore, the Society received donations from as far away as Calcutta (£689), Bombay (£220 from the local East India Company service), the North American colonies, Antigua, and Barbados.  

According to Donna Andrew's estimates about 20% of the income of all London charities were legacies. The Marine Society during the war years, however, remained far below this average. The legacies of Charles Stanhope in 1760, and Peter Lewis Levius in 1761, leaving £100 each, were the only major bequests. It was not that the committee did not try: when in 1757 Richard Taunston left a large sum to be disposed of for charities, for example, the Society sent an eight-man strong delegation to the manager of his bequest. The Society was probably still too new, and furthermore was expected to last no longer than the war. However, the picture was to change dramatically in 1762, with an unexpected legacy from Germany — significantly, given the Society's broad base, from someone living outside England — to which we will return in the last chapter. For this section we can conclude that those most active in the Marine Society had a merchant background; even the famous figures who were offered posts had usually worked their way up in the world of banking and trading. None of the active members belonged to the nobility. In the early years many members sacrificed a substantial part of their week for the Society, however, as the war went on and appeared less threatening, participation sank, leaving all the work to a small circle of men. Next to Jonas Hanway, the most regular attenders were of surprisingly little fame, and also did not belong to the Russia Company. There is reason to believe that at least some of these regular attenders had also commercial connections to the Society. Thus, while the first section has shown

105 See also MSY/A/1, 16/11/1758, 07/06/1759, 12/07/1759, 04/09/1760 & 16/07/1761.
107 MSY/A/1, 31/03/1757.
that the Marine Society worked very efficiently, and was careful to prevent any kind of fraud, making private charity appear far superior to the statutory poor relief, this finding throws a little doubt on the charity's probity. However, the Society's connections to the business community were so multifarious that one gets the feeling that, had there been grossly preferential treatment of one member's business, other members would have noticed and objected. The Society's funds came, as could be expected when one regards the members' background, primarily from the business world, while the contributions from artistic circles and from the Navy's captains were smaller than the Society might have hoped. The Society's main strength, however, was that it mobilised a wide public and attracted a higher number of subscribers than any other charity.

II.3. Promoting the Marine Society

To attract new members and subscribers the Marine Society concentrated on lobbying and the press. Members with private and business connections to certain circles or regions were urged to promote the Society there, their lobbying being supported by cheap printing, as they approached potential donors and promoters with one of the Society's publications, such as Hanway's Letter from a Member of the Marine Society, or an abstract of it. Such 'direct marketing' was particularly important for gaining support in places outside London. Beyond personal contacts the Society also wrote letters asking for donations to companies and individual gentlemen, and, asking for donations as well as recruits, to the mayors and chief magistrates of all English corporations and market towns. The Society's minute book contains a list of 48 City Companies, their number of courts of assistants, masters or princes, and wardens — all

---

108 See for example MSY/A/1, 28/10/1756.
109 See for example MSY/A/1, 12/10/1758.
110 MSY/A/1, 28 10/1756.
recorded so that those which appeared 'most profitable' could be provided with one of
the Society's publications.\textsuperscript{111} Letters were written to the governors of all colonies in
North America, and the Society approached residents of the colonies in London with the
request to promote the Society and to collect subscriptions in the Society's name.\textsuperscript{112}
Naturally, such colonial agents were also provided with copies of the Society's
publications, to be distributed in the settlements.

The Society's plan, advertisements for subscriptions and recruits, and reports of
quarterly or annual meetings were regularly placed in the \textit{Public Advertiser}, the \textit{General
Evening Post}, the \textit{Gazetteer} and other daily and evening newspapers. For these
advertisements, as for most of the Society's publications, the Society relied on the pen of
Jonas Hanway. Next to lobbying and the press, a third 'marketing-tool', or public
relations activity, were the already mentioned benefit theatre plays, as well as charity
sermons combined with dinners. Part of the Society's anniversary dinner was that the
latest boy recruits, equipped with banners, marched to the sound of drums and fifes from
the Royal Exchange to the Admiralty.\textsuperscript{113} Such a show of clean and properly-clothed
pauper boys marching off was guaranteed to catch any bystander's attention, and the
Stepney Society had used it for years to mark its annual Cockney Feast. The Marine
Society, which included some who also organised the Cockney Feast, was able to equal
the spectacle of the Stepney Society, particularly on the day of David Garrick's benefit of
the \textit{Suspicious Husband}.\textsuperscript{114} 75 Marine-Society boys and 40 young landmen, all of them
bound to march to Portsmouth the following day, were first assembled on Constitution
Hill by John Fielding, to be presented to the King. His Majesty's coach passed the
recruits very slowly, during which, according to the newspaper report, 'a Smile

\textsuperscript{111} MSY/A/1, 27/03/1760.
\textsuperscript{112} See for example MSY/A/1, 07/06/1759, 12/07/1759, 27/03/1760, 30 10/1760.
\textsuperscript{113} MSY/A/1, 01/05/1760.
\textsuperscript{114} See \textit{Public Advertiser}, 10-13/05/1757; \textit{London Magazine}, May 1757, p. 257. See also coverage of
expressive of paternal Delight overspread his Royal Countenance'. After that the recruits marched to the Admiralty to be presented to the Lords, and then continued with a Roast Beef and Plum Pudding meal, while the members of the Marine Society went to dine separately and were joined by many 'Gentlemen of Fashion'. Cannon salutes concluded the feast, and in the evening recruits and Society members together went to attend Garrick's play. Garrick had arranged some additions to the comedy to ensure that the boys and young men were sent off with their heads filled with emotive patriotism: he spoke a prologue dressed as a sailor, and in the epilogue even Britannia herself appeared together with some of the boys on stage.115

Regarding the contents and messages of the Society's printed advertisements the section on Charity and Policy United has already given an adequate insight. 'Policy and humanity unite with religion to plead the cause which the Society espouses', claimed the Letter from a Member of the Marine Society.116 Every benefit for the country resulting from the Society's work was presented to the public in shillings and pence. The costs of impressing a man, for example, estimated at £10, were set against the Marine Society spending only £5 per recruit,117 or a lengthy calculation was performed, showing the public the exact financial gain the country would receive when unemployed men were sent to sea, rather than pressing those who were employed in the merchant navy or elsewhere.118 The advertising texts made every attempt to present the Society as benefiting the country as a whole, and ultimately the subscriber himself. Hence Hanway asked rhetorically 'will not self-interest induce him to contribute towards the support of your undertaking?'119 Financial gain is one powerful advertising message, creating fear is

115 To us today it almost sounds as if the whole came close to the stage shows with children by popstar Michael Jackson we recently had to endure.
116 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 4th ed.), p. 64.
118 See for example Hanway, Three Letters: Letter II. (1758), pp. 5-6.
another. The Society played on the military and economic threat from France, but also on the dangers from neglected youths and unemployed young men, something other charities played on too. The threat of the war promised the widest support, and the Society used it to create a feeling of national unity, a sentiment of being 'one great Family, whose Sovereign is their common parent', which was meant to find its expression in support for the Marine Society at all social ranks. The broad base of subscribers can be seen as a proof that the Society was successful in this attempt. Trying to unite all social groups under the banner of patriotism also reflected concern about the inner stability of the country: after all, the Society was founded only a decade after the Jacobite invasion. Although the Society's advertisements never spell out a political threat from within, they almost always warned of the dangers to public safety if the Society did not take care of such boys and young men as would allegedly most probably end in a life of crime. Next to the French, they were the second threat communicated through the Society's advertisements. When, for example, the Society campaigned for support for finding employment for the boys in private businesses after the war, the plan was described not as helping the boys, but rather as 'precautions' undertaken to 'prevent numerous mischiefs which will otherwise naturally arise, by many of these boys turning thieves & robbers of the very worst & most dangerous kinds.' In December 1757, Jonas Hanway praised the Society in a newspaper advertisement by claiming that at a modest computation it had 'cleared the land of 500 thieves and robbers'. Portraying the recruits as troublemakers (or at least as unproductive), whom one had to get rid of anyway, was also a neat way to avoid criticism.

121 At one point in its early days the Society seems to have been worried that the word 'Marine' would make the Society sound too exclusively maritime, and for a short time the term was left out and the Society instead advertised as the 'Society of Noblemen, Merchants & others' (MSY/A/1, 30 12/1756).
122 MSY/A/1, 27/04/1759.
123 MSY/A/1, 08/12/1757.
Focussing on the subscribers' gains, however, also meant taking into account that some donated for very personal motives indeed, as already mentioned in the last section of chapter one, that is that some donated to improve their personal image, to please their vanity, or even to prove their liquidity. Publishing the names of the latest donors, the sums they had donated, mentioning even small donations,\textsuperscript{124} and adding that the 'Example of these Gentlemen deserves the most Honourable mention',\textsuperscript{125} was therefore a regular theme in the Society's newspaper advertisements. Yet the Society had to keep in mind the image concerns not only of its subscribers, but also its own. The committee had to appear efficient and trustworthy. Here the famous names among the chairmen, the treasurer's reputation as a man devoting his entire spare time to philanthropy and being free of any vanity, and the famous supporters all paid off. Publishing quarterly and annual financial accounts in the newspapers was another way of building up trust. The image had to be safeguarded: in 1756, for example, the Society did not answer to a benefit play offered by Theophilus Cibber,\textsuperscript{126} since Fielding thought his plays were illegal. On another occasion the committee was surprised to discover an advertisement for an auction for the benefit of the Society, of which they knew nothing.\textsuperscript{127}

An interesting side-aspect of the Society's advertisement campaign is its relation to London's other charities. Though the charities were naturally in competition for subscriptions, one expects, considering the large overlap of committee members and the common interest to perform charitable work, that comparative advertising would not be part of their campaign. Yet, Jonas Hanway and the Marine Society occasionally struck a rather competitive tone, and it is evident that they must have thought the Marine Society

\textsuperscript{124} See for example Public Advertiser, 16/05/1757 & 26/05/1757; or London Magazine, February 1757, p. 97, December 1757, p. 618, April 1758, p. 212 & July 1758, p. 370; and Gentleman's Magazine, April 1759, p. 190.
\textsuperscript{125} Quote from MSY/A/1, 02/021758.
\textsuperscript{126} MSY/A/1, 16/06/1757. Theophilus Cibber (1703-1758) was an author and actor, and regularly arranged benefit plays for other causes.
\textsuperscript{127} MSY/A/1, 16/06/1757.
had priority in wartime. Hanway pointed out that, compared to other charities, the Marine Society offered an immediate remedy, and rhetorically asked which hospital had in such a short time saved so many lives, 'saved them from the gallows, or from a noxious infection; saved them from penury and disease; from misery and untimely death? Where is the hospital which guards the laws by removing those who are most exposed to the temptation of violating them?'

An advertisement for the Marine Society in February 1758 stated that the Society:  

(...) is founded on the same principle as all the other numerous Charities which abound in these Kingdoms, to the great Honour of our Maker and the good of Society; with this Difference, that it is one of the most important Benefits to the Community, at this time, because it is peculiar to war:- Because it relieves those who must suffer without the assistance that is given them – Because it diffuses a Spirit of Patriotism more than any other Institution – Because it preserves Lives to become immediately useful in the most important instance (...)

However, other charities did not behave that charitably either towards their fellow philanthropic institutions: The Idler complained in the Gentleman's Magazine of 1758 that the open competitions between the hospitals, and the animosities with which their patrons opposed each other, made them appear anything but charitable and would deter some people from donating anything at all.  

Whatever the thoughts of the public on such competitive advertising, the Marine Society's promotion campaign was certainly a success, and, as we have seen earlier, the Society probably received a wider support than any other subscription charity at the time. Although the other big 'contestant', the Foundling Hospital, even achieved the full financial backing of Parliament at the same time (apparently also out of concern about the war), it became in a way a victim of its own success and was criticised for allegedly wasting government money and for encouraging careless sexual behaviour by

---

129 MSY/A/1, 02/02/1758.
guaranteeing admission to any child. For most contemporaries private charity was not meant to fall into the same trap as the Poor Law did, that is creating chronic dependency and not forcing the recipients to take their fate into their own hands. The Marine Society, by contrast, was offering only a starting aid and made no long-term commitment. As its advertisements were keen to point out, the Society required little fixed capital and no government support. The disadvantage of the Society's promotion strategy, with its heavy reliance on the war threat, was that one had to expect that when the war ended, the subscriptions would decline rapidly – the additional problems being firstly that the public was apt to consider the war won before it was actually over, and secondly that when the war ended the Society still felt obliged to take care of the younger boys, for which it needed funds. To the first obstacle the Society reacted by clothing fewer boys and no men at all when the subscriptions drained; the second obstacle will be discussed in the final chapter of this study.

11.4. The Case of Magistrate John Fielding: Individual versus Associated Philanthropy, or 'Charity and Policy Disunited'?

In April 1757, after the Society had been running very successfully for almost a year, Richard DuHorty proposed to the committee, and the committee unanimously agreed, that two of its members should be presented with a silver anchor in acknowledgement of their extraordinary contribution to the Society's work. One of them was of course Jonas Hanway, and the other, at first glance less expectedly, magistrate John Fielding – less expectedly because Fielding had only attended the committee on 23 December 1756 for the first time. Until then he had merely produced written applications for clothing for

---

131 See for example J. Massie (1759 & 1760).
132 See for example newspaper advertisement in MSY/A/1, 31/08/1758.
133 The anchors were finally presented in November 1757. The presentation was also mentioned in a newspaper advertisement, which, as a classic example of pride and vanity being mixed with philanthropy, even gave the anchor’s metallic value (about ten ounces of silver) (MSY/A/1, 07/04/1757, 06/10/1757, 17/11/1757, 01/12/1757, 08/12/1757).
his boys, or had sent his boys directly to the Society. Nevertheless, Fielding and the Marine Society had worked hand in hand; he collected his own boys and the Society clothed them, and Marine-Society advertisements for ships' boys not only named John Stephens' but also Fielding's office as a contact address. The silver anchor was a recognition of the large number of boys Fielding had recruited, rather than of his contribution to the committee, although, after his first visit in December 1756, he also became a regular attender at committee meetings. Occasionally he even chaired meetings. However, Fielding was soon to come into conflict with the Society, and the award of the anchor was perhaps also an attempt to bridge an opening rift and to draw him into the committee. The breach between the two parties is of interest for two reasons: because it can be seen as a clash between the new style of associated philanthropy and more traditional (individual) approaches, and because it might tell us something about the Society's priorities.

John Fielding was, like other members, over the years active in a variety of charitable institutions, such as the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, the Royal Female Orphanage and the British Lying-In Hospital. However, in the case of the Marine Society he continued to run his own recruitment enterprise parallel to the institutionalised charity. To him that appeared perfectly legitimate and only practical, as he saw himself as the originator of the scheme, and since he got so often into direct contact with potential recruits, in the form of the boys brought before him as a magistrate. Fielding's enterprise was more what one might label 'traditional

---

135 See also Fielding dealing independently with the Admiralty (ADM 2/706, 16 12/1756, [pp. 268-269]; 10 01 1757 [p. 375]; ADM 2/707, 09 05/1757 [pp. 319-320]). Vice-Admiral Charles Knowles, for example, referred to the Society in 1758 still as 'Mr. Fielding's Marine Society' (see Phulo Nauticus [Knowles] in Bromley [1974 6], p. 109). As a magistrate Fielding was of course anyway in contact with the Admiralty, since one of his duties (and source of income) was to help apprehending deserters (see for example ADM 2/704, 15/04/1756, pp. 202-203; ADM 2/706, 22/11 1756, p. 148; ADM 2/716, 17/09 1760 [pp. 189-190], 25/04/1760 [pp. 221-222]).
charity' (though he collected subscriptions too), a one-man-business, not regulated, and institutionalised only to the degree that it was linked to his magistracy. The successful beginnings of Fielding's recruitment scheme for boys, prior to the Marine Society's foundation, have been described in the first chapter. However, one thing was already wrong with Fielding's first load of boys: Vice Admiral Henry Osborne in Portsmouth was alarmed to find out that many of the boys were apprentices, who either must have run away from their masters, or wrongly assumed they could just leave without cancelling their indentures, or perhaps had even felt going to sea was an order they had to obey if they wanted to avoid legal punishment. What Osborne worried about was the danger that their masters could appear and demand a share of the boys' official wage, that is the wage the officers were normally receiving. The Admiralty advised Fielding to be more cautious about which boys he took, and not to send any apprentices.

Fielding's selection of his recruits, or rather lack of selection, was also to become a crucial point in his breach with the Marine Society. Fielding's main aim remained the use of the sea service as an alternative to punishment for young offenders, and as a precautionary measure for those whose circumstances might lead them into crime, to convert 'Thieves in Embryo into useful sailors' as he phrased it. Hanway and the other members had the same intentions, and they used this extensively for advertising purposes, yet to them serving the Royal Navy had priority. Initially everyone involved had assumed that both objectives, social-policy and naval aims, would go hand in hand, that charity and policy would be united. But they clashed at the point where the Navy felt harmed by boys of whom Fielding (and others) thought it would be better for them and the community if they were sent to sea. When the Navy's complaints about runaway

136 ADM 1/922, Henry Osborne, 26/05/1756. In 1757, the act 31 George II, c. 10, s. xvi, provided a safeguard for naval officers by ruling that they could keep the pay if they had been unaware that their servant was an apprentice.

137 ADM 2/704, 27/05/1756, p. 449.

138 In Public Advertiser, 15/03 1756.
apprentices, and about deserting boys, reached the Society, and it appeared that many of these boys had been sent by Fielding, a rift opened up between the Society and Fielding.\textsuperscript{139} Deserters not only damaged the Society’s relations with the Navy, it was also expensive financially, as the boys ran away with the Society’s clothing. The committee had to ensure that the boys were trustworthy, really wanted to go to sea, and were not apprentices. Several times the committee hinted at disapproval of Fielding’s operations: complaints about the boys were sent to Fielding’s office, or Fielding was desired to write a letter of apology to the Navy.\textsuperscript{140} On two occasions Fielding was desired to draw up a newspaper advertisement, ‘in order to prevent the Society being imposed on by frequently clothing apprentices’. In the first case his proposed advert was even ‘corrected and improved’ by Hanway.\textsuperscript{141}

It should not have come as a surprise that Fielding’s boys were often troublesome. After all he came across them through his work as a magistrate. Given that Fielding knew too well how miserable some boys’ apprenticeships were, he may not have been too keen to enquire whether a boy was an apprentice of some master, since it was evident that this master did not or could not take care of the boy. The members of the Marine Society were of course also aware of the necessity to drag young offenders out of their poverty and bad company, and of the defects of the apprenticeship system, yet in the interests of their cooperation with the Navy, and in the interests of the quality of the Navy’s recruits, as well as for not risking that clothes were stolen and money wasted, better care had to be taken when selecting the boys. If Fielding was not prepared to apply the same selection criteria, then they had to act. In July 1757, the committee ordered that for the future no boys that offered themselves at Mr. Fielding’s office would

\textsuperscript{139} See also Fielding’s letter to the Society in 1772, in which he acknowledged that desertions had always been a problem (MSY/A/5, 23/07/1772).

\textsuperscript{140} MSY/A/1, 19/05/1757, 15/09/1757.

\textsuperscript{141} MSY/A/1, 21/04/1757, 28/04/1757, 05/05/1757, 01/09/1757. Normally proposed adverts, which were in most cases Hanway’s drafts, do not seem to have been corrected by the committee.
be clothed, and instead that those boys had to come to the Society's office to be examined and enquiries made about them, to find out whether they were apprentices and whether any adults could vouch for them. The following year the Society's secretary was ordered to formally acquaint John Fielding 'that the affairs of this Society may be conducted with the more regularity as well as dignity' if for the future he would hand over all queries regarding the Society to the secretary. The Society then ran an advertising campaign informing the public that to prevent any confusion, applications by recruits should be made to their secretary only. Fielding attended the next committee meeting held after the publication of these advertisements – the minutes, as so often, do not mention anything that might have been discussed regarding the cooperation and controversy with Fielding – and from then on he hardly ever attended a meeting again.

All this, however, should not leave us with the impression that the Society entirely distanced itself from the idea of recruitment by magistrates. At the same time, the Society's publications still styled the Society as a crime-prevention programme, and Hanway was about to publish a plan for raising additional seamen in which he underlined the importance of magistrates picking up vagabonds and informing the Marine Society about them. As we shall see in chapter four, the Society had quite disillusioned views of the character of their own boys recruited in London. Of course they wished that only well-motivated boys would apply, but what counted in the end was that they were not apprentices and could be expected not to run away. The rift with Fielding came because he was not taking proper care of that, and because he refused to subordinate his independent operations to the Society.

142 MSY/A/1, 21/07/1757.
143 MSY/A/1, 21/09/1758, also 14/09/1758.
144 MSY/A/1, 12/10/1758, also 27/04/1758, and MSY/A/2, 04/11/1762.
145 MSY/A/1, 19/10/1758. The next meetings Fielding attended were on 29/03/1759 and 22/11/1759.
146 Hanway, Reasons (1759), p. 104.
The rivalry between Fielding and the Society was to stretch far beyond the Seven Years War. In *The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society* (1770), the Society emphasised that they had never sent any money for clothes to Fielding, but had only sent their clothes and visited Fielding to inspect the boys, as they considered his boys ‘now under our protection’.\(^{147}\) Having always to visit Fielding’s house was apparently very inconvenient: there was not enough space, unless one went into the open yard. All this was to show that such an enterprise had to be managed by a single large organisation. Thus, when the Society’s *Historical Account* of 1772 discarded Fielding’s activity as inferior, it was also an attack by an associated charity on more traditional approaches to philanthropy:

(...) a society qualified to conduct an enterprise of this nature, having credit with the public to collect the sums necessary for the purpose, conversant in the proper clothing, and connected with the maritime people, must do the business incomparably better, and with more permanency than taking up the object for an occasion only, and without proper officers to conduct such business.

A regular Society was formed, and a proper committee and other officers appointed; Mr. Fielding was invited to join as a member; but did not long continue such (...)\(^{148}\)

Such little gibes towards Fielding may of course appear unworthy of a charity and are reminiscent of the complaints by *The Idler* about the uncharitable animosities exchanged between patrons of hospitals. Hence, to conclude this section and chapter, a short episode from another London charity, which had nothing to do with the Royal Navy or sending boys to the sea, will serve as a reminder that not everything that went on between Fielding and the others was about the Marine Society. Personal animosities could grow anywhere, and one always has to remember that we are dealing with a whole network of charities in the mid-eighteenth century.\(^{149}\) In 1758, there was a meeting in John Fielding’s house – the house that had been considered as being inconveniently small

---

\(^{147}\) *The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society* (1770), pp. 6-7. Contrary to this, the minutes of 29 July 1756 state that the Society on that occasion sent money, and not clothes, to Fielding. This is confirmed in *Public Advertiser*, 30 07/1756-04/08/1756.

\(^{148}\) *Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account* (1772), pp. 2-3

\(^{149}\) For the following see Allan & Abbott (1992), pp 30-37.
by the Marine Society. It was a meeting of the Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, which at the time had its headquarters there. The room was full of familiar Marine-Society faces: Lord Romney sat in the chair, being also that Society's chairman, and George Box took the minutes, being also that Society's secretary. Jonas Hanway, an active member of the Society, made a proposal that the Society should put a premium on the best plan for a charity house for the reception and employment of young women whose poverty had forced them into prostitution. Of course, Hanway, and also the fellow member Robert Dingley, had already written such a plan. An ad hoc committee, consisting of Hanway, Robert Dingley, the Marine-Society members Charles Dingley and Edward Hooper, and three other men, decided that Hanway's idea was worthwhile and published advertisements inviting the submission of plans.\textsuperscript{150} When the day to choose the best plan came, fifty-one members attended the Society's committee,\textsuperscript{151} among them the said persons of the ad hoc committee, as well as John Fielding, David Garrick, Samuel Johnson, Saunders Welch, and John Wilkes.\textsuperscript{152} Fielding and Welch had also submitted plans. Trying to imagine these meetings, and what went on before and after, gives wings to any historian's fantasy. Fielding and Hanway could settle some Marine-Society business, Johnson could have annoyed Hanway by drinking tea, magistrate Fielding might have told Garrick off for performing Gay's \textit{Beggars Opera}, or perhaps intensified their friendship to make him give a benefit performance for his cause rather than for Hanway's. At the end of this meeting Welch's

\textsuperscript{150} See for example \textit{Public Advertiser}, 14/04/1758. Fielding had already three days earlier advertised that such a plan written by him would soon be published. Hanway advertised his proposal a week later (see \textit{Public Advertiser}, 11/04/1758, 21/04/1758).

\textsuperscript{151} Note: They probably did not meet in Fielding's open yard, but inside his house. Hence the meeting room could not have been as small as the Marine Society suggested when complaining about the insufficient space at Fielding's offices (see above).

\textsuperscript{152} There might have been an antagonism between two groups, which in the first chapter were carelessly thrown into the same drawer 'middle class', that is those with a merchant background on the one hand, and those with an intellectual, artistic or juridical background on the other. However, this impression would need a more thorough analysis.
plan received most votes; however, the decision was later overturned (Allan & Abbott suggest by Hanway and his friends), with the explanation that none of the plans had received a convincing majority. Thus, no premium was paid to anyone. Hanway presumably wanted Dingley’s, his own, or nobody’s plan to be awarded – certainly not the one of Fielding, or someone so close to him as Saunders Welch. Hence it is no wonder that we earlier noted Welch not being a subscriber of the Marine Society. Despite this unsatisfying outcome, Dingley, Hanway and others went ahead with the foundation of their Magdalen Hospital, while Fielding and Welch focussed on the younger girls in the Female Orphan Asylum, but, nevertheless, Fielding and Welch became members of the Magdalen Hospital too.

London’s charities in the mid-eighteenth century were run by a closely linked circle of philanthropists. The men met each other on different committees, they often quarrelled or formed alliances, wrote (sometimes anonymous) pamphlets and articles criticising or mocking each other, yet still continued to work on the same charities. The committees of their charities were run almost like an Athenian democracy, no post elevated a member above the others, the leadership might go to the most regular attendant, the most active and the most eloquent member, or to the one that managed to get his friends, or business colleagues, to turn up in great numbers for the occasions when important decisions were taken.
CHAPTER THREE:

Recruiting and Protecting Sailors

III.1. The Future Ships’ Boys Arrive

The Society’s initial newspaper advertisement announcing its foundation, and the introductory letter to the Admiralty, marked also the beginning of the recruitment of landmen; any landman who had enlisted was invited to collect his clothing (and initially also bedding) from the Society before leaving for his ship. The recruitment of the boys was a little more complex. Looking at the way the Marine Society operated, recruiting boys was much more the Society’s own business. While the Navy helped to fill each individual captain’s ship with a sufficient number of men, finding boys for the servant positions had usually been left to the captains and other officers themselves. The Marine Society constantly checked with Navy personnel how many servants were currently needed, and in accordance with the Navy’s demand intensified or slowed down its advertisement campaign and tightened or softened its selection criteria. Often Marine-Society advertisements would only ask for a specific number of boys – not least out of fear of receiving numerous boys sent from far-away towns, whom they somehow had to dispose of, or have them sent back.

The boys were checked for their suitability by the Society itself, usually by the apothecary Henry Haskey. Those with minor illnesses, such as the itch (scabies) or scal’d heads,¹ were sent to a lodging house and attempted to be cured, entirely at the Society’s expense.² Haskey provided the necessary medicines at a special rate and also

¹ That is diseases of the scalp, usually characterised by pustules (dried discharge of pustules comes in the form of scales), and by falling out of the hair.
² Similarly, the Navy also accepted men with curable illnesses, and sent them straight to a hospital ship to be cured. A proposal to the committee to inoculate all boys and young men, to prevent the danger that one of them could spread the smallpox on board, does not appear to have been followed up during the Seven Years War (MSY/A/1, 02/06/1757).
checked the progress of the boys' recovery. Such minor illnesses as the *itch* were indeed very common among the boys:³ in the first quarter of 1757, for example, more than 10% of the boys had to be cured before being sent to sea.⁴ Fourteen-year old orphan Joseph Hall, on the other hand, managed to pass the Society’s medical check at his first attempt – despite the fact that he had only one eye.⁵ After Navy complaints that some boys had been too weak for service on a warship, the committee set a minimum age of fourteen and a stature of at least 4ft 4in, with a possible exception for very stout, tall thirteen-year olds.⁶ In the following years the Society usually tried to enforce a height standard of 4ft 3in, with one or two inches flexibility according to the specific demand-supply relation.⁷ However, as we shall see in chapter four, neither the height nor the age standard was always upheld, and a great many boys went to sea who would have been considered too young or too short.

All accepted boys were stripped of their clothes, washed and then dressed at the Society’s office. Some boys were allowed to hold on to their old clothes, that is after they had been thoroughly cleaned, but usually the Society preferred to either give them to the *ragman* or to destroy them, as it regarded many garments as a health risk,⁸ a possible source of infections, and we shall see later how important it was that the Society kept a strict policy in this respect, despite the fact that science and most contemporaries had not yet realised what high risk of infections these rags indeed carried. For hygienic reasons the boys were also advised to cut their hair; the caps they received from the Society were to protect their heads instead. Boys with nowhere to stay, and those with

---
³ See for example MSY/A/1, 16/04/1761, 12/11/1761, 26/03 1762, 11 06/1762, 29/07/1762, 12/08/1762, 02/09/1762 & 15/07/1762 for cases of the *itch* (prior to 1761 such specific cases were probably not recorded); and MSY/A/1, 15/07/1762 for *scal’d head*.
⁴ MSY/A/1, 07/04/1757.
⁵ MSY/H2, no. 3009.
⁶ MSY/A/1, 16/06/1757, 05/05/1757 (exemption for 13 year olds), 12/05/1757 (complaints)
⁷ For 4ft 3in see advertisements in MSY/A/1, 08/12/1757, 09/02/1758, 16/02/1758, at one point the standard was also increased to 4ft 6in (see MSY/A/1, 06 07 1758).
minor illnesses, were lodged and fed until they went to sea, at the expense of the Society. Maintenance and medical treatment of the boys accounted for a large share of the Society's costs – at its highest, in the busy second quarter of 1757, for example, more than £300 were spent on maintenance and cure. For most of the time the boys were sent to the house of a ‘providetor’ named Daniel Fluyd. Fluyd was reminded to keep the boys' rooms clean and warm, to use the bedding and clothing provided by the Society, and to make sure they received three meals a day. The boys' meals consisted of beef and mutton – one day hot and one day cold – as well as bread, and milk porridge or beef broth for breakfast. For supper Fluyd had to hand out beer, bread, and butter or cheese. One can imagine that many street urchins had rarely enjoyed such provision and care before, and clearly the boys' food provisions were not only offered to feed them properly, but also to entice boys to enlist. As mentioned above, the Society evidently did not trust the providetor and checked the quality of his food and lodging on a weekly basis. Taking advantage of friendless boys was a far too familiar crime in eighteenth-century London.

The providetor also had to assist with the medical check, under consultation with Henry Haskey, and – in the Society's words – he was supposed to make his decision 'on the merciful side'. At the same time he was warned not to put the Society to an 'extraordinary and fruitless expence' for boys who would afterwards be rejected by the Navy's officers.

9 The Navy, in response to a request by the Marine Society, frequently helped by accommodating and victualing boys at the Nore, or at Portsmouth, until the servants were distributed among the officers (ADM 2/706, 15/11/1756, p. 124).
10 MSY/A1/1, 14/07/1757.
11 MSY/A1/1 16/06/1757 (also spelled Flude). Initially the boys had been lodged at New Prison and other places (see for example MSY/A1/1, 17/03/1757). Fluyd's house appears to have originally been a kind of workhouse.
13 See also a scandal uncovered by the Society, where a ship carpenter and an old sergeant of the Marines had tricked thirteen boys into an indenture that virtually enslaved them for work in the colonial plantations (MSY/A1/1, 28/02/1760, 20/03/1760).
The boys were sent to sea without any pre-sea training, although at one point the Society decided that it would be a good idea to teach some of them to play the fife. Hanway explained the decision with his usual 'political humanity': 'Amusement is necessary to life, and keeps a seaman in some degree from the desire of roving, therefore to withhold any gratification of this kind from him (...) would be as little politic as humane.' In May 1757, the Society began to lodge fife-boys in a house at Tothill Fields, where they were taught to play the instrument. The training lasted between six weeks and two months, depending on each boy's progress. A drum major of one of the regiments of guards acted as a fife master, teaching the boys To Arms, the Grenadiers March, the Reveiller or Ravalle, and the Tattoo. Being trained to play the fife was certainly a reward for boys whom the Society regarded as the better ones. Usually the Society trained only boys that could read and write, unless they seemed particularly motivated. The fife-master was reminded that: 'If any boy is of a tender frame, you must not harass him, nor endanger his health'. Furthermore, the boys were later visibly distinguished with a white sleeve and a white cape to their blue jacket. They even received a certificate addressed to their captain, asking him to put the boy under the care of a fife player. Thus distinguished by their certificate, uniform and their instrument, one can imagine that the fife-boys were likely to end in more caring hands on board their ships than other servants. Ironically, not all future Marine-Society boys were to appreciate this privilege of being taught to play the fife: the boy William Stevens, who

---

14 Hanway Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 57. There were also plans to teach boys to play the drum, but they appear not to have been turned into practice (only sign of drummer boys in MSY/A/1, 01/05/1760, but other than that there is no evidence, also not in the Society's accounts).
15 MSY/A/1, 12/05/1757, 19/05/1757, and 15 09/1757; also Hanway, Three Letters: Letter I (1758), p. 21
17 That fife-players were much desired is underlined by the fact that even a major of the Army asked for two fife-boys, who were to go with the Army to India. The Society, however, refused the request, stating that it only supplied boys to the Navy (MSY/A/1, 17/11/1757).
went to sea via the Marine Society in 1808,\textsuperscript{18} was one of their fife-boys, and according to William's great-great-grandson the amusing family story goes that young William became an expert in the fife and was often requested by the officers to entertain them, but that William himself regarded the whole thing as an extra duty, and to free himself of that duty, he decided to let the fife go overboard.\textsuperscript{19} When anchoring next at Malta, the officers bought and presented him with a new fife, accompanied with the hint that if that went over board too, William would follow 'PDQ'. William took the warning seriously, and the replacement fife is today still in the possession of his family. During the Seven Years War the Society taught around 170 boys to play the fife, until the training was stopped in 1760, when the Society’s finances ran low, although the initial resolution had anyway been to teach around 150 boys.\textsuperscript{20}

Though the rest of the boys went on board without any training, the Society did not allow them to leave entirely uninstructed: after they were clothed at the office the Society read out some instructions to them.\textsuperscript{21} They were reminded of the great benefit they were allegedly receiving, and while the Society used the lure of prize money in their advertisements, the boys were now told not to have too high expectations and to be content with their wages in case they should not earn any prize money. They were advised to keep themselves clean, for the sake of their health and so that their officers would accept them. They were cautioned not to fall in the habit of drinking excessively, swearing, lying, thieving or whoring – the latter 'certainly brings on pain and diseases; if you do not shun bad women, you will die in misery, or at best, whilst you should be drubbing your enemies, you will be languishing in an hospital.' How many of the boys

\textsuperscript{18} MSY/O/11, no. 711  
\textsuperscript{19} Don Kingston, great great grandson of William Stevens, in correspondence with the author (13/04/2001).  
\textsuperscript{20} MSY/A/1, 09/10/1760, 13/11/1760.  
\textsuperscript{21} The main author of these instructions was of course again Jonas Hanway (see MSY/A/1, 26/05/1757). For the complete instructions see Society’s rules in Hanway, \textit{Three Letters: Letter III} (1758), pp. 56-60.
had a cheeky smile on their face while hearing these warnings, we do not know, nor whether the majority of the boys, being fourteen and younger and having not yet reached puberty, fully understood. The Society’s instructions also went beyond practical advice:

You are the sons of Freemen. Though poor, you are the sons of Britons, who are born to liberty; but remember that true Liberty consists in doing well; in defending each other; in obeying your superiors and in fighting for your King and Country to the last drop of your blood. (...) To obey God is the first and greatest duty. (...) [God] will give victory to those who he thinks best to reward, and it generally is given to those who are most ready to obey their Commander, and do their duty best (...).

[E]vidently the Marine Society was aware that ‘religion makes the steadiest warriors’. The Society also took the opportunity to tell the boys about the New Testament, even about loving your neighbour as yourself, despite the fact that the boys were going to war with Britain’s neighbour. Apparently the boys found hearing about the New Testament a ‘strange and wonderful thing’, and it was to be doubted that some of them had ever heard of the name of Jesus Christ before.

The landmen received similar instructions, though theirs were not read out but merely given in the form of a book, which the boys received as well. Most of the men and boys got their written instructions bound together with Josiah Woodward’s Seaman’s Monitor and Edward Synge’s Essay towards making the Knowledge of Religion easy to the Meanest Capacity (both edited by Hanway), and also a prayer book and a New Testament provided by the S.P.C.K. Publications like Woodward’s Monitor reflected concern about the sailors’ discipline and religiousness, and the dangers when they

---

22 Quotation from the dedication to the public in Regulations of the Marine Society (1772, 1775), p. viii.
24 For the instructions to the men see Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III (1758), pp. 60-63.
25 Original title The Seaman’s Faithful Companion.
26 Dr Edward Synge, late Lord Archbishop of Tuam (Ireland). His essay was also part of the written instructions the boys placed as apprentices by the Stepney Society received (the instructions being presumably also mainly the work of Hanway).
27 MSY/A/1, 12/08/1756, 26/05/1757, 03/11/1757, 24/11/1757, 26/01/1758.
encountered foreign peoples and cultures. Woodward worried about mutiny, piracy, and any kind of misbehaviour towards foreigners, and the shame these actions brought to the country and to the Christian faith. Woodward was obviously haunted by the thought that the only Christians, or British, some foreign communities might encounter, were raucously drinking sailors. In Woodward's eyes all the misdemeanours committed abroad by seamen stemmed from a lack of religious instruction that could restrain the men; the Monitor encouraged sailors to say their prayers on board, even if confronted by the mockery of shipmates. He also warned them that they should not think themselves safe from prosecution for any ill committed abroad. On the other hand we also find in Woodward the fear that the sailors themselves might be negatively influenced by the contact with foreign cultures and religions. Despite Woodward's complaints about the sailors' irreligion, the common stereotype that sailors believed – if in anything – only in superstitions, and Jonas Hanway observing that the strongest profession seamen generally made of the being of God was swearing by his name, we should not discard the Society's literature donation as a complete waste of paper. Not only did many sailors use books to find entertainment on long journeys, it is also conceivable that, facing hitherto unknown hardships at sea and at war, combined with the usual insecurities the adolescent mind is experiencing, many of the young recruits were searching for psychological support. In that case, religion was still one of the first addresses (unless shipmates and rum fulfilled that function). Reading skills should have been widespread among the boys, seeing that reading was on the curricula of the numerous charity schools. The Society's records of the 1770s and 1780s show that then at least half of the

---

28 Woodward, The Seaman's Monitor (1705, 1767), pp. iii, 5-6, 23-26, 32-34. Josiah Woodward wrote at the turn of the century, but his works were still being published in the middle of the eighteenth century.


30 Lists of deceased sailors' possessions regularly featured books (see for example Earle [1998], p. 94).
boys were able to read. The Society encouraged those who could not read to ask their comrades to read aloud for them.

Equipped with their literature, clothes, bedding and final instructions, the boys went off to their ships, although, after some bad experiences with thieves, equipment and boys often went separately. Those destined for ships at Deptford, Woolwich, Chatham, or ships waiting at the Nore were often picked up by a Navy officer and/or sent to a naval tender in the Thames (where the landmen and their equipment would go too), and then transported to their ships. Boys destined for vessels lying in Portsmouth marched there on foot; they were collected by an attendant, and first ‘paraded’ through the City and then walked across Westminster Bridge. The march usually took four days, and the Society covered all costs of their journey. Only if a boy struggled to make the distance, or the group encountered very bad weather, was the attendant allowed to take a wagon. The attendant was to provide the boys with a sufficient quantity of milk porridge or bread, cheese and beer in the morning, and meat, roots and similar in the evening, and by no means to injure the boys’ health by overwalking them. If there were more than fifteen boys in a group, he was either to take more attendants ‘to prevent boys from playing tricks’, or to separate them into smaller groups with an older or more sober boy as assistant leader, ‘to give them a greater order when on the road or entering the inns’. The boys destined for ships at Plymouth sailed there from Portsmouth. In later years the Society avoided sending the boys on such foot marches, in consideration of the costs involved, particularly because the groups of new boy recruits were not that large anymore. The committee then preferred that the captains or other officers picked them up themselves, which also avoided the risk that a boy would be sent all the way from

---

31 See database Floud (1986), SN: 2134 ‘At least’ – because it is not clear whether blanks in the registers always indicate that the boy could not read, or merely that the registrar did not record it. However, as the Society was more selective regarding its boys in peacetime one may presume that during the Seven Years War the percentage of boys that could read was not as high.

London to Portsmouth only to be rejected as unsuitable by the officer there. Eventually
the Society began to send their boys overland only if the boy's officer paid for the
transport.\textsuperscript{33} Once the boy was in care of his future master, the Society considered its
work completed.

III.2. The Marine Society's Recruitment Success

On 24 July 1756 the first landmen volunteers equipped by the Society entered the
Navy;\textsuperscript{34} the first boys followed in August. The Society's documents do not reveal a great
variety of actions taken to reach their man and boy recruits directly, though it is difficult
to say how many activities remained unrecorded. The main means of attracting men and
boys were advertisements placed in newspapers or pasted up in public places in and
around London,\textsuperscript{35} which was always done in consultation with the Navy's regulating
captains or other officers. The advertisements offered free clothing, relied on the lure of
prize money, to which, as was underlined, the boys were entitled as much as the men,
and also proclaimed that the boys would be provided for with accommodation, good
food and clothing until they went to sea.\textsuperscript{36} Regarding the boys, the advertisements were
always vital in informing the public when and how many boys were wanted, what the
minimum physical requirements were, and the advertisements were therefore issued
regularly throughout the war. The calls for men, on the other hand, became less regular
over the years. The texts for both struck a rather sober and un-emotional note; there was
nothing that might have appealed to the volunteers' patriotism or adventurousness. In

\textsuperscript{33} MSY/A/1, 20/11/1760, 05/02/1761, 26/02/1761, 28/05/1761; MSY/A/2, 04/11/1762.
\textsuperscript{34} MSY/S/1.
\textsuperscript{35} For posters see MSY/A/1, 23/12/1756, 31 03/1757 & 30/11/1758.
\textsuperscript{36} See for example advertisements in Public Advertiser, 17–29/07/1756 (for landmen), 03–06/08/1756
(for landmen), 01/01/1757-13/01 1757 (for landmen and boys), 28/03/1757-30/03/1757 (for boys),
January 1758 (for boys), 07/04/1758 (for boys); as well as advertisement texts in MSY/A/1; and the
fact, some of the Society's publications were more likely to offend any upright patriotic volunteer, by portraying them as a burden to society or even potential criminals.\textsuperscript{37}

The Society's public-relations events, such as the theatre plays, mainly targeted potential donors. There is hardly any event recorded that was directed at the volunteers, such as perhaps a public speech, a band playing, a social evening in a pub or similar. One of the few exceptions occurred when in April 1759 the committee, recognising that there were still so many boys 'lurking in and about the environs of this great City', decided to:\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{quote}
(...)

\textbf{equip three boys with the distinguishing ornaments of a black ribbon round their necks \\& a ribbon round their hats \\& a blue ribbon round their knees, with a rattan in their hands \\& two shillings \& sixpence in their pockets \\& that one of them be a fife \\& the other two boys who have been at Sea in the Kings service, who are lively, well satisfied \& to be trusted, be commissioned to make a Tour \\& pick up all the boys they can who are proper for the sea, agreeable to the advertisement.}
\end{quote}

Perhaps the decision to let the boys march through the City and over Westminster Bridge on their way to Portsmouth,\textsuperscript{39} and also to finish the Society's anniversary dinner with the boys marching with banners to the Admiralty, accompanied by the sound of drums and fifes, were further activities designed not only to impress potential donors, but also bystanding boys. In July 1760, the Society sent one of their employees together with three boys and two fife-boys, dressed in the Society's clothing, to march around in the suburbs, and to try to procure as many boys as possible.\textsuperscript{40} But this was all: never again is a similar activity mentioned, nor is any activity recorded that tried to attract landmen volunteers. Regarding the boys it appears to a degree understandable that not too much was done to reach them directly, as it was perhaps more efficient and safe to contact parents and local authorities in London, and all over England, who would know of any trustworthy and unbound boy, thus avoiding the risk of clothing runaways or thieves.

\textsuperscript{37} See for example the London Magazine, 03/1757, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{38} MSY/A/1, 19/04/1759.
\textsuperscript{39} MSY/A/1, 23/03/1758.
\textsuperscript{40} MSY/A/1, 31/07/1760.
The city of Gloucester, for example, promised soon after the Society began with its recruitment to send all boys willing to go to sea to London, and the Marine Society published a newspaper advertisement praising Gloucester’s promise and expressing the hope that other authorities would follow its example. The Society continued to write to parish overseers, magistrates, mayors and other gentlemen all over the country as probably the most promising way of reaching their boy recruits. Nevertheless, this reliance on reaching the boys indirectly via local authorities naturally places a question mark on the recruits’ volunteer status, which will be addressed in chapter four.

Despite the slightly disappointing attempts to reach men and boys directly, the Marine Society counted in its first year 1,911 men and 1,580 boys as their recruits. At the end of their second year the Society proudly announced that so far it had ‘fitted out 4078 men and 2797 boys to fight for the country’. Within the next year the Navy’s general manning problems eased – though there would never be enough recruits, certainly not enough able seamen, and impressment had to continue, the overall manning situation was far better than at the start of the war, and the fortunes of war mirrored the improved manning situation. The recruitment of boys was always a little more complicated, as there was usually only a certain number of placements available. There had initially been some bad experiences when the Society sent boys to the Navy regardless of the specific number demanded: the Navy, not knowing what to do with them, kept them together with the pressed men in the tender, where the boys frequently had their clothes stolen, and became sick and finally so miserable that no officer would take them, so that they were then just set on shore, barely dressed and forced to beg their way back home. The Marine Society complained about this to the Navy – notably,

41 MSY/A/1, 21/10/1756.
42 MSY/A/1, 14/07/1757.
43 MSY/A/1, 31/08/1758.
44 See ADM 1/923, Osborne, 20/11/1756.
again nothing of this is mentioned in the Society’s minutes – and the Navy responded by advising the Society to send for the future only the exact number of boys demanded.

During the first war years the Society usually had no problem collecting the required number of boys, although the boys were often below the average age it was looking for. There were also intervals when the Navy’s demand suddenly exceeded the supply, and when the Society became desperate for any boy. In April 1757, for example, the committee proclaimed that London was currently drained of boys willing to join the Navy and that the Society would have to intensify its efforts to reach boys in the country.\footnote{In May the committee even promised to cover the travel expenses for boys coming from outside London.} The response in the rest of the country was great, so much that the Society was swamped with boys and issued an advertisement asking that no boy should be sent to London without prior consultation.\footnote{Over the years the Society struggled to organise the recruitment of youngsters from the country, to ensure that only boys who were needed and fit enough, willing and no apprentices, were sent to London. The Society did not want rejected boys to be stranded in London with no support – a problem which John Fielding had already encountered when he set up the Universal Register Office: suddenly would-be apprentices sent by local authorities from all over the country appeared at his door.} In the autumn of 1758 the number of available boys was again below the demand of the Navy.\footnote{This time the Marine Society’s connections to Francis Grant in Edinburgh,\footnote{For Scottish boys see MSY/A/1, 06/07/1758, 16/11/1758; ADM 2/80, 07/04/1758, pp. 252-253; ADM 2/710, 12/05/1758 (p. 35); 28/06/1758 (p. 162), 01/07/1758 (p. 166), 05/07/1758 (p. 175), 10/07/1758 (p. 192). See also Grant’s proposal to recruit sailors from Norway in ADM 2/710, 27/04/1758 (p. 1), 09/05/1758 (p. 26), 06/06/1758 (p. 91). For the Marine Society’s connection to Thomas Gardiner in Scotland see for example MSY/A/1, 29/05/1760.} The response in the rest of the country was great, so much that the Society was swamped with boys and issued an advertisement asking that no boy should be sent to London without prior consultation. Over the years the Society struggled to organise the recruitment of youngsters from the country, to ensure that only boys who were needed and fit enough, willing and no apprentices, were sent to London. The Society did not want rejected boys to be stranded in London with no support – a problem which John Fielding had already encountered when he set up the Universal Register Office: suddenly would-be apprentices sent by local authorities from all over the country appeared at his door.\footnote{In the autumn of 1758 the number of available boys was again below the demand of the Navy. This time the Marine Society’s connections to Francis Grant in Edinburgh,\footnote{For Scottish boys see MSY/A/1, 06/07/1758, 16/11/1758; ADM 2/80, 07/04/1758, pp. 252-253; ADM 2/710, 12/05/1758 (p. 35); 28/06/1758 (p. 162), 01/07/1758 (p. 166), 05/07/1758 (p. 175), 10/07/1758 (p. 192). See also Grant’s proposal to recruit sailors from Norway in ADM 2/710, 27/04/1758 (p. 1), 09/05/1758 (p. 26), 06/06/1758 (p. 91). For the Marine Society’s connection to Thomas Gardiner in Scotland see for example MSY/A/1, 29/05/1760.}
sufficient number of youngsters. The Navy agreed to ship the Scottish boys to the Nore, and also to provide for them, and to bring the Irish boys to Plymouth or Portsmouth on board any ships which were about to make that voyage.

Surprisingly, in the final war years, despite the improved overall manning situation, it became more difficult than in the initial years to fill the Navy’s servant positions. At the same time, the subscriptions came in less plentifully than at the beginning. Early in 1760, the committee saw no other way out of the financial shortage than to stop clothing men, and to concentrate on the boys; the very last men entered the Navy on 6 June 1760. The following year the bedding for the boys had to be cancelled, and the clothing was reduced to a smaller package. At the end of 1762 the Society considered the war finally over, and decided to stop clothing boys, apart from a few particularly destitute boys sent by magistrates or other exceptional cases. The disposal of those servants now discharged by the Navy and not yet old enough to take care of themselves, as well as the pursuit of the bequest made by Mr Hicks from Hamburg, now required all its funds and attention.

Table a. Official Figures for Recruits, Costs, and Subscriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Men</th>
<th>Costs of clothing Men (£)</th>
<th>Number of Boys</th>
<th>Costs of Clothing Boys (£)</th>
<th>Conveying Boys to Ships, Food, Medicines, Rents, Salaries etc. (£)</th>
<th>Subscriptions Received (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1756/7</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>3,739</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>11,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>5,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,452</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>5,040</td>
<td>22,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 For the Irish boys see MSY/A/1, 30/11/1758, 16/10/1760, 04/12/1760; also ADM 2/81, 08/12/1758, p. 419; ADM 2/711, 08/12/1758 (p. 84), 21/12/1758 (p. 126); and later MSY/A/1, 29/05/1760. For the Dublin Marine Society see also ADM 2/710, 16/05/1758 (p. 41), 31/07/1758 (p. 268); ADM 2/712, 09/04/1759 (p. 41), 29/05/1759 (p. 304), 31/08/1759 (p. 546); ADM 2/715, 12/04/1760, p. 53.
52 See for example MSY/A/1, 29/05/1760, 16/10/1760, 21/05/1761, 26/02/1762 & 16/04/1762.
53 MSY/A/1, 21/02/1760, 03/04/1760, 17/07/1760 (decision to stop clothing men); MSY/A/1, 19/03/1761 (no more bedding for boys); MSY/A/1, 09/04/1761 (smaller clothing package).
54 MSY/A/2, 11/11/1762.
55 Figures taken from Hanway, Christian Knowledge (1763), after p. 56 (rounded to pounds)
One wonders if the officers and captains would have been able to recruit all the 4,787 boys on their own, without the help of the Marine Society, and how many positions would have stayed vacant, or would have been filled with men, thus failing to make the Navy's 'nursery for seamen' work. Admiral Boscawen, a subscriber to the Society, is supposed to have said that no scheme for manning the Navy had to his knowledge ever been such a success as the Marine Society's. Based on estimates by Stephen Gradish and the Navy's manning figures, one can surmise that around 7% of all sailors employed by the Navy from 1755 to 1762 (if we include the boys), or about 13% of those that joined after the foundation of the Marine Society, had been equipped by the Society. And, although it is difficult to estimate a percentage, one may assume that the greatest part of the boys that served in the Navy during the Seven Years War wore the Marine Society's clothes. All these recruits not only filled the ships, they also saved the public the cost and economic damage caused by having to press other men into the service. Although landmen volunteers needed to be trained, which took time and made a warship more vulnerable, many captains might have agreed with Captain Edward Wheeler, who, enraged by his crew threatening not to sail unless the ship underwent repairs, shouted at


57 See Gradish (1980), pp. 70, 216 (drawing on report to House of Commons in Commons Journal, XXXIX, 475), who estimates that 145,000 seamen were employed between 1755 and 1762; and ADM 7/567, pp. 89-90 (also in Christopher Lloyd [1970], pp. 287-288; and Rodger [1986, 1988], p. 369). Rodger (1986, 1988), p. 162, gives a similar percentage with 5% of all who joined during the war.

58 Estimate derived by taking Gradish's estimate of 145,000 seamen employed between 1755-1762, and deducting the manpower-medium in 1756 (ca. 50,000 according to ADM 7/567, p. 89) and the losses due to desertions etc. in 1755-6 (ca. 15,000 according to Adm B/161, 10/01/1759) Ronald Hope (1990), p. 232, gives a similar figure with 15%.

59 Assuming that the Navy at one time would have had (at maximum) around 6,300 servant positions available (which were surely not all filled, despite the Society's work), and that the Society's boys entered on average at the age of fourteen and were rated not before the age of eighteen.
them that he would rather go to sea with a willing landman than with an unwilling sailor, be he the best seaman in the world.\textsuperscript{60}

However, the Marine Society’s recruitment record, though widely praised by contemporaries and historians, has to be taken with caution. There are a few points that reduce the Society’s impact. The very first landmen recruits make it already apparent why it is problematic to label all these men as ‘Marine-Society recruits’, or as having been collected by the Society (as done in the secondary literature\textsuperscript{61} and in the contemporary press\textsuperscript{62}). The Society’s newspaper advertisements promised the clothing and bedding bounty to landmen who were able to produce a certificate from a regulating captain, testifying that they had enlisted.\textsuperscript{63} Hence right at the beginning one has to ask whether these men had been recruited by the Marine Society, or whether they would have joined the Navy anyway and the Society merely acted as a provider of free clothing. After all, these recruits had to have been at the Navy’s recruitment office prior to visiting the Society. Although the Navy’s regulating captains soon started to visit the Society’s committee meetings, so that the volunteers could enlist at the Society’s office, the committee also began to send representatives to the regulating captains’ office in Mark Lane, to inspect volunteers there that might qualify for the Society’s clothing bounty.\textsuperscript{64} The Navy’s officers all knew of the Marine Society, and it was only natural that they advised any man to see whether he could obtain clothes; yet this means that it is hard to say whether the volunteers joined because they had heard of the Marine Society’s offer or would have enlisted anyway. Soon some captains even began to write letters to the

\textsuperscript{60} ADM I/655, 29 01/1760 (Wheeler); also Rodger (1984), p. 70.
\textsuperscript{62} See for example London Magazine, February 1762, p 107; The Annual Register for 1762 (1787, 5\textsuperscript{th} ed.), p 71
\textsuperscript{63} MSY/A/1, 15 07/1756, and for example Public Advertiser, 17-29/07/1756, 03-06/08/1756, 01-13 01/1757.
\textsuperscript{64} See Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed.), p 20, and Three Letters: Letter III (1758), pp. 13, 53. In January 1757 the Society began to clothe men also during sub-committee meetings.
Society, asking for clothing for men who had already entered their ships, and although the committee felt reluctant to clothe just any men, and demanded that these men should at least come to the office as soon as their duty allowed them the time off, they sent the required equipment to the ships.65

For the boys the problem is similar. Although their recruitment was more in the hands of the Society, it regularly occurred that the officers brought their own boys to the office to be clothed. In fact, the Society even encouraged officers to find their servants themselves and to present such boys to the Society, so that they could be equipped.66 Some boys, who had already entered the Navy, came on their own to claim the equipment, and in other instances captains wrote letters asking for equipment to be sent to their ship for a boy who had recently entered their service. However, in both such cases the committee informed them that these boys would receive their clothing and bedding only if they appeared at the Society’s office accompanied by their captain or officer.67 Captains with good connections to the Marine Society, such as Henry Dyve, may have got away with the occasional written application and the boy not appearing in person.68 Nevertheless, at one point the committee even asked the boys’ captains and officers whether the lad had really entered the Navy with the view to being supported by the Marine Society69 — a pointless enquiry presumably, seeing that otherwise the officers themselves would have had to arrange that their boys were provided with clothing and bedding. In 1761, Captain Brooke of the Pomona, who had written to the Society and desired that clothing for seventeen boys be sent to his ship, had not only to be told that

---

65 See for example MSY/A/1, 17 02/1757, 24/02/1757; also MSY/A/1, 26 05/1757, 07/07/1757, 28/07/1757.
67 See for example MSY/A/1, 26 05/1757, 04/11/1762.
68 See for example MSY/H/2, no. 4158.
69 MSY/A/1, 26/05/17857.
the Society did not clothe any servant without seeing him, but also that some of his seventeen boys had only recently been clothed.70

Interestingly, more than a fourth of the boys sampled for the career analysis in chapter five have an earlier date of entry recorded in the Navy's muster books than the one which is noted for them in the Marine Society's registers – perhaps an indication that a significant share of servants had entered independently of the Marine Society. Admittedly, most of these date differences are only a few days, and it also appears that the entry-dates in the muster books are not totally trustworthy, as they vary on a few occasions in later muster book entries. Furthermore, there are a few individual cases that warn against reading too much into marginal entry-date differences.71 The entry-date comparisons also reveal another interesting feature: there are a relatively higher number of servants to officers other than captains among the boys with earlier entry-dates. Could it perhaps be that they often preferred to choose their servants themselves, seeing that most of them had only one or two? Captains might have done the same with those particular servants that were close to them, while all the rest of the captains' servants were mainly 'sailor-trainees', served the captain only as wage bonuses, and were therefore taken from the Marine Society.72

The Society's manning impact has to be further scaled down by the fact that in March 1757 the Society began to not only clothe landmen volunteers but also men forced into the Navy by civil magistrates.73 The committee thought that:

70 MSY/A/1, 14/05/1761. See also the three boys of the Kent being returned to their officers, because these officers had had boys clothed before (MSY/A/1, 29/07/1762).
71 Acteon Jefferys, for example, a boy who was undoubtedly recruited by the Marine Society (see MSY/A/1, 13/09/1759, MSY/H/2, no. 3525; and chapter four), has got a two days earlier date of entry in the muster book. There are also three servants with earlier entry-dates who were brought to the Society by their parents, as well as two who were brought by other persons, which suggests that they had not been on board a naval vessel before (MSY/H/2, nos. 2744, 4135, 4144, and nos. 3050, 4134).
72 However, the career analysis in chapter five does not show that those who were servants to other officers stayed significantly longer with their masters than the captains' servants. The information about the boys' families recorded in the Society's registers also does not indicate that the boys with earlier entry-dates came from a better off background.
73 MSY/A/1, 03/03/1757.
(...), in consideration of the miserable condition of such men who are occasionally sent by the Civil Magistrate & detained for the use of the Kings ships, being in rags & filth, & subject when confined not only to receive a taint from each other but also to infect volunteers, therefore on condition that such men first wash themselves very clean & clear the ships of such filthy garments, it is agreed that such clothing shall be given to them as by the report of the Regulating Captain shall appear to be absolutely necessary to their preservation.

Furthermore, at least from May 1757 onwards the Society even clothed men rated as ordinary seamen. At that time there seems to have been some confusion within the Society as to who the proper objects for the clothing bounty were. When the secretary asked for clarification, it was laid down that landmen and ordinary seamen were entitled to clothing, provided they entered as volunteers and were not entitled to more than 30s bounty from the King, as well as those men sent by civil magistrates. In 1758, Jonas Hanway wrote that the Society kept a Foul Entry-book for the men, in which was noted beside each name whether the recruit had been an able-bodied landman volunteer, ordinary seaman volunteer, pressed man, a distressed man returned from prisons in France, or sent by a civil magistrate. At this stage it becomes perfectly clear that one cannot assume that all the Society's recruits were landmen, nor that they were all volunteers, and also not that they were all recruited by the Marine Society itself. Alas, in the surviving register book, which is probably a transcript of the mentioned Foul Entry-book, this differentiation is mostly omitted, so that no good estimates on the percentage of each category of men can be given. Only from January 1759 onwards, that is for the last one thousand recruits, are labels similar to those mentioned by Hanway recorded in

---

74 MSY/A/1, 26/05/1757.
75 See Hanway, Three Letters: Letter II (1758), pp. 10-11, see also Society’s rules published in Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III (1758), pp. 16-17; Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 52; and MSY/A/1, 26/05/1757.
76 See MSY/S/1. In 1757 the label ‘C.M.’ (presumably meaning sent by civil magistrate) appears in the heading above most, though not all, groups of men sent to the tender. Their numbers are not inconsiderable. From around September 1757 the great majority of men went on board a tender first, and the label ‘C.M.’ vanishes. For recruits for whom the Marine Society recorded the actual ship they were going to, and not just the tender, one could perhaps determine whether they were landmen or not by checking the Navy's muster books.
the surviving register book - then nearly all recruits were characterised as volunteers and only a few as pressed men. However, at this stage the Navy’s manning problem had been greatly eased, so one would expect that the proportion of volunteers in this period was higher.

Why the Society gave up its initial policy of just trying to entice landmen volunteers into the Navy by offering them clothes, might partly be explained with the changes of their clothing procedures. When the Admiralty decided that all men from London, volunteers and pressed, were first to go on board a tender in the Thames, in order to prevent desertions, the committee, in consultation with the regulating captains, came to the conclusion that it was better to hand out its clothes on board the tender, as this seemed a good way to prevent thieves from running away with them. Therefore the secretary was sent to the tenders at least twice a week, with the order to hand out the Society’s clothing to those in need – at this stage the difference between ‘original’ Marine-Society recruits and others may have completely vanished, and all those that received the clothing were counted as Marine-Society recruits. Here may also lie the explanation for some confusing statements regarding the Society’s clothing policy, which led to the misunderstandings in Peter Kemp’s and Betsy Rodgers’ studies: at this stage of the Society’s operations the secretary could decide on board the tender who was to be a ‘Marine-Society recruit’, and he was able to vary the Society’s generosity according to its financial situation and to limit the bounty at times of low finances to those men that appeared most desperately in need of new clothes. In the end, even able seamen could

---

77 See proposal of Marine-Society member and Regulating Captain Andrew Cockburn in MSY/A/1, 22/12/1757.
78 See Society’s rules published in Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III (1758), pp. 25-26. It appears that the Society also paid the captain’s clerk on board the tender for help ng with the distribution of the equipment (MSY/F/1, p. 95).
79 See Chapter 1.2. For the Society clothing only those that appeared most desperate, when its finances ran low, see for example Society’s rules published in Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 93.
receive the Society's clothing, if they were returned prisoners of war, and the secretary was just broadly advised not to give any clothing to able seamen that were not coming from French prisons, nor to men who had wages due from the merchant service, or who appeared to have sufficient equipment.

In summary, though the Marine Society's manning impact was certainly unmatched by any other scheme, it is hard to assess how many of its recruits would have joined the Navy had the Society not existed. The number of genuine Marine-Society recruits was clearly well below the five and a half thousand men, and these men were not all volunteers, nor were they all inexperienced landmen. However, it was merely in the best interest of everybody concerned about the Navy's manpower and the sailors' welfare that the Marine Society tried to ensure that nobody went on board inappropriately dressed and thus endangered himself and others (through possible diseases carried in the clothes). The following section will expand on this point. Yet, the fact that the Society ended up clothing experienced seamen is also remarkable for another reason, as it shows that the concern about the war outweighed the business interests of the overseas merchants in the committee, who were after all still competing with the Royal Navy on the labour market for sailors. The merchants were probably far-sighted enough to realise that the health benefits of proper clothing ensured that a higher number of sailors, who had anyway already entered the Royal Navy, would stay alive and thus reduce the Navy's need for even more men.

The 4,787 counted boys were also by no means all genuine Marine-Society recruits, but here, even more than with the men, it was in the Society's best interest that as many boys as possible were properly nursed in the Navy to become good seamen – who would afterwards, in peacetime, be available for the merchant service. A final, thorough look at the Society's lists of boy recruits, however, forces us to make one last deduction from the figure it claims to have equipped. Surprisingly, quite a few boys appear twice in the
registers. It is tedious to detect and often difficult to judge whether two boys are identical, given the inconsistent spelling and incomplete background information, but some cases are quite obvious, and in some rare instances the registers explicitly note that a boy had been there before. We can divide these boys into two groups: first those that appear twice within a short time-span, for whom we may presume that they had not yet joined a ship, and for whom we can conclude that they have been accidentally double-counted and therefore have to be deducted from the total number. The other group are those boys that appear a second time after a longer period, and for whom we can presume that they had been at sea in the meantime, but had either to be clothed or to be placed again (or both). Whether one should deduct the second group from the Society's total figure of boy recruits is debatable. Regarding boys with common names there is of course always the danger that we are dealing with two different boys. However, for at least around 140 we can be fairly certain that they appeared twice in the registers, and nearly 40 of these appear to have already been at sea and were then clothed or placed for a second time by the Society. Taking into account the often incomplete information, address changes, death of parents and inconsistent spelling, one suspects that there are far more double-counts and returnees.

Among the boys entered twice within a short time-span are many fife-players. They seem to have been first recorded when they were sent to their training accommodation in Westminster, and then a second time when they joined a ship after the training. There is also a group of sixty boys sent from Edinburgh in 1758, who were recorded when being brought down from Scotland, and again when placed on board a specific naval vessel.\footnote{For some of those boys it is impossible to identify the double}
Richard Ollis, for example, both suffered from the *itch* when they appeared for the first time at the Society's office, and they were not sent to their ship, the *Princess Amelia*, but back to their accommodation to be cured.81 Both reappear in the registers a week later, this time recorded as going to the *Hampshire*. Another boy, Samuel Saunders, reappeared in the registers almost a year after his first entry, having been too ill for service in the previous year.82 Robert Cannady, on the other hand, had already been on board his ship, and returned to the Society from the *Royal William* over a year later after 'having been very ill'.83 Such boys reappearing in the registers after a longer period are the more interesting cases, particularly because most of them have, unlike Robert, no hint that some illness was the reason for their return. Given the Navy's tight manning situation it is surprising that these boys were discharged during the war, especially when considering that the Navy regulations specifically forbade this. Some might have merely applied for another set of clothing, others clearly had returned from their ships and needed a new servant position, such as the two boys appearing in November 1760 in front of the committee, who were placed on board the *Temeraire* and given a new pair of shoes and stockings.84 For Richard Sutton and William Baldwin the registers explicitly state that they had been at sea before, and Sutton claimed that he had been properly discharged from his ship.85 Thus it appears as if the Navy, or rather certain captains, discharged boys while the war was still going on. The boy Richard Sutton is interesting for another reason: the first time he appeared at the Marine Society he was brought by the Lord Mayor's officers. Was he perhaps a rather unwilling boy, whom no officer wanted as a servant? Thirteen-year old Zebulon Dent, whose father was in the Fleet

---

81 MSY/H/1, nos. 856, 863 (Langley), and nos. 855, 866 (Ollis).
82 MSY/H/1, no 1714; MSY/H/2, no. 2483.
83 MSY/H/1, no. 1025; MSY/H/2, no. 2813.
84 MSY/A/1, 27/11/1760. The boys could not be identified in the registers; one of them might be MSY/H/2, no. 4220.
85 MSY/H/1, no. 1987; MSY/H/2, no. 2975 (Sutton); MSY/H/2, nos. 3656, 3832 (Baldwin).
Prison, also came from the Lord Mayor, that is when he appeared for the second time within three months at the Society. At his first appearance he had been sent to the Seahorse, but the ship's muster book tells us that he has been discharged after only three weeks, due to 'Request', without giving any hint as to where he was going (these unspecified discharges from ships will be at the centre of chapter five). Similarly, William Griffiths was first brought by his aunt and went on board the Monarch, from which he was discharged due to 'Request' after only three months, and six weeks later he reappeared at the Marine Society's office being sent by magistrate John Fielding. Jacob Crawley even appeared three times at the Society's office: from his first ship he was discharged due to 'Request' after only eleven days; at the ship he was assigned to during his second visit he never appeared; and at his third placement he was again discharged due to 'Request' after only three weeks on board. Perhaps all these boys did not appear physically fit enough to their officers, but what seems more likely is that they were simply not very keen on going to sea - one more reason to check the Society's claim that all its boys were volunteers, a task which will be undertaken in chapter four.

While this section has shown that the Marine Society's recruitment success has so far been overestimated, the next section will show that its contribution to the preservation of recruits has so far been greatly underestimated. Of course the Society, or Hanway, also contributed on other levels to the improvement of the manning situation. Hanway entered the theoretical debate with his Reasons for an Augmentation of at least Twelve Thousand Mariners (1759). As further positive effects of the Society's work, Hanway's biographer John Hutchins claimed that the Marine Society's and Hanway's writings greatly improved society's attitudes towards seamen, by underlining their importance for

---

86 MSY/H/2, nos. 4027, 4200.
87 See appendix three. There is also an R. recorded behind Zebulon's first entry in the Society's registers.
88 MSY/H/2, nos. 3428, 3667; ADM 36 6073, p. 29 (no. 249), p. 50 (no. 249).
commerce and country, by portraying their profession as a wise and well-paid career choice, and by overcoming the negative stereotype of the drunken and rowdy sailor.  

With regards to the economic value of sailors this is certainly true, but also something Political Arithmeticians had preached since the beginning of the century. However, it is debatable whether the Marine Society really improved the sailors' negative stereotype – certainly not by repeatedly portraying its recruits as potential criminals. The coming wars against France may have played a more prominent role here – not by transforming the raucous stereotype itself, but by turning it into the positive version of *Jolly Jack Tar*, whose masculinity and wildness, and what one would today perhaps call hooliganism, no longer scared and ashamed the country, as in the Reverend Woodward's days, but instead protected it from the French.

**III.3. The Importance of the Sailors' Clothing in the Georgian Navy**

Naval recruits, whether volunteers or pressed, usually entered the Navy with the clothes they happened to be wearing. Proposals to hand out free uniforms had never been put into practice, because sailors were, unlike soldiers, not permanent employees. The men could obtain clothes and bedding on board in exchange for a wage deduction at any time and as long as the ship's stock lasted: the Navy had introduced this to prevent the seamen from suffering from a want of equipment and having to buy products abroad. Fear of desertions prevented the Navy from giving away anything for free. It appears to have been largely up to the individual sailor whether he thought it necessary and worth the wage deduction to obtain new clothing and bedding. Of course, in particular for those landmen and boys who were driven into the Navy by their destitute situation, and

---

89 Hutchins (1940), pp. 82-3.
90 From 1748 commissioned officers had a standard uniform (though the introduction took some time), and from 1756 midshipmen too (Clowes [1898, 1966], p. 20; Rodger [1986, 1988], p. 65).
who possessed no sailors' clothes at all, fitting themselves out would have been very expensive. Here the Marine Society helped by offering free sailors' clothing. Initially the Society provided the men also with bedding, and until the royal bounty for landmen was introduced even with a change of clothes, but for most of the time only the boys received clothing and bedding.

The exact equipment the Society gave out varied over time, as the committee tested new products, abandoned old ones that proved unsatisfactory, or was forced by lack of money to reduce the package. When the Society picked and clothed their recruits among all the men on board the tender, some might have only received certain items they were particularly in need of. The garments the men usually received were a felt hat, two worsted caps, a kersey peajacket, a waistcoat with slashed sleeve, two or three shirts, one to three pairs of drawers, a pair of canvas trousers, a pair of hose (yarn or worsted), a pair of shoes, two handkerchiefs, a pair of blue horn buttons, and a bag to hold their gear. The boys usually got the same as the men, plus an extra pair of shoes, an extra pair of yarn hose, one more shirt, and bedding consisting of a mattress, a pillow, a blanket, and a coverlet. The clothes came in blue or brown. When the price of indigo rose brown became the dominant colour, but from 1758 onwards dark blue was the norm, dyed with indigo, which apparently was the most weather-resistant colour. A sample of the clothing was kept on show at the Society's office. The regular equipment also included some useful tools, such as thread, worsted and needles, and even a knife.

Three reasons had led the Marine Society to provide new clothes instead of trying to attract the volunteers with an extra money bounty, as the government and also some towns and corporations did: the concern about the integration of their recruits on board,

91 For equipment see for example MSY/A/1, 22/07 1756, 29/07/1756, 12/08/1756, 24/03/1757, 26/05/1757, 03 11/1757, 24/11/1757, 26/01/1758, and also Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 3rd ed.), p. 42; and the Society's rules in Hanway, Three Letters: Letter III (1758), pp 21-30.
to lower the temptation for thieves to steal the bounty, and to protect the sailors' health. As described in chapter one, sailors were often regarded, and regarded themselves, as different from the rest of society, and aversion against landmen was widespread, especially in the Royal Navy. The landmen on board were easy to detect, not only by their inexperience, but also because they were dressed as people on land normally did. By dressing them in sailors' clothes the Society hoped to hasten their integration on board. Seamen referred to the dress of landmen as *long toggies*, since landmen usually wore long coats and waistcoats over their tight breeches and stockings, while in contrast sailors wore shorter clothes, their (usually blue) jackets and (red) waistcoats only reaching their waist, as this was safer for working aloft. Hence, replacing the landmen's *long toggies* also reduced the risk that their long garments might cause an accident. Hanway's brother Thomas, a captain in the Navy, told Jonas once of the problems he had when commanding a ship with a large number of landmen. He found it very difficult to get the sailors to mix with the landmen, so he bought sailors' clothing for them from their first prize money and observed that the distinction between seamen and landmen immediately ceased. Thomas Hanway thought that his landmen thereby became seamen in one third the time they would have normally needed. The Society's clothing bounty was now to eradicate this visual difference from the beginning, and according to a report in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of April 1757 it did so, ending a distinction between seamen and landmen, 'which used to create animosity, and subject the landmen to some hardships'. Greg Dening has argued that a further intended psychological effect was that clothing the recruits uniformly was to promote the subordination of the new men to

---

92 Apparently the term derived from the Roman Toga (see *Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account* [1772], pp. 4-5).
95 *Gentleman's Magazine*, April 1757, p. 150
the discipline of the ship. Undoubtedly, uniforms suppress individuality and resistance, and the Marine Society's clothes were indeed a uniform (though some recruits received only particular items of clothing); yet I have not come across any comments from the Marine Society or Hanway that they were aware of, or intended such effects on naval discipline. The committee hoped, however, that the proper look and good quality of the clothes would constantly remind the recruits of the great charity they had allegedly received.

Apart from the concern for the new recruits' integration on board, fraud and theft were another reason that led the Society to offer clothing rather than a money bounty. It was hoped that a clothing bounty would prove less tempting for thieves; as the clothes were uniform they were easier to detect when sold illegally, and they made it easier to identify any deserter running away with them. The most important aspect of the provision of new clothing and bedding, however, was the positive impact it had on the health of the recruits, and on the whole ship's company. The men applying to the Marine Society were usually poorly dressed, and it was obvious that their ragged clothing would not give them sufficient protection against the weather. Even if fears about thefts and integration on board were put aside, the Society would probably still have preferred to hand out the clothing directly rather than giving out money with the hope that the men would buy what they considered necessary. Experience told the Society that sailors often enough paid less attention to their clothing than the Admiralty did, and it did not expect its landmen and boys to be more considerate than those "old salts" - Jonas Hanway thought that both landman and experienced mariner "often stand in need of others to think for them." Being the "hardy and robust men" Hanway wanted them to be, and

---

96 Dening (1992), pp. 133-140.
97 Hanway, Three Letters: Letter I (1758), p. 3.
98 See Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 3rd ed.), p. 22.
their machismo being formed within a male world of the ship and the hazards of nature and war, the chances were high that sailors would spend a large share of such clothing money in taverns rather than on clothes. Hanway observed that 'Our Seamen (...) are confusedly brave, but they are apt to be careless; and more lives have been lost for want of clothing than many imagine,’ 99 and that the Marine Society ‘mean to preserve this nation, by saving our Seamen from avoidable hardships, and preserving them from their worst enemies, themselves.’100 Perhaps asking sailors to disregard their health when engaging in combat, going on long risky voyages and working in stormy weather, but at the same time expecting them to be sober enough to spend a large part of their modest income on proper clothing, was asking the impossible from one and the same character. This ‘demanding of the impossible’ and Hanway’s impression of the sailors’ attitudes are colourfully illustrated in Captain Edward Wheeler’s verbal attack on his crew.101 His men had complained that the ship was in such a bad state, with leaks everywhere, that scarcely any man would have a dry hammock to turn into after coming down from a cold wet deck, and that this threatened their health and made many unfit for duty. Wheeler blasted at them: ‘For God’s Sake, what are ye? Are ye Men? Or have ye only the appearance of such; English Seamen ye cannot be, for their Distinguishing Characteristick has ever been to Brave all Danger, to Undergo hardships, and to Endure Fatigue. Have ye ever Considered that the ship is just fitted by the King’s Builder, and reported fit for the Sea?’ – Wheeler knew himself very well that the ship was in a worse state than ever, that her damage was far from being repaired, and that, as he told the Admiralty, the King’s Builder had not even thought it worth his while to inspect her, but he carried on lecturing his crew:

99 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 4th ed.), p. 33.
100 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 3rd ed.), pp. 32-33.
101 See ADM 1/655, 29/01/1760 (Wheeler).
Ye Complain of as appears by the Sick list, but a very great Number came ill to Sea, full of vile Diseases of their own acquiring, by their Debauch'd manner of Living, and I am sorry to say it, tho' I have very often given Cloathes to ev'ry man in this ship (...) I have lent many my money (...) Yet, with all these Advantages, and Encouragements, I could never prevail on them, to keep themselves Tight Cloath'd and Clean, which alone would Enable ye to Bear the Inclemency of Weather, and undergo Fatigue much better than ye now do; I have observed too, whenever ye get any money paid, ye do not act with it like rational Creatures, and lay it out on Cloaths and Necessarys, But ye throw it immediately away in Dirty Whores and in Stinking Gin, much better indeed it would be to throw it overboard, for then ye would save your healths and Constitutions (...)

Insufficient clothing in stormy and cold weather cost many men’s lives, but old and ragged clothing (and bedding) posed a much greater danger, not just to the recruit but to the whole crew, even the whole fleet, and that was that filthy clothing was very likely to carry diseases like typhus on board.\textsuperscript{102} Typhus, then known as jail distemper, or gaol-, ship-, hospital-, camp-, putrid-, malignant- or pestilential fever,\textsuperscript{103} was one of the greatest killers of naval manpower. In overcrowded warships diseases spread all too easily – any tourist visitor to the H.M.S. Victory in Portsmouth today feels amazed that 850 men could live and work in a space little more than 50m long, 15m broad and 6m deep. As the naval surgeon James Lind remarked in 1762, ‘the number of seamen in time of war, who die by shipwreck, capture, famine, fire, or sword, are indeed but inconsiderable, in respect of such as are destroyed by the ship diseases, and by the usual maladies of intemperate climates.’\textsuperscript{104} Hence, for anyone interested in solving the Navy’s manning problems fighting the causes of these diseases was as important as recruiting new sailors. According to Lind, in peacetime diseases were virtually no problem, or no more than for people living on land; the trouble only started at the outbreak of war, when

\textsuperscript{102} N.A M. Rodger has pointed out that clean clothing was especially important when considering that washing the body was hardly possible during the voyage, as fresh water was too dear, and soap was expensive and less effective in salt water (see Rodger [1986, 1988], p. 107)

\textsuperscript{103} In 1750, Sir J hn Pringle, the celebrated army surgeon had identified hospital fever, jail fever and camp fever as being the same, and Navy surgeon James Lind established that the ship fever belonged to this group, though both of them never used the term ‘typhus’, which was introduced by William Cullen in 1769 (see for example Lloyd & Coulter [1961]).

\textsuperscript{104} Lind (1757, 1762), p. xvii.
the press gang roamed the urban slums and filled the ships with ‘such idle fellows as are picked from the Streets or the Prisons’.\textsuperscript{105} Such men threatened to bring on board ‘a Disease of the most contagious nature’, as Lind described it, ‘the Produce of Filth, Poverty, and a polluted Air, which subsists always in a greater or less Degree in crowded Prisons, and in all nasty, low, damp, unventilated Habitations loaded with putrid animal steams’.\textsuperscript{106} A single infected man on board a tender, from which the men were distributed to their ships, could theoretically infect the whole fleet. Indeed Lind complained that the guard ship at the Nore, which received the men taken up in London, had often turned into a ‘Seminary of Contagion to the whole Fleet’ through a single diseased person.\textsuperscript{107}

The Admiralty took a few steps in the right direction, so that the care about the personal hygiene of the crew was not exclusively left to the individual recruit. The Admiralty’s regulations ruled that if any pressed men was in need of clothing or bedding the captain could order him to be supplied with clothes or bedding not exceeding one month’s pay in value.\textsuperscript{108} However, out of fear of theft or men reselling their clothes for a higher price, captains were at the same time instructed not to supply anyone who was not really in want of clothing or bedding. No man was allowed to obtain a second supply of clothing or bedding until he had worked off the first. The Admiralty’s Additional Regulations and Instructions of 1756 went further, insisting that all new recruits, volunteers and pressed men, had to have their clothing and bedding checked when coming on board and if necessary replaced. Furthermore, the limit to which equipment could be handed out was increased to two months wages;\textsuperscript{109} yet again the warning was added not to give the pressed men more than what was absolutely necessary. Since the

\textsuperscript{105} Lind (1757), p. 1.
\textsuperscript{106} Lind (1757), p. 2.
\textsuperscript{107} Lind (1757), pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{108} Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty’s Service at Sea (1757, 9th ed.), pp. 72-73.
\textsuperscript{109} ‘Additional Regulations, XXI’ (1756), in Regulations and Instructions (1757, 9th ed.), pp. 209-210. Regarding the volunteers the two-months advance made this provision risk-free.
men had to pay for their clothing and bedding, they were probably always reluctant to cooperate and would get on board insufficiently equipped. In 1757, Jonas Hanway was still optimistic (or perhaps he tried to put pressure on Admiralty and captains), writing that he was told that, after the Marine Society had improved the landmen's clothing, the Admiralty now intended to improve the clothing of sailors.\textsuperscript{110} The Admiralty's regulations regarding clothing and bedding, however, though evidence of an increasing awareness of the dangers of bad clothing and bedding, remained insufficient due to a lack of funds to provide the men with free equipment, and because the Admiralty was too afraid of theft and sailors (re-)selling their clothes. Looking back on the thousands of deaths through diseases at wartime, and on the resulting military and financial costs, one gets the impression that it was a case of saving expenditure at the wrong end. N.A.M. Rodger, though, has objected that it would have been difficult for the Admiralty to hand out any free clothing, for if they had clothed the men on board, it might have been too late, as the men could have already infected others on board the tender (as described above), and clothing them before they reached the ship was dangerous, since the men had at that point not yet legally joined the Navy, and there would have been no legal means of keeping them in the service.\textsuperscript{111} However, the Marine Society clothed their men on board the Navy's tenders, which seems to have worked well.\textsuperscript{112} In defence of Admiralty and captains, the exact causes of the \textit{ship fever} were still a mystery. Bacteriology and the discovery that lice (and fleas) were the main carriers of typhus were still over a century away. The tiny blood-sucking insects were probably the only inhabitants that thrived in the humid and overcrowded living conditions below deck, and,

\textsuperscript{110} Hanway, \textit{Letter from a Member} (1757, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed.), p. 23.

\textsuperscript{111} Rodger (1986, 1988), pp. 107-109

\textsuperscript{112} At least volunteers could have been forced to be clothed in exchange for withholding the bounty payment (as has been done with some German and Swiss recruits, see ADM 2/78, 27/05/1757), or in exchange for the two-months advance, though admittedly such measures would have reduced the Navy's attractiveness to volunteers
being so small in size that one hardly recognises them, they ended up killing and disabling more men on both sides than any enemy force. 113 Though ragged clothing and bedding was always considered a danger, 114 until mid-century and beyond the predominant assumption was that the foul air in the damp and overcrowded wooden environment was the actual cause of the ship fever. Consequently most of the Admiralty’s efforts to improve the disastrous health record were concerned with ventilation techniques and the cleanliness of the ship itself. However, as the ventilation measures did not bring the hoped-for results, various people shifted their attention to the men’s personal cleanliness and clothes, though even the celebrated Navy surgeons James Lind and Thomas Trotter did not consider lice as the guilty party. 115 Lind proposed the establishment of a quarantine ship for ragged men, where they should be washed, and their old clothes destroyed and new ones given out together with new bedding. 116 And there are other examples that personal-hygiene awareness was growing, even before Lind began working at Haslar Hospital in 1758, the Hospital had already an established procedure of fumigating the patients’ clothes in smokehouses, and getting rid of the beds of infected sailors. 117 Patients were supplied with hospital clothing, which was paid for by the Navy, though the positive side effect that deserters could be easily identified might have further encouraged the Admiralty to finance this hygiene measure. The Admiralty also added new clothes to the bounty for those sailors who enlisted again after being released from foreign prisons. 118 Individual Navy members also proved forward looking, such as

---

113 For a general history of lice’s contribution to history see Zinsser (1935, 1965), in particular the chapter On the influence of epidemic diseases on political and military history, and on the relative unimportance of Generals.
114 The documents of the Sick and Hurt Board, for example, show that also in the early eighteenth century there was an awareness of the dangers (Pat Crimmm, in a lecture on the Sick and Hurt Board during the eighteenth century [London, 12/12/2002]).
115 Lind observed that lice were not killed by fumigation, and therefore, as he trusted this method as an effective measure against infections, he concluded that lice could not be responsible.
116 Lind (1757), p. 4.
117 See for example ADM 305/1, 12/04/1758 (p. 42), 11/07/1758 (p. 46); also Gradish (1980), p. 195.
118 ADM 2/222, 08/07/1757, p. 222. There is an overlap here, as the Marine Society claimed in the same year that it too equipped returned prisoners of war.
Admiral Knowles who, in 1757, requested a ship at Portsmouth as a delousing station, a request rejected by the Admiralty; however, in 1759 the Admiralty provided a delousing ship at Plymouth to deal with some Irish recruits.

As with so many health issues, the acknowledgement that personal cleanliness and clothing might be connected to the fevers spread long before a proper scientific explanation was found. At the forefront of these new insights was the Marine Society, though no famous scientist was among its leading characters. More than once the Society pointed out in its publications that replacing their recruits' ragged clothing would prevent fever epidemics, as if this was a scientific certainty. Nevertheless, even the Marine Society, which normally understood the art of self-advertisement only too well, gave the successful fever prevention it performed insufficient praise, which suggests that the members were not fully aware of it. Through the provision of new clothes for those who, due to their destitute backgrounds, normally posed the greatest health risk to the fleet, and by taking away and often destroying their old clothes, the Society contributed to the Navy's manpower far beyond the mere number of recruits they supplied – even more so when it began to clothe the men sent by the magistrates (and insisted that they washed themselves thoroughly), 'in consideration of the miserable

---

121 See also anecdote in Friedenberg (2001), p. 77, of sailors taking the clothing and bedding of a typhus-infected shipmate away for cleaning, without the surgeon's orders, and, when asked by the surgeon why they did this, replying 'because it was lousy' (see furthermore Hanway's comment in the following footnote).
122 See for example Hanway, To the Marine Society (1757), p. 4; also Hanway and Thornton, Three Letters: Motives (1758), p. 6; Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), p. 52; and Hanway, Serious Considerations (1762), p. 59 Remarkable is also a comment by Hanway about lice being the carrier of diseases, which he made when talking about the necessity to educate the children of the poor 'When boys are not regarded they become, with respect to a ship's company, what lice and small vermin are to a human body: and if they are of a very tender age, they cannot fail of being a nuisance, and generating infection and disease' (Hanway, Account of the Marine Society [1759, 6th ed.], p. 55).
123 See for example Hanway, in Serious Considerations (1762), where (even after the war) he still devotes much more space to the Navy's ventilation efforts; also in London Magazine, September 1762, pp 483-485.
condition of such men', 'being in rags & filth, & subject when confined not only to receive a taint from each other but also to infect volunteers'. With regard to these health benefits the Society's manning impact has so far been underestimated, perhaps even by the Society itself. It deserves to be classed with the newly established hospitals and the Sick and Hurt Board as another important force that prevented the outbreak of any serious typhus epidemic in the Royal Navy in the late 1750s. In 1761, James Lind could proudly observe that the whole fleet had been in an unparalleled state of good health for the last two years. The positive effects of providing fresh clothing and enforcing personal hygiene could not be overlooked: in 1762, James Lind added (for the second edition of his *Essay on the Health of Seamen*) 'Rags' to his above quoted introductory description of the disease, and also that 'the purest Air cannot cleanse Rags from Contagion', as well as an example of a fever epidemic where the 'fatal Mischief lurked in their [the men's] tainted Apparel; and Rags, and by these was conveyed into other Ships'. In the following decades, surgeons, captains, and other officers pleaded for the introduction of a uniform, but the Admiralty reacted only slowly, and it took another hundred years before a uniform was introduced (with the introduction of continuous service), and even the provision of soap for the men was only introduced at the end of the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the recognition grew within the Navy of how important it was that new recruits were washed, disinfected, and made to buy new clothes. One consequence of this increasing recognition was the emergence of the Divisional System in the 1770s, whereby the men were divided into

124 MSY/A/1, 03/03/1757.
125 Lloyd & Coulter s (1961) standard book on Medicine and the Navy, for example, does not mention the Marine Society nor Hanway. For the Sick and Hurt Board see P.K. Cumming (1999).
126 Lind (1761, 1763), p. 31.
127 Lind (1757, 1762), p. 2.
128 Lind (1757, 1762), p. 4.
129 See Lloyd & Coulter (1961), pp. 77ff. The Marine Society too, however, appears not to have considered handing out soap
little groups and supervised by a midshipman – the system was not only to ensure discipline on board, but also that someone would keep a close eye on each man’s cleanliness and clothes.\textsuperscript{130} Jonas Hanway had already advocated a similar system to inspect the men and their clothes back in 1758.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{130} See for example Christopher Lawrence (1996, 1998), p. 93.
\textsuperscript{131} Hanway, \textit{Two Letters: Letter IV} (1758), p. 3. In 1759, Captain Richard Howe (later Admiral Lord), in the oldest ship order book we know of, made his midshipmen responsible for checking the men’s clothes and cleanliness and whether they had sold or lost any of the clothes supplied to them (see Lavery [1998], pp 74-75, 82-91).
The Marine Society's office, by J.B. Cipriani (1758). On the bottom right the boys are inspected, leaving their concerned mothers behind; then a captain directs them over to the other side, where they are clothed in the Marine Society's uniform by the 'slopman'. At the table Jonas Hanway is speaking, Lord Romney sits in the chair, next to whom the treasurer John Thornton is counting the finances (see Hanway, *Christian Knowledge* (1763), British Library's copy contains Hanway's hand-written explanation of the print).
IV.1. A Marine-Society Boy

It is now time to rescue the seafaring boy from historical anonymity, to enter the Marine Society's office, pictured in the illustration, and to take a look at the boys appearing before the committee. Who was the typical boy we would encounter there? Where did he come from, how old was he, what do we know about his family background? These questions will be addressed in the first two sections, while the third will attempt to unearth the boys' motivations for going to sea, cast a critical eye on the Society's claim that all their boys were volunteers, but also attempt to explain the fascination the sea service could exert on unsettled youths by looking at it from a youth-cultural angle. A positive result that came out of chapter three is that, because the Society began to equip boys from all over the country, provided clothing for any boy taken to sea by a captain or officer and perhaps for the majority of the servants employed during the war, we can expect a much wider representation of ships' boys in the registers than just the London urchins initially targeted by the Society.

If we want to give the typical Marine-Society boy a name at the start of our investigation, it would have to be unsurprisingly John. Almost every fourth boy entering the Society's office was called John. John, together with William, Thomas, and James, name more than half of all the Society's boys. Chart b. illustrates the dominance of these four names.1 Richard, Jos(eph)2, George, Robert, Edward and Charles cover most of the

---

1 Double-counted boys and returnees were excluded.
2 Cases of double-counted boys indicate that Jos stands for Joseph, rather than for Joshua or Josiah.
remaining boys.\textsuperscript{3} Those boys, who have the full name of their fathers recorded, prove how common it was to name the son after the father. A remarkable 50\% carry their father’s forename. Cases of brothers being recruited together suggest that always the older one, or first born, carried the father’s forename.\textsuperscript{4} Assuming that the Society’s recruits contained a large contingent of boys who were not the first born son, the tradition of naming the first born after the father was presumably even more widespread.

Most probably the John appearing at the Society’s office would be a mere fourteen years old.\textsuperscript{5} Chart c. gives an overview of the boys’ ages. First of all, with regards to what has been written in Chapter I.3 about youth history, one has to acknowledge that the age distribution reveals a clear general idea of where youth began and were it ended: there is the lower border of twelve to thirteen, below which boys are considered as too young, and the top end around seventeen to eighteen, above which most boys were categorised as men. Once again a concept of youth shows up which very much resembles our modern one. The mode and median age of John and his comrades are both fourteen, and even the mean, which should give an exaggerated average, since there could be extraordinarily old boys but not much younger ones, is merely 14.6. Median and mean dropped over the calendar years from fifteen to fourteen, suggesting that the Society found it increasingly difficult to get older boys. Taking the criticism of the data made in the Introduction into account, the real age average could have been even lower, as some boys might have made themselves (or were made) older to get accepted. The low age averages reveal a great disappointment for the Marine Society, which had always wanted to recruit the

\textsuperscript{3} While short forms such as Ed and Sam appear frequently, none of the many James is recorded as Jim, the name Robert Louis Stevenson was to give his seafaring and treasure-hunting boy hero one and a half centuries later.

\textsuperscript{4} See MSY/H/2, nos. 4110, 4111 & nos. 4113, 4114 & nos. 4415, 4416. The assumption that these are pairs of brothers is based on matching background information.

\textsuperscript{5} For around 80\% of the boys the age is recorded. For the age analysis all boys suspected of having been counted twice when they enlisted are only included as one entry, while the returnees are counted as two different entries.
older lads of sixteen years and over, who could soon be rated as seamen and thus make space for another boy. Even though the Society still equipped a remarkable number of older lads (a little over one fourth were older than fifteen), the initial aim had been that at least two thirds would be above the age of sixteen or even seventeen. The Society was forced to acknowledge that it was more difficult than it had anticipated to find older boys who were not employed in any other occupation. Where were all the unemployed older teenagers, the ones who had passed the age of fourteen and were still or once again without a proper apprenticeship or employment? Perhaps the problem of runaway apprentices was something that mainly occurred among older apprentices in their early twenties, who could no longer cope with still being under the same restrictions, and who were able to enter the Navy as landmen and not as servants. So were there simply not as many unemployed older teenagers as the Marine Society thought, and did the ca. two thousand lads older than fourteen it collected drain already the whole potential of unemployed youths? Or were they, as the Society once noted in 1759, still ‘lurking in and about the environs of this great City’? In 1760, when Jonas Hanway visited the London Workhouse, which normally housed boys suspected to be beggars, vagabonds, or pilferers, he was told that the Marine Society had done its business so completely, that apparently nothing remained for the London Workhouse to do. The number of London

---

6 See for example advertisements in London Magazine, March 1757, p. 112; or Gentleman’s Magazine, April 1757, pp. 149-150.
7 See MSY/A/1, 14/04/1757.
8 See also Peter King, who suggests that the apprentices aged 18-24 might have been the most dissatisfied (King [2000], pp. 170, 176ff., 288).
9 Estimate derived by counting number of lads older than fourteen, and adding an estimate for those who might hide behind the boys with no recorded age, under the assumption that their share of all boys with no recorded age is the same as the share of those above fourteen of all youths with age information.
10 MSY/A/1, 19/04/1759.
boys aged 15-19 at any given point may be estimated at 20,000;\textsuperscript{12} over five and a half years the Society sent roughly 900\textsuperscript{13} of that age group to sea. At first sight it seems as if either a large part of London's unemployed older youths was unwilling to go to sea, or the unemployment rate was by modern standards far from dramatic. However, if one considers that roughly between 200 to 500 of these 900 entered in the first year of the Society's existence, the figure appears more impressive, and it becomes clear that the Society probably absorbed the largest part of London's unemployed youth at the start of its work.

The Society not only reached a lower share of older boys than hoped, it also enlisted a surprisingly high number of boys who were below the minimum age. The Navy regulations determined thirteen as the minimum age.\textsuperscript{14} The Marine Society had set fourteen as the minimum age, while thirteen-year olds were to be accepted only if exceptionally fit. Despite these regulations nearly 8\% of the boys were below thirteen. Roughly two thirds of these met the Society's height standard. However, how boys like Richard East, an illegitimate child brought to the Society by a Mr Forrest from Cavendish Square, could be accepted remains astonishing: Richard was ten years old and a mere 3ft 11in.\textsuperscript{15} All boys like Richard were sent to sea contrary to the Navy regulations, but it has already been suggested in other studies that the age regulation was frequently ignored by captains.\textsuperscript{16} The Navy regulations provided an exception for the

\textsuperscript{12} Based on estimates given in Landers (1993), p. 180 (for 10-19-year old boys and girls per thousand), and on the assumption that the teenaged population is evenly spread over the ages and sex.

\textsuperscript{13} Estimate derived by counting the recruited London boys aged 15-19 (607 boys) and adding an estimate (ca. 272) for the London boys of the same age that might hide behind those with no or unidentified geographical information (plus the few Londoners with no age) recorded (the latter estimate based on the assumption that their share is similar to the one of the others in relation to all who have background information recorded; however, as the near 600 early recruits with no address information were probably predominately Londoners, the real figure can be expected to have been a little higher than this estimate).

\textsuperscript{14} Regulations and Instructions (1757, 9\textsuperscript{th} ed.), p. 152.

\textsuperscript{15} MSY/H2, no. 4404.

\textsuperscript{16} Some underaged boys (MSY/H2, nos. 4258, 4286, 4287, 4288) were brought by naval officers to the Marine Society, so we can be sure that they were accepted on board.
sons of officers, who could be as young as eleven, and one may assume that the officers provided as much guidance and protection for their sons as would be necessary if a child of such young age is put on board a warship; however, there is no hint that any of the underaged Marine-Society boys were related to officers on board. Perhaps the lower age limit for sons of officers was in practice also granted to seamen, for some of the underaged boys had sailors as fathers. In the case of John Dowsett it is apparent from the registers that his father was on the same ship, and also William Woodward, though already thirteen years old but far too short, had his father on the same ship. In fact, at least regarding the height standard, the Marine Society advertised that it was willing to accept undersized boys when they had fathers serving on board (or ‘other circumstances’). Next to having a relative on board, having a relative with good connections to men on board could have been another reason for getting underaged boys accepted. The fathers of the twelve-year olds Robert Haslewood and James Nichols were both shipwrights, and perhaps the purser of the Syren and the carpenter of the Leostaffe each took one of them in exchange for a special attention by the shipwright when the ship came into the dock. Remarkably, all sons of shipwrights in the Society’s registers can be considered as either too young or too short.

The young age of so many boys we would encounter at the Society’s office might leave us a little shocked about the fact that captains and officers allowed such young children to go to war, and that against the Navy regulations. Half a century later even

---

17 The only exception might be the youngest boy of all, eight-year old John Bradbury, whose father was a gunner at Deptford, where also the boy’s ship Vesuvius lay (see MSY/H/1, no. 961).
18 MSY/H/2, nos. 3477, 3600, 4053, 4086, 4267, 4326, 4406, 4415, 4431, 4659, 4662 & 4716.
19 MSY/H/2, no. 2602 (Dowsett); MSY/H/1, no. 1915 (Woodward). See also Richard Philip, only twelve years old and measuring 4ft 11in, whose father was an armourer on board the ship he was sent to (MSY/H/2, no. 4210)
20 See for example advertisements in General Evening Post, 17 01/1758, or Public Advertiser, 07/04/1758.
21 MSY/H/2, nos. 4304, 4343.
22 See also MSY/H/2, nos. 2738, 4764 (both aged 13), as well as the undersized sons of shipwrights in the height analysis below.
Horatio Nelson, who also joined the Navy very young, was to complain that so many boys entered the Navy far earlier in life than was good for them. The decisive point is probably whether the officers took these underaged boys under their personal care, as they would do with their own sons, or whether the children would be largely left to live among the crew. As young as all these boys were, there are plenty of examples of other children in the eighteenth century who went to sea, and some also to war, at the same tender age. The laws providing for compulsory maritime apprenticeship for parish boys, for example, referred to all children above ten years of age. Even among the Society’s slightly older boys we find some for whom it was not the first time they went to sea, and who had had some tough seafaring experiences outside the Navy: thirteen-year old Joseph Graham, for example, had been a castaway in the Marquis of Granby, and fourteen-year old James Martin had come from a French prison, where he had ended up after being taken while serving on board the King of Prussia privateer, on which he might have sailed together with the young Thomas Paine. Fourteen-year old Peter Maquire had been paid off by the Neptune merchantman from Virginia – a friendless orphan, left to his own devices at the harbour. The Marine Society later claimed that pity for the desperate boys, and not the need for recruits, often led it to accept such underaged or undersized boys. In some instances, as for example in the case of some underaged Scottish boys, who had been shipped to London amongst a big group of recruits, it appears understandable that it was perhaps more humane to accept them, rather than returning them somehow, or, even worse, leaving them in London. Pressure from a local authority could have been another reason that brought these young boys on board: the twelve-year old orphan Arthur Tolboy, for example, was sent by the Lord

23 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. I (1703).
24 MSV/H/2, no. 3763.
25 MSY/H/2, no 2972. See also no. 3118, Steven Collard, another returned prisoner of war
26 MSY/H/2, no. 5008.
Mayor, and also ten-year old Sam Hardman, whose father's trade was registered as that of a smuggler, was probably sent by some legal authority.

At the other end of the age scale there are also some surprises. About a fourth of the Society's boys was older than fifteen, the age group the Society was predominantly interested in. Yet, some of them were so old, that one wonders why they were entered as boys and not as landmen. The Society initially stated that it was not to be expected that anyone older than eighteen would enter the Navy as an unpaid servant, but the oldest 'boy' ever to enlist through the Marine Society was an astonishing twenty-eight years old. His name was Thomas Warwick, and in his case, as in many others, one senses that entering a man as a servant was a way of discriminating against less favoured recruits, perhaps motivated by an urgent demand for servants. Thomas' stature does not indicate any physical deficiency, but a note behind his name might provide us with the reason why he had to be content to enter as a servant: Thomas was 'a black' coming from the East Indies. In fact, all 'black' boys equipped by the Society were eighteen and older. A criminal conviction might have been another reason for young men being entered as servants, as, for example, among the recruits who were clothed on board the tender we find many older ones.

John, the typical Marine-Society boy, was likely to appear at the office in rather filthy clothes, as already suggested in the previous chapter. The engraving of the scene at the Society's office, and the painting commemorating the Society's incorporation give a

---

28 MSY/H/2, no. 4201.
29 MSY/H/2, no. 3229.
30 Gentleman's Magazine, April 1757, p. 149.
31 MSY/H/1, no. 1252. Behind a few other boys names the Society recorded Man went for a boy (MSY/H/1, nos. 182, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 229, 231, 243), but the said boys age only between sixteen and nineteen, and it is not clear why they were labelled as men (see also MSY/A/1, 07/04 1757) Perhaps these were just cases of boys receiving men's clothing, or it indicated that the boys had already experiences as sailors. Remarkably, of the one group of six boys labelled as men, at least two deserted later, and one was lost out of sight when he changed the ship.
32 See for example MSY/H/1, nos. 549-582, 765-774.
33 See end of Chapter VI.
vivid, though perhaps slightly dramatising, impression. On the top of their heads most boys would have had their own hair, rather than a wig or a cap. Few of John’s comrades would have fitted Herman Melville’s ideal of the ‘Handsome Sailor’ Billy Budd: the smallpox had left its marks on many of the young faces, to such an extent that the Marine Society used the boys’ scars as a way of identifying them. What we today would find most astonishing about John’s appearance is his height: he was tiny. Jonas Hanway observed with sorrow ‘that many of them are stunted in their growth; some appear with shrivelled countenances, as if they were born of parents, who had received no other nourishment than Gin’. On average John would be between 4ft 4in and 4ft 6in. Table d. puts the boys’ statures in relation to their age.

Table d. Average Heights of Marine Society’s Boys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4ft 3.4in</td>
<td>4ft 4in</td>
<td>4ft 3in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4ft 4.3in</td>
<td>4ft 4in</td>
<td>4ft 4in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4ft 5.6in</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4ft 7.2in</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 7in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4ft 8.8in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
<td>4ft 9in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4ft 9.9in</td>
<td>4ft 10in</td>
<td>4ft 10in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4ft 10.9in</td>
<td>5ft</td>
<td>4ft 11in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4ft 11.7in</td>
<td>5ft 2in</td>
<td>5ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall: 4ft 6.4in 4ft 4in 4ft 6in

---

34 MSY/H/3.
36 See MSY/H/3. One Henry Rowming (MSY/H/3, no. 43), just fourteen years old, bore upon his return from sea service in 1763 an even more significant identification: he had his name written on his right arm. If this was some sort of tattoo, then it is remarkable, as the question in how far tattooing had disappeared in European culture after the Middle Ages, and only reemerged in the late eighteenth century with Cook’s explorations of the Pacific, is currently debated in academia (Nicholas Thomas, in discussion with the author, 02/2003; and Jane Caplan [2000], pp. xv-xx).
37 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 4th ed.), p. 17.
38 The height has been recorded for little more than 60% of the boys. For this analysis double-counted boys with identical height information were counted only once, while returnees are included with both entries.
39 Mean, mode and median should, at least for adult populations, be the same, as heights are usually quite symmetrically spread.
For any attempted generalisations about lower-class boys these averages have to be taken with a little caution, as the Society's boys do not represent a random selection: on the one hand, well-built boys were more likely to be approached; on the other hand many boys would have belonged to the most deprived children in the community, which must have had a negative impact on their growth. Furthermore, there is the possibility that some boys pretended they were older, to be accepted, which would make the height average for an age group appear lower than it was in reality. The biggest distortion, though, is caused by the varying minimum height standard.\textsuperscript{40} For most of the time the standard was at 4ft 3in, and consequently we see the heights of twelve-year olds, which, being at the bottom end, are most affected by the standard, averaging exactly on that height. Hence the average height of the younger recruits was probably still higher than the one of all boys coming from a comparable background. The older boys should be less affected by the standard, and therefore more representative. However, regarding those aged nineteen and over there might again be a distortion – this time a negative one, as their smaller stature might have played a role in determining that they would enter as servants and not as landmen.

Seeing that the young boys would still grow, the concern about minimum heights is interesting: height was associated with strength and fitness. In fact, a small stature was even believed to be less resistant to disease, which according to modern research might well be a valid point.\textsuperscript{41} Yet, nevertheless almost 10\% of the Society's boys were still below the 4ft-3in minimum height. Accepting these boys was a risk, because officers might later reject an undersized boy; however, after some cases of boys being rejected, the Marine Society probably clothed these boys only if they were indeed certain that their

\textsuperscript{40} Floud, Wachter and Gregory used Wachter's quantile bend estimation to correct the distortion of the height standard in their data collection. This estimation is based on the assumption that the boys' heights are almost normally distributed, as those of men appear to be, albeit in reality the growth spurt prevents a normal distribution (Floud/Wachter/Gregory [1990], pp. 118-119, 164).

\textsuperscript{41} Floud/Wachter/Gregory (1990), pp. 264-265
future masters would take them.\textsuperscript{42} Family connections might have helped some boys to overcome the height standard: 4ft 1in tall John Stone had his brother on board his ship as a carpenter;\textsuperscript{43} and again we also find sons of shipwrights among the boys accepted below standard, whose fathers might have arranged that their boys would be taken.\textsuperscript{44} Again, other boys might have been taken out of pity: William Ball, a 4ft 1in tall thirteen-year old, had lost his father at sea, and perhaps someone in the Navy thought that this was the best they could do for the boy.\textsuperscript{45}

The recorded heights for the Marine Society's boy recruits during the Seven Years War fit into the general picture outlined in Floud, Wachter and Gregory's groundbreaking study, which analysed changes in height averages of boys over the past two hundred years, using them as an indicator for general socio-economic trends.\textsuperscript{46} The growth rate of children is very much affected by environmental conditions, and is therefore a wonderful indicator, though never the sole indicator, for research into nutritional, health and standard of living conditions. Paediatricians today use growth rates of children in order to determine whether a child is deprived or abused. Even the eighteenth-century Marine Society was already aware of the connection between height and standard of living, claiming that their boys' growth was 'checked by the poverty and insufficiency of their diet, and the defect of due warmth, occasioned by the want of such clothing as our climate requires to nourish their limbs'.\textsuperscript{47} Compared to a thirteen-year old London child of today, a Marine-Society boy of the Seven Year War would on average be around ten inches shorter — which led Roderick Floud, Kenneth Wachter and Annabel

\textsuperscript{42} Four feet short John Jones (MSY/H2, no. 2447), for example, has accepted by the Captain noted behind his name.
\textsuperscript{43} MSY/H/1, no. 2264.
\textsuperscript{44} MSY/H/2, nos. 3735, 4734
\textsuperscript{45} MSY/H/1, no. 2615.
\textsuperscript{46} Floud/Wachter/Gregory (1990), pp. 163ff. This data set of the Seven-Years-War period would have to be corrected downward with the same estimation techniques Floud, Wachter and Gregory used.
\textsuperscript{47} Regulations of the Marine Society (1772), p. 11.
Gregory to state that if any Marine-Society boy entered a doctor’s surgery today, he would be immediately sent into a hospital as suffering from under-nutrition or child abuse. Another remarkable comparison from Floud, Wachter, and Gregory’s study is that while a fourteen-year-old Marine-Society boy measured on average 4ft 5in, an upper-class fourteen-year old at the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst would reach 5ft 1in on average. Thus the upper-class boys were literally looking down on the Marine-Society boys, though the latter would later catch up a little, as they had their growth spurt later and continued to grow for longer. Nevertheless, the height gap was so big that one wonders how far it influenced contemporary views on the hierarchical structure of society.

Many of Marine-Society boy John’s comrades would not appear alone at the office, but accompanied (or at least sent) by some adult. Occasionally the registers recorded by whom a youth was brought or sent; from October 1758 there was even an extra column for this information. However, the fact that for most boys no such information is noted does not mean that the vast majority came on their own. It is unlikely that, for example, the three Higgins brothers would have introduced themselves as ‘Three Thieves’, as recorded behind their name – some authority would have brought them; nor would ten-year old Sam Hardman have come on his own from Sussex and declared his father’s trade as being that of a smuggler. When the Marine Society was attacked on the ground that it would allegedly take away boys from the country that were needed in agriculture and husbandry, Hanway replied that in fact the majority of the boys from the country were sent by magistrates or gentlemen of estates, and these men would certainly collect only those that were a nuisance. Whenever a person delivering the boy is

---

48 Floud/Wachter/Gregory (1990), p 166.
49 Floud/Wachter/Gregory (1990), pp. 166, 176, 197.
50 MSY/H/I, nos. 803, 804, 805.
51 MSY/H/2, no. 3229.
recorded, it is in most cases the father or the mother. One boy, Richard Reynolds, was brought in by the Society’s chairman, Lord Romney, himself – Richard was the son of his servant.\textsuperscript{53} Other boys were, as already discussed in chapter three, brought or sent by naval officers and captains, whose ships they had just entered. And then there were of course all those sent by authorities such as parish officers, overseers, justices, workhouses, aldermen, mayors, beadles, or even a Bishop. Seeing that the Society’s recruitment campaign outside London was mainly concerned with reaching local authorities or private men who might know of suitable boys, one expects that most country youngsters were sent by somebody, as Hanway had claimed above. Good examples are the already mentioned connections to Francis Grant and Thomas Gairdner in Edinburgh, who collected Scottish boys, the city of Gloucester promising to send all suitable boys, or the recruits who came from Colchester. The latter serve as another example that the information, by whom the boys were sent, was not always recorded, for only from a loose paper left in the registers is it evident that the first group of Colchester boys was sent by a Mr Grey. Later, Mr Grey, or Gray, appears frequently in the official registers as having recommended or sent a boy from Colchester. Mr Grey was of course the MP and active Marine-Society member Charles Gray. In the history of Colchester insufficient workhouse accommodation had often led the overseers to send their poor elsewhere to work.\textsuperscript{54} Thus parish boys from Colchester were apprenticed not only to local weavers, but often also to fishermen, oyster dredgers, and mariners near Colchester or further away at Southwark, Deptford, and even South Shields or Sunderland. Sending boys to the Marine Society must have seemed a reasonable alternative solution, despite the fact that being a servant in the Royal Navy was not an apprenticeship.

\textsuperscript{53} MSY/H/2, no. 4354.\textsuperscript{54} Janet Cooper (1994), p. 280. The bonus for the parish officer was that a boy sent to another place for an apprenticeship would get his settlement there, and thus the officer would no longer be responsible for him (see Thomas [1977], p. 154)
Likewise among the London boys surely more had been sent by a local authority than the registers recorded. Only nineteen boys are marked as having been sent by magistrate John Fielding, three by magistrate Saunders Welch, and eighteen by the Lord Mayor. Fielding definitely collected far more than those nineteen. Finally, former apprentices, brought or sent by their masters, also do not appear to have been always marked as such. Charles Awbrey is one of the exceptions: he was already eighteen years old, and it is remarked that he used to be an apprentice to a chimney sweep before coming to the Marine Society. His stature of a mere 4ft 7in was perhaps a sad proof of his long service. Charles was discharged from his apprenticeship by Sir Charles Asgill, former Lord Mayor, alderman, and deputy chairman of the Marine Society. Boys like Charles Awbrey might have awakened Jonas Hanway’s interest in the misery of the chimney sweeps’ apprentices. Unfortunately there are only a few other boys of whom it is recorded in what trade they were apprenticed before, such as James Laurence Sinoquet, who used to be an apprentice to his father, unsurprisingly (considering the Huguenot name) a weaver from Bethnal Green; or Richard Heaver, who had been placed by the charity school at Reading with a water gilder. Richard’s school even paid the Marine Society the remaining money of the fee for the boy’s master. Despite this meagre background information on the boys’ previous apprenticeships, we may nevertheless presume that a large part of them would have been working somewhere before, perhaps not in an apprenticeship but as errand boys, weaver boys, labourers, or casual workers; the more detailed registers for boys equipped in the 1770s show that even the youngest usually had earned some money in such employment.

55 MSY/H/2, no. 2925.
56 MSY/H/2, no. 3638.
57 MSY/H/2, no. 2944 (a water gilder trapped waterfowl)
58 See MSY/O.
Having observed John's appearance upon his arrival at the office, and the people that accompanied him, probably still our most burning interest would be - if we were allowed to visit the Marine Society’s office in the mid-eighteenth century - to find out more about John’s character. What kind of boy was he? Of course, John’s visit at the office, and his short stay at the lodging house, give us only a glimpse of his personality. The *Gentleman’s Magazine* noted after one benefit theatre performance that the boys, dressed in their new uniforms, gave great satisfaction to their benefactors by their decent appearance,\(^{59}\) yet the Society’s calls for boys that were considered a nuisance or future felons lead us to expect a few hardened characters coming through the office door. The time was surely too short for a proper assessment, nevertheless, later in 1772, in one of the Society’s own publications, a rather negative picture was presented. Here, the youngsters were divided into three categories: first the well-behaved, educated, and religious ones; then those that were active and brave, but had ‘little or no guard against temptation’; and finally, allegedly by far the most numerous group, those that were ‘abominably corrupted’ due to an early loss of their parents and the misfortune of never having received any instruction, living as vagabonds and in a habit of idleness, and in the ‘most wicked company, in the most wicked part of these kingdoms’, and being ‘hardened in iniquity’.\(^{60}\) It seems as if John’s appearance and character often shocked the members of the Marine Society, yet one has to credit Hanway and the others for always seeing him as the product of his unfortunate upbringing, as a victim of social circumstances which had turned his appearance and character into something others found hard to feel pity for. The harsher comments were probably mainly directed at the London youths. Hanway and the Marine Society observed some striking differences between the boys from

---

\(^{59}\) *Gentleman’s Magazine*, June 1757, p. 285.

\(^{60}\) *Regulations of the Marine Society* (1772), pp. 12-14.
London and those who were sent from the north of the country. In general, they felt the northern children were more pleasant – the more northern the better. The committee thought it its religious duty to examine these differences, and found that to a large degree they stemmed from the fact that in the northern parts the children were brought up in the fear of God, and were educated by clergymen to obey their superiors. Northern boys were allegedly more virtuous and honest, more religious, better dressed and behaved, less prone to swearing, and had better reading abilities – according to Hanway’s memory all northern boys were able to read – than their age peers from London. Again, the development of London, the ‘Moloch’ in both senses, was regarded as the source of all social misery and corruption, while the country remained in a state of innocence. In a letter published in the *Public Advertiser* a visitor of the Society’s recruitment day expressed the differences he perceived between urban and country youths in rather drastic words:

And when the Town and Country Boys were mixed together, with their respective Parents, the ingenious Mr. Hogarth’s two Prints, of Beer-street and Gin-lane, came strongly to my Mind. The Country Boys were straight, stout, and well-grown, and their Complexions clear and ruddy, their Coat patch’d, their Stockings dearn’d, their Shoes cap’d, but all tight; and their Parents modest, and anxious for the Welfare of their Children. The Town Boys puny, pale, seemingly check’d in their Growth, ragged and dirty, their Parents abandon’d, noisy, and lost to paternal Affection: And their Cloaths, or rather Rags, burnt off their Backs with the same poisonous Gin, with which they had destroyed their own Constitutions, and the Growth, Strength, and Vigour of their Offspring; for a Country Boy of twelve Years of Age was larger than many of the Town Boys of sixteen.

Evidently, a visit to the Marine Society’s office not only allows us a glance at the Marine-Society boy John, but also at his parents and his home, which shall be undertaken in the following section.

---

62 *Public Advertiser*, 29/01/1757.
IV.2. Family and Home

Those of John's future fellow ships' boys, who arrived with the noisy and gin-affected parents, were perhaps still better off than many others, for as sorry as their state appeared to the reader of the Public Advertiser, at least these boys had some parents, while more than half of John's comrades had no father, and every sixth had no adult at all, no parents nor any relative or friend, taking care of him. With regards to the boys' family circumstances the Marine Society was remarkably preoccupied with recording information about the boys' fathers, presumably as the family's bread winner, while the mothers were neglected. In general, the recruits can be divided into three groups: those for whom a father is recorded, those who are described as fatherless, and those categorised as friendless. Regarding the first two groups it is not clear whether there was a mother or not. At least for those labelled as fatherless, that is where the father had either died, was nowhere to be found or unknown, we can assume that there must have been a mother, a relative or other adult responsible for the boy, for otherwise the boy would have fallen under the third category, which is 'friendless'. 'Friendless' were those boys that had no adult at all responsible for them. It is occasionally ambiguous as to what the registrar's entries regarding a boy's family meant, and how certain abbreviations were used, and whether the use of these abbreviations was consistent. Based on the interpretations of the registers described in appendix one, 44% of the boys had a father, 39% had none but had other adults responsible for them, and 17% were friendless.

It is likely that runaway boys lied about their parents and falsely declared themselves as orphans, so the share of friendless boys could be lower than the actual number. In terms of age and height there are no significant differences if we look at these three

---

63 For little more than 60% of the boys information about their parents is recorded. Blanks in the relevant register columns have been interpreted as no information about the parents, rather than as having any meaning, such as that no parents were present. For this analysis double-counted boys with identical information about their parents were only counted once, while returnees were included as two different entries.
groups of boys separately. Fatherless and friendless boys were evenly represented among the fife-boys, suggesting that the Marine Society offered them the same opportunities as to those with families. A few fatherless boys had actually lost their fathers through the sea service, such as thirteen-year old William Ball from Holborn,\textsuperscript{64} or Thomas Tilley from Bedfordshire, a thirteen-year old who stood just 4ft. Perhaps Thomas was one of those accepted out of pity, or a feeling of responsibility for a boy whose father had died a violent death: he had been shot when attempting to desert\textsuperscript{65} – as the Marine Society rightly observed, one death at war could ruin more than one life.\textsuperscript{66} In a way, the Navy, or the war, made many other boys at least temporarily fatherless: John Wilkinson’s father, for example, had been impressed and sent on board a tender,\textsuperscript{67} and with the Navy allowing little shore leave or visits on board, and often turning the men immediately over to other ships at the end of a voyage, many sons were prevented from seeing their fathers for years.

Some of John’s mates would have had as closest responsible relative an older brother, and it sometimes happened that both arrived together at the Society’s office in order to join the Navy.\textsuperscript{68} Also among the boys that had fathers were many pairs of brothers appearing together at the office to be enlisted.\textsuperscript{69} Possibly both boys were attracted to the sea service, but perhaps it is more likely that the financial circumstances of the family, or the death of the father, had left them with no other choice. Interestingly, none of the pairs of brothers were separated; they always went to the same ship. This

\textsuperscript{64} MSY/H/2, no. 2615.
\textsuperscript{6} MSY/H/2, no. 3442.
\textsuperscript{66} MSY/A/1, 08/01/1762
\textsuperscript{67} MSY/H/2, no. 3631
\textsuperscript{69} The assumption of boys being brothers is based on matching dates and background information. For friendless and fatherless pairs of brothers see MSY/H/1, nos. 2153, 2154 & nos. 2372, 2373; MSY/H/2, nos. 2425, 2425 & nos 4072, 4073 & 4215, 4216 & nos. 4392, 4393.
\textsuperscript{69} See MSY/H/1, nos. 1078, 1134 & nos. 1258, 1259 & nos. 2338, 2342; MSY/H/2, nos. 2480, 2481 & nos. 2510, 2511 & nos. 3582, 3583 & nos. 3932, 3933 & nos. 3731, 3732 & nos. 4110, 4111 & 4332, 4335 & 4567, 4568 & 4755, 4763.
was both humane and practical, especially since some of the little brothers were among the youngest of all recruits. The naval vessel could even host a mini family reunion, as it did in case of the Mitchell brothers: Peter and James Mitchell both went aboard the Rippon, where their father served as a sailor. Whenever there are seafaring fathers, the boys very often went to the same ship, as for example those youngsters going to the Norfolk, Rippon, and Magnanime. Evidently sailors did what we know to have been a common practice among officers, taking their own sons on board. With regards to educating, protecting, and disciplining the boys this was something the Navy presumably welcomed. Many were probably anyway, without the assistance of the Marine Society, already going on board their father’s ship, and the ship’s captain had then established the connection to the Marine Society – in case of the Norfolk a very likely scenario, as her captain was a subscriber to the Society.

Before investigating further how many of Marine-Society boy John’s comrades had seafaring fathers, and what trades the others worked in, we shall turn to the question of where John actually came from. Initially, the Society had thought only of the London urchins as their potential recruits, yet the temporary shortages of boys, the Society’s attractiveness to men in the country taking care of pauper children, as well as to the youths themselves, brought boys from outside London to the Society’s office from the start. And as the Society also equipped any boy that a captain or officer had collected himself, we find indeed a selection of boys from all over the country. For about 70% of the boys the Society recorded a place, mainly so that if there was any problem with the boy they could find someone responsible for him. Hence we may assume that whatever

7 MSY/H/2, nos. 2414, 2415. The registers also remark that the two had been sent by the captain, so it seems likely that these boys had already been on board and merely turned to the Society to be provided with clothing and bedding.
71 MSY/H/2, nos. 2414, 2415, 2400, 2401, 4210 (Rippon), MSY/H/1 nos. 2232, 2242, 2260, 2263 (Norfolk), MSY/H/2, no. 3709 (Magnanime).
72 MSY/F/1, pp. 92-93.
the registrar recorded under *What parish belongs to, or Place of abode*, was presumably the current place of residence of his relatives, or the responsible local authority, workhouse or similar, though the possibility that the recorded place was in fact merely the home parish from which the boy had (alone or with his family) already earlier moved to London cannot be entirely discounted. The quality of the recorded information differs greatly; while London boys often have a street recorded,\(^{73}\) boys from more distant places have just the town noted behind their name, some only the county. Remarkably, all friendless boys have a place recorded, and despite the Marine Society stating that a large proportion of their boys had been ‘vagabonds, and above all distressed orphans, who wander about like forsaken dogs’,\(^{74}\) only three boys are registered as being vagabonds and having no habitation.\(^{75}\) It is, however, doubtful that the place of abode recorded for the other friendless boys always referred to a proper home – perhaps rather a workhouse, a person knowing the boy, or just the parish or similar. *Table e.* gives an overview about the places the Marine Society’s boys came from.\(^{76}\)

The table shows that just under half of the boys came from London (just over half if we include today’s Greater London).\(^{77}\) The population of London boys aged 10-19 may be estimated as having been 40,000 at any given point\(^{78}\) - during five and a half war years the Marine Society equipped around 2,100 (ca. 300-600 in the first year) of that age

---

\(^{73}\) Only three of the London addresses, however, were specified with the allegedly common practice of naming nearby inns, taverns, or other landmarks (see MSY/H/1, no. 1209, MSY/H/2, nos. 3284, 3668).

\(^{74}\) *Regulations of the Marine Society (1772)*, p. 41.

\(^{75}\) MSY/H/1, nos. 1201, 1840, 2302. In the registers of the 1770s and 1780s far more boys are recorded as being vagabonds, homeless etc..

\(^{76}\) The enclosed database shows how each boy’s home town was categorised according to modern day counties, inland or coastal town, and urban or rural. For this analysis double counted boys and clearly identifiable returnees have been excluded.

\(^{77}\) The share of Londoners might have been a little higher, as it appears that just when the Society began to intensify the recruitment in the country it also started to record the boys’ home towns again, after having neglected it for nearly 600 boys who entered shortly before.

\(^{78}\) Based on the estimates given Landers (1993), p. 180, and the assumption that there were equal numbers of boys and girls.
Table e. Geographical Origins of the Marine Society’s Boys (1756-1762).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Boys</th>
<th>South-East England</th>
<th>South-West England</th>
<th>Northern England</th>
<th>Other Places abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, Westminster &amp; immediate surroundings</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London today</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle England</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon (mainly Bristol)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern England</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire (L’pool, M’chester)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside (East Riding)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See database on enclosed disc for the grouping of each individual place of abode.

b Including Borough, Southwark, Rotherhithe, Stepney, but excluding Bethnal Green, Islington, Deptford, Greenwich, Woolwich.

c Excluding London, Westminster and immediate surroundings.
group for the Navy. Table e. also illustrates the important contribution of Francis Grant’s (and to a lesser degree Thomas Gairdner’s) recruitment efforts in Edinburgh. Most of the boys that registered places abroad other than Scotland or Ireland seem to have been sons of soldiers, and the place was merely the father’s current station. There are, however, also some orphans that seem indeed to have come from abroad. Francisco Manuel hailed from Grand Canary, George Cary from Lisbon, Joseph Emanuel from Marseilles, and Francis Lewis Recordon from the very non-maritime city of Bern. Unfortunately we do not know how these young orphans ended up at the Marine Society – had their fathers emigrated to England, or had they already joined a naval vessel closer to their home and were now just applying for clothing and bedding? Having received subscriptions from the colonies, one is not surprised to see that among the Society’s recruits were also four from New England and one from Carolina. A distant place of abode have also those nine ‘boys’ registered, who are labelled as ‘a black’. Thomas Chana and Sandry Kilerrouby came from Guinea, John Cashu from India, John Vaughan from Barbados, Thomas Warwick from the East Indies, and John Robinson from New York. They were either orphans or had no family background recorded, and were all eighteen years or older, which means they could have been entered as paid landmen. Perhaps they too were already servants on board ships, whose officers or captains had applied for clothing, and were reluctant to have them rated. It does not appear that there were any further ‘black’ recruits among all those boys with British addresses. The fact that the Society labelled them as blacks suggests that it did not consider them as their

---

79 Estimate derived by counting the recruited London boys aged 10-19 (1,453 recruits) and adding an estimate (ca. 652 boys) for the London boys of the same age that might hide behind those with no or unidentified geographical information (plus the few Londoners with no age) recorded (see also fn. 13 for the probably even higher share of Londoners).
80 MSY/H/1, no. 2180 (Cary); MSY/H/2, nos. 4336 (Manuel), 4352 (Emanuel), 4355 (Recordon).
81 MSY/H/1, no. 2352; MSY/H/2, nos. 2604 (Carolina), 3299, 4171, 4537.
82 MSY/H/1, nos. 361, 611, 766, 1067, 1156, 1252, 2259; MSY/H/2, nos. 2821, 3154.
83 William Young (MSY/H/2, no. 3715) has also Barbados registered, but perhaps this was the place of residence of his father, who was a sailor or soldier.
usual recruits, but it does not indicate that the Society was reluctant to clothe them. The
discriminative entry as servant, rather than as a landman or sailor, was perhaps more
down to the particular naval officer or captain than to the Society. When the Marine
Society restarted to recruit boys after the Seven Years War, the minutes specifically
stated that any boy, regardless of which continent he came from, would be welcome,
‘provided they are born Subject to the King, or desirous of becoming such by their
Useful Labours in this Nation’. The debate is open whether this was the spirit of
Enlightenment or just practicality. Interestingly, the Society’s registers also label one
boy, Jacob Hart, explicitly as ‘a Jew’ – an indication for another group of boys whom
the Society did not consider as its usual recruits? After all, Hanway’s early fame was
based on his pamphlets against the naturalisation of Jews. Nevertheless, the Marine
Society also had in Michael Adolphus a Jew as an active committee member, and Jacob
Hart was, though the only one marked as such, probably not the only Jewish boy
appearing at the office.86

Considering what has been written both by the Society and in the letter to the Public
Advertiser quoted above, about the miserable condition of the London boys compared to
the healthy northern and country boys, one expects that a comparison between median
heights of the boys from the different regions would produce notable differences. Indeed

84 MSY/A/2, 12/04/1764. Controversy arises only through Jonas Hanway’s and Henry Thornton’s (son
of John) later involvement in the Committee for the Relief of the Black Poor, which attempted to relieve
the black poor living in England by resettling them in Sierra Leone – one charitable project co-founded
by Hanway that has hitherto been neglected by his modern biographers (see for example Isaac Land
[1999], pp. 151ff.), though Hanway, also chairman of the Committee, died in the same year the
Committee was founded. Land suggests that regarding blacks Hanway’s usual concern for more sailors
and population growth was outweighed by nationalistic or racial concerns, for many Africans and
Indians were naval veterans and could have also been useful to the Navy. However, there was no urgent
demand for naval recruits at that time, certainly none that could swallow whole communities, and Land
also acknowledges that the idea of a resettlement in Africa only got the upper hand once the Committee
saw that its attempts to collect money for housing and providing for the black poor in England were
unable to cope with the numbers, and that the plan for a resettlement also had the backing of
Abolitionists, including Olaudah Equiano.
85 MSY/H/2, no. 3666.
86 See names such as Levi Barnett (MSY/H/2, no. 4076).
Table f. shows that there clearly were such differences. The Society's selection process probably made the differences appear less dramatic by rejecting the shortest among the London boys, while boys coming from greater distances were presumably far more seldom rejected, seeing that otherwise they would have had to embark on a long journey home.

Table f. Regional Height Differences (median height):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Age 14</th>
<th>Age 15</th>
<th>Age 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4ft 6.5in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
<td>4ft 8.5in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East England</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 7in</td>
<td>4ft 10in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern England</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 7in</td>
<td>4ft 9in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle England</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 7in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West England</td>
<td>4ft 5in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; Westminster</td>
<td>4ft 5in</td>
<td>4ft 6in</td>
<td>4ft 8in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we sort the counties of Table e. according to Floud, Wachter and Gregory's division of England into rural and urban areas, we see that of those English boys not coming from London, Essex, Kent or Surrey, a little over two thirds came from rural areas. However, this finding has to be taken with caution, and for this study it can not serve as a basis for an urban-rural height comparison, as Floud, Wachter and Gregory's grouping was first of all designed for both eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and therefore their categories are influenced by the demographic changes of industrialisation, and furthermore, categorising, for example, Gloucestershire as rural hides the fact that almost all the boys came from the city of Gloucester itself.

A remarkable aspect that is also hidden behind the county statistics is that if one looks at the boy's home towns it becomes apparent that merely 16% came from places

---

87 The percentages of boys coming from London having no father, or being friendless, are almost identical to those for the national averages, so this factor should not distort anything. For an analysis of regional height differences see also Floud/Wachter/Gregory (1990), pp. 196ff.

located at or close to the coast. Of course the London boys weigh heavily in this statistic, but even if we exclude anyone coming from London and today's Greater London, the share of boys from towns at or near the coast still only climbs to 39%. Thus the majority of the boys came from inland towns. This is certainly not enough to claim that the majority of the boys came from communities unconnected to seafaring, as the example of London shows that one has to take rivers into account and also differentiate further (so that a boy from Hampstead is not in the same category as a boy from Greenwich), yet it is a good indication that a large part of the boys had no family or community connection to seafaring. This is remarkable, as sea service in the eighteenth century in general is regarded as having been largely self-recruiting,\(^89\) with sailors usually coming from seafaring families and communities. It shows how the Navy's great wartime demand could make a large number of boys and young men from non-maritime communities choose a career at sea, at least temporarily. The following analysis of the boys' fathers' occupations will expand on this aspect.

Whenever any of the boys had a father, the Society took care to note down his trade.\(^90\) Why it did so is not entirely clear; perhaps it helped to identify the parent, in case of any irregularities. Table g. attempts to categorise the recorded occupations. The occupations are primarily categorised according to the product. The categories are my own, they are chosen to make best use of the recorded information, but they have also been inspired by Paul Glennie (1990), and A.J. & R.H. Tawney (1934).\(^91\) It would certainly have been helpful to categorise the occupations according to social status; however, this appears not to be feasible, as behind a title such as, for example, watchmaker or carpenter a wide

---

\(^{89}\) See for example Earle (1997), p. 81.

\(^{90}\) Thirty-six fatherless and friendless boys have also the trade of the deceased father recorded, and a further seven boys have been brought by their father, but not registered any occupational information about their fathers. For this analysis double counted boys and returnees were counted as only one entry, unless the recorded trade had changed.

\(^{91}\) The enclosed database shows the categorisation of each individual occupational title. Due to time restraints it was not always possible to conduct deeper research into the nature of an occupation.
### Table g. Occupational Titles of Marine-Society Boys’ Fathers (1756-1762):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labourers &amp; Low-Skill Workers</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Shoes</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylors</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staymakers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Sea or Water</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermen &amp; Lightermen</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marines</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Gilder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailmakers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair- and Wheelmakers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipwrights</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makers of Tools, Instruments, Art &amp; Small Items</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch- &amp; Instrument Makers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(others include engravers, and makers of cabinets, pins, perukes, spectacles, baskets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Servants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchmen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(others include cooks, chimney sweeps, musicians)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continued on next page)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drink Processing and Retail</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewers &amp; Brewer’s Servants</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alehouse Keepers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Construction</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasterers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening, Agriculture &amp; Animals</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardeners</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers &amp; Husbandmen</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly smiths (smiths &amp; blacksmiths)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (on land)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmen</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail &amp; Dealing (non food &amp; drink)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. salesmen, booksellers, jewellers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom &amp; Excise Officers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (e.g. surgeons, schoolmasters)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Heavers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Occupation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beggars</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalids &amp; Pensioners (excl. sailors)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified &amp; Unclassified</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travellers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of social ranks could hide. Furthermore, as most of the registered information consists of just a title, it is occasionally impossible to say whether someone was a maker of a product, or a dealer in the product, or both, and hence a category like Food & Drink Processing and Retail had to be designed to include all possibilities. Regarding the character of the recorded occupations, it has to be noted that no father was described as unemployed, apart from the four beggars. There are a few boys that have a father but not his trade recorded, yet it appears that this was rather due to a lack of information.\textsuperscript{92} As the concept of permanent unemployment was not familiar to eighteenth-century contemporaries, we have to expect unemployed fathers among those recorded as having a trade,\textsuperscript{93} hence we should regard the registered information as occupational titles rather than as occupations. A further problem of the records is that when the father was not present, the Society had to rely on the accuracy of the boy's statement, or on the person accompanying him. Thus, fifteen-year old Samuel Hunt from Northamptonshire, for example, bluntly described his father's trade as that of a 'Laborer and Lunatic'.\textsuperscript{94}

Unsurprisingly, as the Society aimed to reach the sons of the poor and destitute, the mere title labourer is the most frequently recorded occupation among John's fathers. The title suggests that the father was not permanently employed in one particular business, thus would have possessed little specialist skills, and there is evidence that in the Army of the time recruits with no proper trade or employment were always registered as labourers.\textsuperscript{95} Also the other regularly appearing professions for John's fathers are such as are familiar from studies on eighteenth-century miseries: weavers, bakers, tailors, and shoemakers are known to have been among the common trades of parish children; watchmakers, soldiers, sailors and again shoemakers were among the

\textsuperscript{92} One of them, for example, is just recorded as being 'in Ireland'.
\textsuperscript{93} See also Floud, Wachter and Gregory (1990), p. 98.
\textsuperscript{94} MSY/H/2, no. 4435.
\textsuperscript{95} See Floud, Wachter and Gregory (1990), p. 99.
most frequently caught pickpockets. In 1754, John Fielding complained that there were some hundred boys in London that lived solely from thieving, and most of them were the children of porters and chairmen – both common occupational titles in the Society’s registers. Similar to a labourer, being a chairmen was a rather unsteady work, almost more a social code or label, than a proper permanent employment. In the product categories requiring more skills we often find the Marine-Society boys’ fathers concentrating at the bottom end: thus Wood is dominated by carpenters, while there are only three fathers registered as joiners (responsible for the finer wood work); and Metal only has one father specified as locksmith (which required more skills). It is also no surprise that none of the fathers with potentially better off professions, be it carvers, watchmakers, brushmakers, furriers etc., is listed in Mortimer’s *Universal Director* (1763) as being among the prominent members of their trade. However, one nevertheless has to be very careful when generalising the Marine-Society boys’ social background as lower class: chapter three’s finding that a great part of the boys were not collected by the Marine Society itself serves already as a warning that we can also expect to find boys from less destitute backgrounds being equipped. There are indeed many occupations registered that could hide wide ranges of social status, and although the Society’s mission statements and its published descriptions of its boys suggest that the fathers would usually have occupied the bottom end of the social hierarchy within their trade, if they were employed in it at all, it is nowhere mentioned by the committee that it operated any sort of barrier against boys that came from more secure backgrounds. Perhaps the process of noting down the father’s occupation might be regarded as such a check, yet it does not appear as if the Society would have made any inquiries into the business

---

97 *Public Advertiser*, 16/12/1754.
98 Chairmen are a little researched group, standing below the coachmen. Many Irish in London worked as chairmen (Mark Jenner during discussion with author [17/12/1999]).
fortunes of, for example, those fathers that were butchers, bakers, alehouse keepers or similar, to find out if their sons were worthy recipients. Robert Quelch's father is even recorded as being a gentleman. The category Makers of Tools etc. certainly harbours the biggest collection of such ambiguous social backgrounds. Here, we find for example fourteen fathers recorded as makers of watches or instruments. While the watchmakers could well have belonged to the poorest — according to Mortimer's Universal Director (1763) particularly among the watchmakers there was a vast disparity between the top and the bottom of the trade — the six sons of (mathematical) instrumentmakers are unlikely to have come from an impoverished background. At the time there were only about 160 mathematical instrumentmakers in London. John Talbot of St. Katherines, father of fifteen-year old Marine-Society boy Francis Talbot, was one of them. In 1755, Francis was still listed as his father's apprentice; two years later Francis was to join the Royal Navy via the Marine Society. Unfortunately we do not know why Francis decided not to continue his father's business, and to join the Navy instead. It was not usual for sons of instrumentmakers to go to sea, though through their business instrumentmakers usually had good connections to Navy personnel. Perhaps Francis had not given up in trying to follow his father's career and merely hoped to learn something about the practical application of his father's instruments at sea. Whatever his reasons, Francis Talbot does not seem to have been a destitute boy dropped in the office by gin-affected parents; we should take him as evidence that the Marine Society did not hand out its uniform exclusively to those who would not have been able to afford their own equipment, and also that poverty alone cannot always explain why the Society's boys

---

99 MSY/H/1, no. 896.
90 MSY/H/1, no. 1895.
101 See Gloria Clifton (1995). I am also indebted to Gloria Clifton for advice on further research.
102 Francis became a gunner's servant on board the Gibraltar; after his master deserted it was impossible to retrieve Francis in the Navy documents (see appendix three).
went to sea. The general picture points to the bottom end of the social ladder, yet at the end the problem remains, as Paul Glennie also remarked about his study, that even the carpenter can theoretically be anything from unemployed and without parish support, to a regular wage-labourer, up to an independent artisan with a workshop.\footnote{Glennie (1990), p. 14.}

Looking at the various sectors of the economy the boys' fathers worked in, the most remarkable aspect is the relatively low proportion of fathers with a connection to the sea – something that builds on the above discovery that most of the boys came from inland towns. Only 9% of the fathers (and only a few more if we include marines, watermen and lightermen, and shipwrights, sailmakers and colliers), and thus less than 4% of all boys that have family information recorded, were directly connected to the maritime world, despite the fact that the Society drew up specific advertisements for seamen wishing to enlist their sons on board their ships, offering to pay the boys' travel costs and to accept them even when they were below the minimum height.\footnote{MSY/A/1, 26/06/1760, Public Advertiser, 09/04/1758. Of the seafaring fathers thirty are identifiable as currently serving in the Navy. Only four were fishermen – perhaps their sons were already at sea, protected from the press by being apprentices.} Thus the vast majority of the boys, and hence probably even the majority of the servants employed by the Navy during the war, did not come from a maritime family background. Also surprising is that, despite the numerous boys coming from rural areas, there are only fourteen whose fathers were farmers or husbandmen.\footnote{The gardeners are grouped together with the agricultural workers because so many of them came from rural areas (see also Paul Glennie [1990]).} Unless some further agricultural workers are hiding behind the title labourer, this indicates that farmer boys were, through work or family, strongly rooted in their community. Floud, Wachter and Gregory have already suggested for the
mid-eighteenth-century Army, and the marines, that agricultural workers were under-represented.106

The great advantage of modern computer technology is that it allows us to run numerous cross checks of a data collection such as the Marine Society's registers, so that one can with little work investigate any possible causal connections within the recorded information. For example, building on Floud, Gregory and Wachter's study of height as one welfare-indicator, it is tempting to investigate possible height differences within the various occupational categories, to see whether they allow any conclusions about the economic circumstances of a particular profession. There are certainly height differences observable: fourteen-year old sons of sailors, and of fathers that are involved in the production of clothing and shoes, are on average (median) an inch shorter than the overall median; and the sons of fathers working with wood are even two inches shorter. However, the problem is that our statistical population is very small, and the larger we design an occupational category to get more height-data, the greater becomes the danger that fathers with very different economic circumstances are thrown into one class. Furthermore, there is the geographical factor: as the sailors, clothing- and shoe workers, and wood workers all feature a high proportion of London boys, one gets the impression that this perhaps more than the occupational category is mirrored in the boys' height. Separating the boys according to geographical background would make the sample much too small; hence it appears difficult to draw any conclusions about the economic circumstances of an occupation, or sector, based on the height-data of the Marine Society's registers alone. However, the database could prove very helpful if other, similar data-collections were undertaken, thus increasing the analysed population.

Generally, one would think that any occupation repeatedly appearing among the fathers in the Society's registers was in some way in a crisis or flooded with work seekers, solely on the assumption that poverty was one, or the major, factor that drove most boys to the Society. The boys' motives, and particularly the question how voluntarily they decided to enlist, will be the subject of analysis, interpretation, and some speculation, in the next section.

**IV.3. Why They Went to Sea**

What drove John to the Marine Society, what motivated boys, who in most cases had no seafaring father and had often grown up far away from the coast, to go to sea? Was it just the need to make a living, or also youthful bravado, patriotism, and the search for adventure; or was it actually some adult or authority who made them go? The question whether John was in any way forced into the Navy is probably the most interesting. The Society's boys, as well as the men, were all meant to be volunteers. The third chapter, however, has already shown that there were some involuntary recruits among the men. The Society justly argued that it was only beneficial for everybody involved if it equipped these men, particularly as they were usually the most insufficiently dressed and most likely carriers of disease. The boys, however, were all meant to be volunteers. Yet doubts about this arise right from the very beginning, simply from the fact that magistrate John Fielding played such an important role. Although Fielding too assured the public that all his boys had enlisted voluntarily,¹⁰⁷ it is obvious that for many this was the only alternative to legal punishment. Of course, whenever magistrates or parish officials acted as agents, which should have been the case for a large part of the youngsters, the question arises whether these boys had come to the authority's attention through their

¹⁰⁷ See for example Fielding in *Public Advertiser*, 15/03/1756.
social circumstances or their delinquent acts. If the latter, would the boys have opted to
go to sea if they had not been convicted? The Society's registers give only a few explicit
examples of delinquent boys: four are labelled as thieves, and another fourteen-year
old is recorded as having been tried at the Old Bailey. However, committee
resolutions, such as to convey known thieves to a tender in the Thames, to warn the
'proveditor' to take extra care when delinquent boys sent by a magistrate were
clothed, and to give 'private Intimation' to any captain or officer about to receive a
boy who had been a thief, suggest that there were far more with a delinquent past than
these five. A vivid example is a letter the Society received in September 1759 from
Alderman George Nelson, recommending a poor boy named Acteon Jefferys, who had
been caught pilfering. Nelson also took the opportunity to invite the Society's secretary
to collect a large donation from him – £21 were recorded in the Society's account book
– and in the very same month the boy Acteon was clothed and on his way to the Royal
Sovereign. Being convicted for theft must have made Acteon a great deal more
'receptive' to the Alderman's proposal to volunteer for the Navy, and perhaps the
donation helped to overcome doubts within the Society. In the end it might not really
have mattered whether poor John, the Marine-Society boy, was caught committing a
petty crime or not, for simply the fact that so many had no father as a breadwinner for
the family led authorities, and certainly also the Marine Society, to assume that he was

108 MSY/H/1, nos. 803, 804, 805, 808.
109 MSY/H/2, no. 2891 The Old Bailey's records of proceeding of the 1770s and 1780s give numerous
eamples of boys, convicted for thefts and other crimes, being ordered to the Marine Society. Tim
Hitchcock's and Robert Shoemaker's database of the Old Bailey's proceedings will make it easy to find
such cases (its search engine will not only be able to locate any case where the 'Marine Society' is
mentioned, but also allow the records to be searched after 'punishment: military/naval duty').
Unfortunately, their database had not yet gone online when this thesis was completed, yet I am indebted
to Tim Hitchcock for allowing me a preview of it and providing me with a few examples of boys being
sent to the Marine Society
110 See fn. 117
112 MSY/A/1, 17/03/1757.
113 MSY/A/1, 13/09/1759, MSY/H/2, no. 3525, MSY/U/21; MSY/F/1, 20/09/1759, p. 184; and Jefferys
in appendix three
likely to steal in the future, because of his need to survive and because his social circle was crowded with criminals.\textsuperscript{114}

Analysis of the Society’s advertisements suggest further doubts about the boys’ volunteer status, as the Society’s publications often ascribed rather un-charming attributes to their recruits, portraying them not just as being impoverished, but also as threats to public safety. The \textit{Letter from a Member of the Marine Society} stated that the ‘objects of the Society are the removing of those who are Vagrants, Pilferers, or by extreme poverty and ignorance, are pernicious to the community’, and only afterwards added also the intention ‘to encourage the industrious poor to send their children to sea’.\textsuperscript{115} Despite all this, the Society insisted throughout the war that only boys who really wanted to go to sea went through their hands.

Frequent complaints, especially in the first year, by captains and officers about Marine-Society boys deserting, many running away before their ship sailed, could be another indication that some boys had been rather unwilling recruits.\textsuperscript{116} However, it is also possible that these deserters had from the start intended only to steal the clothes, or that they experienced a sudden change of mind after their first taste of naval life. Recruiting and clothing boys who would soon afterwards run away was a waste of money for the Society, and it had to react to the deserter problem. One solution was to keep servants under a closer confinement: boys, who appeared suspicious or had a delinquent past and had come from a magistrate, were conveyed to a tender in the Thames,\textsuperscript{117} and the Society also approached the Lords of the Admiralty, and wrote

\textsuperscript{114} See for example John Fielding (1758), p. 22, talking about ‘Thieves of Necessity’; and the Marine Society’s advertising messages described in \textit{Chapter II.3.}
\textsuperscript{115} Hanway, \textit{Letter from a Member} (1757, 3rd ed.), p. 8
\textsuperscript{116} For deserting boys see MSY/A/1, 31/03/1757, 14 04 1757, 19 05/1757, 20/06/1757, 15 09/1757, 21/09/1757, 13/07/1758, 14 09/1758, 21 09/1758, 26/02/1762, 05 08/1762; MSY/I/H1, nos 735-738, MSY/I/H2, no. 3483. For deserting men see MSY/A/1, 02/06/1757 and ADM 2/707, 31/05 1757, p. 431
\textsuperscript{117} MSY/A/1, 09/03/1757, 16 03/1758; and Society’s rules in Hanway, \textit{Three Letters: Letter III} (1758), pp. 40-41.
directly to all commanders and officers, asking them to be more careful in preventing the boys from running away, to inform the Society about any deserter, and warning them that it was becoming difficult to find a sufficient number of boys as replacements. One captain, Clark Gayton of the St. George, who had a number of boys running away and consulted the Society about ways to prevent such desertions in future, decided to deny his boys shore leave, and to put them on board a guardship when his ship was in the dock – without doubt, once they had enlisted the boys were bound to the Navy just like any man, until the day the Navy had no more use for them. The Society not only asked captains and officers to take more care to prevent desertions, it also advised them not to discharge any boy pretending to be an apprentice, but to inform its secretary first, who would then make an inquiry about the boy’s claim. Claiming to be an apprentice was a promising way for a boy to get away, as officers were afraid of losing their wage bonus to the boy’s master, yet the crucial point here is the question why any boy would try to do this, even falsely pretending to be an apprentice, so shortly after apparently volunteering for the service? Only a week after the Society’s letter regarding apprentices, for example, the Ramilies’ captain informed the committee that a couple of his boys claimed to be apprentices, yet an enquiry found out that many of their indentures had been delivered up by their old masters to be cancelled. The boys had to stay – unfortunately for them, for the Ramilies was to be the death bed of many. One boy, Peter Ryalls, was lucky enough to leave the Ramilies before disease and ultimately
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118 MSY/A/1, 31/03/1757, 14/04/1757; ADM 2/78, 04/04/1757, p. 282.
119 MSY/A/1, 21/09/1856, 28/09/1759.
120 See also Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), p. 8, fn. a; or MSY/A/5, 23/07/1772 (letter from John Fielding) for runaway boys being regarded as deserters and justification of confinement.
121 MSY/A/1, 14/04/1757.
122 MSY/A/1, 21/04/1757.
123 See Chapter V.4.
catastrophe struck her; he was transferred to the *Royal Ann*, from which he was finally discharged for being an apprentice after a total of five months in the Navy.¹²⁴

Such boys struggling to get away by claiming to be apprentices suggest that the deserters were probably not all thieves, who simply wanted to steal the clothing, but that among them were youngsters that had been brought to the Society's office by their parents, or former masters, or some authority, without being themselves too keen on going to sea. If the Society believed in its policy that all the boys had to be volunteers, then the stricter confinement could not be the only measure against the desertion problem: it had to take more care that all youngsters enlisted out of their own free will, and not because they were being pressured by adults or authorities. To this end the committee began an advertisement campaign in mid-1757, directed at anyone intending to send a boy to their office:

> The Marine Society, tho' Zealous for the Public Welfare, and assiduous in promoting the Interest of the Sea Service, and to relieve the Industrious poor, are resolved not to infringe on the Liberty of the Subject, being also persuaded that volunteers will be most likely to serve their King and Country with Diligence and Fidelity: therefore they hope that the parents or Friends of those Boys will consult their genius and Disposition (...f²⁵

Significantly, at the same time as the Society became increasingly cautious about accepting boys who appeared unwilling, its relationship with magistrate John Fielding, among whose recruits were a number of deserters, deteriorated. The above quoted advertisements, however, were not enough, as particularly authorities outside London seem to have regarded the Marine Society as a convenient way of ridding themselves of troubled youths, without having to pay too much attention to the boys' own wishes.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ See Ryalls in appendix three.
¹²⁵ MSY/A/1, 05 05/1757.
¹²⁶ See case of Stephen Wood, who was sent from Cranborn by the parish overseer against his will, in MSY/A/1, 16/03/1758. See also John Fielding warning the Marine Society later in 1772, when the Society had restarted the recruitment, about the dangers of asking for boys from the country, which would according to Fielding only open the doors for unkind parents and negligent parish officers to drive whoever they consider a nuisance to London (MSY/A/5, 23/07/1772).
The committee had to become more explicit and to run further newspaper
advertisements:127

Whereas several Boys have been lately sent up to this Society by the Church wardens and overseers of
parishes from distant Counties as well as the neighbourhood of London. And whereas some of the
said Boys when they have been presented to the Committee of the said Society, have persisted in
declaring that they were sent against their will and without their consent, the Society have thought
proper to return such Boys to their respective places of Settlement.
The Publick has already been informed that it is no ways agreeable to the Nature of the Institution of
this Society, to use any means of persuasion contrary to the inclinations of children, the intentions of
parents or the consent of masters -
Therefore the Society think themselves oblig'd to give notice in this publick manner and to request
that no parish officer, parent or master whatsoever, do send to the said Society any Boys but such as
are desirous to try their Fortunes at Sea, and that the same be Signified to the Secretary of the Society
with the names of the Boys that it may be truly known whether they are capricious and do not know
their own minds, or really are not of a turn of mind for such an employment, which requires a brisk &
active genius & such boys only can be expected to turn out Intrepid Mariners (...)

Yet, even this was not to be the last time the committee had to remind parish officials
and parents with a likely recruit not to send the boy against his will.128

The Marine Society's attempts to ensure that all their boys went to sea out of their
own free will, and 'not to infringe on the Liberty of the Subject', were certainly well
meant, and we can be sure that, after the troubles in the first year, the Society tried its
best to ensure that each boy joined the Navy of his own free will. However, ultimately
the Society's attempts were undermined by the poor laws, apprenticeship laws, the laws
against vagabonds and rogues, which all ignored the personal liberty of pauper children.
Local authorities had the power to order parish children into a compulsory maritime
apprenticeship, and though being a servant in the Royal Navy was not an

127 MSY/A/1, 20 04/1758.
128 See for example MSY/A/1, 15/03/1759, 26/06/1760; also Hanway, Reasons (1759), pp. 7, 102.
Apparently the committee even tried to assess whether the boy was really convinced of his decision and
was not likely to have a change of mind, leading to some boys being given more time to reconsider their
decision (see MSY/A/1, 11/06 1762; also Hanway, Reasons (1759), p. 7) Hanway's biographer John
Hutchins mentions that sometimes friends or relatives filled a lad with alcohol before delivering him to
the Society's office, forcing the committee to announce that any boy 'wh had the fumes of liquor on his
breath would be sent home' (Hutchins [1940], p. 92 – I was unable to find the source)
apprenticeship,\textsuperscript{129} one can easily imagine that some parish officials felt they were still acting lawfully. Furthermore, the masters of parish apprentices received the right to turn their boys over into a maritime apprenticeship given the approval of JPs,\textsuperscript{130} and they too might have assumed that the Navy would count as such. This could explain why some boys still clung on to the claim that they were apprentices when joining their captain or officer, while their former master had already cancelled their indentures. Next to this apprenticeship legislation, laws against vagabonds could make it legitimate to send anyone considered idle, dissolute, a rogue, vagabond or beggar, regardless if man or boy, forcibly to the Royal Navy.\textsuperscript{131} Using the Navy or the Army to get rid of, or to discipline, troublesome young men, also in the assumption that the aggression of violent individuals could thus be turned into a benefit for the state, had always had a wide backing in society.\textsuperscript{132} Partly the Marine Society had itself to blame for receiving so many unwilling boys, since its own publications portrayed the undertaking as a crime prevention programme that took care of troublesome and potentially dangerous youths, so that some may have perceived the Society as a kind of penal institution for juvenile delinquents. Even a few of the boys, obviously used to being ordered into a workplace, seem to have assumed that the Marine Society was a compulsory institution, as exemplified by the three lads who one night jumped over the wall of the lodging house and ran away, leaving the Society wondering why they escaped when they could have still left freely at any time, and leading to yet another committee resolution to inform

\textsuperscript{129} E.G. Thomas, in his otherwise very useful overview article 'The Old Poor Law and Maritime Apprenticeship' (1977), p. 157, fails to make this distinction between apprentices and servants. Queen Anne's law even forbade that the parish boys, who were placed in a maritime apprenticeship in accordance with the new act, enlisted or were enlisted in the Royal Navy before they reached the age of eighteen (2 & 3 Anne, c 6, s. iv).

\textsuperscript{130} 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. vi (1703).

\textsuperscript{131} 2 & 3 Anne, c. 6, s. xvi (1703); building on 39 Elizabeth, c. 4; and 11 & 12 William, c. 18.

\textsuperscript{132} See for example letters to \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} in January 1762, pp. 34-35, and February 1762, pp. 53-54.
every boy that the decision was up to him alone. Ultimately, one may also presume that even the members of the Society, despite all their assurances, would often have regarded a certain amount of pressure as helpful, particularly when dealing with troublesome or destitute youths. Hanway said it was up to the judges and lawyers how far the laws regarding young vagabonds could be stretched, but he himself certainly felt, since it was plain that such destitute children often had no way to survive other than to steal, and since they were the breeding ground for the most dangerous criminals, that therefore ‘Happy might it be for this Nation’ if the Society could be ‘a means to render our highways and our streets more secure; and by a gentle or compulsive means remove the wretched crowds [sic!] who disturb the peace of civil society. For by thus checking them in the very dawning of their iniquity, Tyburn might be left a desert.’ When at the end of the war the Society made plans for the disposal of the boys in the merchant navy, Hanway assured the public again that no compulsion would be applied, but also noted that ‘persuasion and encouragement will go a great way, and necessity still farther’, and that ‘neither policy, nor humanity’ would permit them to let any boy go that could be expected to end up as a vagabond. After all, the boys were as young as thirteen; all well below twenty-one, an age group that also John Locke had not wanted to entrust with unrestrained liberty. Parents or, if they were in care of the parish, local authorities would always have a strong say in the choice of their profession. Hanway’s own definition of the ‘Liberty of the Subject’ was certainly limited by the patriarchal and authoritarian attitudes of the middle class:

---

133 MSY/A2, 08 12/1763.
134 Hanway, Three Letters: Letter I (1758), p 6. See also Butler Swift’s poem Tyburn to the Marine Society (1759), in which the Tyburn gibbet curses the Marine Society for robbing him of those that were normally brought up to feed him.
135 Hanway, Two Letters: Letter IV (1758), p. 34.
137 Hanway, Moral and Religious Instructions (1767), p xlii.
The sons of Britons are all born to liberty; but I am sorry to say, they do not all understand what liberty means. If it were the liberty of doing mischief to each other, the poor against the rich, it would be full as bad as the rich against the poor (...) True liberty consists in doing well; in obeying parents, masters, and superiors, who have a title to command us.

Having established that there is sufficient evidence that some of the boys volunteered under a certain amount of pressure, we should not fail to see that there are also other aspects that suggest that some boys were very keen on going to sea - even, or perhaps particularly, among those troublesome boys with the 'restless and roving' minds that John Fielding complained of. The Marine Society was, for example, accused of luring away boys from the country who were needed in the agricultural sector. The best evidence for the sea service's attractiveness, however, is that next to deserters the major problem of the Marine Society was exactly the opposite: runaways, who enlisted without the consent or knowledge of their parents or apprenticeship masters.

(...) I took my mother at a time when I thought her a little pleasanter than ordinary, and told her that my thoughts were so entirely bent upon seeing the world, that I should never settle to anything with resolution enough to go through it, and my father had better give me his consent than force me to go without it, that I was now eighteen years old, which was too late to go apprentice to a trade, or clerk to an attorney; that I was sure, if I did, I should certainly run away from my master before my time was out, and go to sea (...) The youth, who thus threatened to go to sea against his father's will and to run away from his apprenticeship, was Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, and there were probably many eighteenth-century boys, like the cooper's apprentice John Nicol, author of The Life and Adventures of John Nicol, Mariner, whom Robinson Crusoe had made weary of their apprenticeship and eager to go to sea, or who felt unsettled in their restrictive apprenticeship and saw the sea as an escape to freedom and adventure. To

139 Runaways were a problem right from the start, first mentioned in MSY/A/1, 23/09 1756
141 Nicol (1822, 1937), p. 36.
142 See, as just one example of many, the case of William Barton, a twelve-year old runaway apprentice, in John Fielding's Newgate Magazine: Vol. II (1765-6), p. 784.
counter the problems with runaways the Society had to go as far as advertising in all newspapers that parents or masters whose boys were missing should come to the Society's office and view the latest recruits, to check whether their boy was among them.\textsuperscript{143} Should it be suspected that the boy had already left, the committee was also willing to let parents and masters have a look in the Society's registers.\textsuperscript{144} Usually apprentices running away to join the Navy had only been a problem for masters of older lads above the age of eighteen, who were sometimes lured away by recruiting officers to serve as landmen or seamen, to the annoyance of their masters, who were thus robbed of the reward for their training, that is having the boy as cheap labour for a couple more years. One reader of the \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} wrote that even if the apprentice did not enlist, he became more idle and insolent, thinking he could leave his apprenticeship at any time and join the Navy.\textsuperscript{145} In May 1757, the committee ordered that for the future no boy would be accepted unless a clergyman, magistrate, churchwarden, overseer of the parish, or some other reputable person testified that the boy was not an apprentice.\textsuperscript{146} Former apprentices had to produce the cancelled indentures from both parties as a proof.\textsuperscript{147} The keeper of the hostel where the boys were lodged was instructed to report any boy in his care he suspected of being an apprentice.\textsuperscript{148}

In view of the shortcomings of some apprenticeships, in particular the abuses of parish apprentices described in the first chapter, it is not surprising that many of the boys preferred to go to sea rather than carry on with their servitude. However, these abuses of apprentices can also serve as another indicator for boys being forced into the Navy, that is in cases where masters tried to encourage their apprentices to run away, so that they

\textsuperscript{143} See for example \textit{Gentleman's Magazine}, April 1757, p. 150; also Hanway, \textit{Letter from a Member} (1757, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed.), p. 13.
\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Gentleman's Magazine}, March 1759, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{146} MSY/A/1, 05/05/1757.
\textsuperscript{147} MSY/A/1, 05/05/1757; also MSY/A/1, 16/06/1757, 08/12/1757.
could keep the fee without having to provide for the boy any longer. In September 1757, for example, the father of William Newton took his son's master, a watch-movement-maker, to court, accusing him of having encouraged William to join the Navy a year earlier. William's father claimed that the master had tried to weary William out and had made him desirous to leave the apprenticeship, while he himself had not received any complaints of his son, and he was sure that his son would have made a faithful and diligent apprentice. William had been beaten many times by the master for not being able to accomplish tasks in which he had not been adequately trained. William Newton had not been placed by the parish, he did not belong to the poorest, and he was lucky to have a father who cared about him and made the effort to go to court for him. That is how we know of his case. Another boy with a similar fate, but coming from a poorer background and having no friends, would have ended on a ship or on the streets of London without his story ever having been drawn to our attention. Thus even William Hogarth's famous *Idle Apprentice*, who had been sent to sea, may now appear in a different light, and Ronald Paulson has argued that Thomas Idle was the one with whom apprentices in the audience would sympathise, rather than with the industrious Francis Goodchild, as they saw Tom as a victim rather than a wrong-doer; Tom Idle was, in the words of Paulson, a 'subculture hero' for the apprentices. Paulson reckons that Hogarth purposely chose Tom Idle to be a weaver's apprentice, as weaving was reputedly the worst paid craft and had the worst prospects, unless one had family connections to a master.

The Marine Society must have been aware of cases like the one of William Newton, for in 1758 Hanway wrote that:

---

149 See appendix of M.D. George (1925, 1965), pp. 420-421. William does not appear to have been clothed by the Marine Society unless he enlisted under a false name.

150 See Paulson (1979), pp. 16-17, 22-23; and Paulson (1975), pp. 72-73; also *The Effects of Industry and Idleness Illustrated* (1748) by an anonymous author who was shocked to see that people in the streets viewing Hogarth's prints in shop windows were apparently misinterpreting their message.

masters are sometimes glad to give up the indenture of boys, who cannot, or will not, learn their trade: and these are the kind of subjects, which it falls to the lot of this Society, to provide for. If any private man accidentally should suffer, or through folly or caprice should clamour, would this be a sufficient reason for any good and great to suspend or withdraw their favour from such a Society?

In May 1759, the committee ordered, in view of the fact that several masters had appeared with their apprentices, who were allegedly not capable of learning their trade and were 'desirous of going to Sea', that the boys' consent had to be obtained, as well as that of their parents, if there were any. Interviewing the boy was necessary, as some masters might have given their apprentice the impression that there was no real choice for him; perhaps there was indeed none, for a master that did not want the boy could make his life hell.

The master of Tobias Smollet's fictional hero *Roderick Random*, also trying to encourage his apprentice to run away to the Navy (so that he could blame his maid's pregnancy on the disappeared Roderick), opted for a more subtle approach:

I am surprised, that a young fellow like you, discovers no inclination to push his fortune in the world. By G-d, before I was of your age, I was broiling on the coast of Guinea. Damme! what's to hinder you from profiting by the war (...) where you will certainly see a great deal of practice, and stand a good chance of getting prize money.

The master's attempt was promising, for the lure of financial gain and adventure must have appealed to many youths, including many of the Marine Society's boys. The prospect of gaining prize money, to which the boys were as entitled as a (land-)man, could mean a large step out of misery for a friendless orphan. Furthermore, as servants in the Navy, and in view of the shortage of sailors, they could expect to be rated as fully paid seamen soon after turning eighteen, which meant it would take them a much shorter time than in any landbased or maritime apprenticeship to become a wage

---

152 MSY/A/1, 03/05/1759
153 Smollett (1748, 1999), p. 30
154 See Chapter V.4.; also MSY/A/1, 05/05/1757; and Hanway, *Christian Knowledge* (1763), p. 4.
earner.\textsuperscript{155} Even in the merchant navy many boys chose to start their careers as servants and not apprentices, according to Peter Earle, seeing that as servants they learned through practical life nearly as much of the profession as an apprentice did in his long servitude.\textsuperscript{156} In commercial shipping the boys would not have been confronted with naval rule and war, yet one aspect that might have made the Navy the more desirable option was that the workload for a naval servant was probably lower than what a youth would have had to expect when working on a small commercial vessel and for a master who tried to get the most out of his cheap labourer.\textsuperscript{157}

In comparison to the bleak economic prospects of some trades on land to which parish boys were apprenticed, seafarers were at the time everywhere very much in need and promised better employment opportunities. For the parish boys sent by Charles Gray from Colchester, for example, being sent away from their home-town for an apprenticeship was in any way a likely scenario. They faced the prospect of being apprenticed to a weaver, bound until the age of twenty-four, misused as cheap labour, and with meagre employment opportunities afterwards in trades that were swamped with pauper apprentices, or being placed in a maritime apprenticeship, being given no pay at all, not even any clothing (only on completion of their service).\textsuperscript{158} To such boys the Marine Society and the Navy, offering a free set of clothing and bedding, a yearly allowance of 40s, and the prospect of becoming a wage earner soon after turning eighteen, must have looked very attractive, at least to those that did not fear the dangers of war. Thus it would also be no contradiction if boys, who had troubles with authority, volunteered for the Navy (the very same institution other boys were sent to exactly

\textsuperscript{155} Queen Anne's act of 1703 regarding maritime apprenticeships for the children of the poor, however, also tried to ensure that the boys finished their term at the age of twenty-one.
\textsuperscript{156} Earle (1998), p 24
\textsuperscript{157} See also the anonymous letter writer to the Grand Magazine complaining about the naval servants allegedly having far too much work-free time (published in British Library's edition of Hanway, Account of the Marine Society [1759], pp. 145ff.).
\textsuperscript{158} See Davis (1962, 1972), p 119.
because it was expected that the Navy would put them under a stricter discipline). The Navy appeared to offer a quicker route to independence for a parish boy than any apprenticeship on land could. Samuel Richardson, in his *Apprentice’s Vade Mecum; or Young Man’s Pocket-Companion* (1734), a guide setting out rules of proper behaviour for apprentices, advised that for boys who cannot obey the rules laid out therein, going to sea was a much better career choice, and also:

(...) a happy Relief to the honest Tradesman, to whom the Youth might otherwise be bound; a great Ease to his Relations, who would thereby spar’d the Mortification and Disappointment of a fruitless Tryal, and Time and Money lost to no Purpose, and a Benefit to the young Man, and perhaps to the Publick, which can be so well serv’d, in such a maritime Kingdom as this by such bold and daring Spirits, as would think themselves above being confin’d to the necessary Rules of an orderly Family.

Thus the restless boys’ ‘bold and daring Spirits’ and the interests of the Empire could profit from each other; the sea service could be the way-out for the authorities as well as for the troubled boy. While adolescent aggressiveness might have brought many Marine-Society recruits into conflict with society on land, at sea and at war that very same character trait was expected of them; and being troublesome youths certainly did not rule out their being patriotic and xenophobic enough to go to war for their country. The Marine Society advertised that, next to the vagabonds with no means but theft or begging to support themselves, they were looking for ‘Boys of a daring Temper whose genius leads them to try their fortune at Sea’, ‘those who are of too volatile a disposition for their trade, or too bold to live on shore with sober masters’, those

---

159 Richardson (1734, 1975), pp. 51-52. In 1759, a Samuel Richardson donated five guineas to the Marine Society.

160 An interesting historical comparison is provided by the studies of rebellious youth gangs in Nazi Germany. Gestapo reports reveal that rebellious behaviour among boys was spread to an extraordinary extent (mainly among working-class boys whose fathers were absent, that is either at the front or already dead), yet the regime applied relatively mild punishments (apart from a few exceptions), as it was acknowledged that often the very same youths later volunteered for the most dangerous arms of the service. Remarkably, many of these rebellious youths chose the Navy, despite the fact that they mostly came from larger cities far away from the sea. And it is perhaps more than coincidence that the most famous of these youth gangs called itself *Edelweisspratzen*, thus keeping the piratical/maritime element of their eighteenth-century peers (see for example Alfons Kenkmann [1991], or Detlef Peukert [1980]).

161 MSY/A/1, 08/01/1762.

Britannia receiving and clothing the sons of the poor for the Navy. The boys at the beach cheer on the battling British warships, seemingly eager to take part (from Hanway, *Christian Knowledge* [1760], also *To the Marine Society* [1757]).
'whose Heads are turned to War'. The earlier finding that many of the Society's boys had been in trouble with their local authorities does not necessarily mean that these were also always the boys that had to be forced to volunteer.

One thing that the Navy, and deep-sea sailing in general, definitely offered compared to what, for example, a Colchester boy had to expect as a weaver's or a fisherman's apprentice, was what the modern youth would call 'action', the deep sea as the epitome of adventure. When analysing this attraction of deep-sea sailing to young people it is important to try to take the viewpoint of an eighteenth-century boy stuck in poverty or a dull, arduous apprenticeship, and with no family connection to the sea service, and not from the viewpoint of an educated contemporary like Samuel Johnson, who called the lure of the sea a perversion of the imagination, or of someone writing from the comfortable perspective of twentieth-century mass affluence. The tales of adventure, the travelling, and the test of manliness, all well represented in contemporary popular art such as the numerous pirate theatre plays, must have made an impression on youths. In light of the repression by apprenticeship masters and the magistrates trying to reduce youthful entertainment, as described in Chapter 1.3., the distant harbour towns and open sea could only appear more liberating. And then there was the public image of the sailors themselves, the behaviour and appearance many of them displayed when on land, which

163 Hanway, *Letter from a Member* (1757, 1st ed.), p. 29
165 Jesse Lemisch and Marcus Rediker have reminded us not to be blinded by seafaring's romantic image and that for some seamen *wanderlust* appears as an ironic parody of their real motives for going to sea (see Lemisch [1968], pp. 373, 377; Rediker [1987, 1998], pp. 4-5). Yet Lemisch does also not deny that the 'mystique' of the sea existed and exerted a powerful force, and in the end one always has to remember that in the age preceding mass tourism navies and armies were still the only way to see the world for the non-privileged. Whether the *wanderlust* of the youth, an ever-present theme in European history, is endogenous, that is resulting from the biological development of the youth himself, or exogenous, and resulting from social and economic pressures, is open to debate. A very simple explanation for the *wanderlust* of the youth could be that it is the only stage in life where an individual can follow this urge, as he has reached the required minimum amount of physical fitness and maturity, while in the same time not yet being bound to commitments such as a family or the possession of means of production.
166 Charles Johnson's *The Successful Pirate* was the first in 1713. For the pirate's romantic image see David Cordingly (1995, 1996).
also often figured in contemporary popular art.\textsuperscript{167} Regardless of whether this image was an accurate representation of the average sailor or not, to many restless youths the drinking, singing, raucously partying and womanising sailor in the taverns, making the harbour district synonymous with the amusement district, was probably a better advertisement for the sea service than the Marine Society could ever come up with.

Surely, the sober mind, and boys that had grown up with seafaring fathers, also knew the sailor's other side, the hardship, danger and suffering. Yet a 'land-boy' like William Spavens, who went to the sea during the Seven Years War and produced one of the few preserved memoirs of the lower deck of the time, remembered how he looked at the sailors with envy, and never considered any of the perils and hardships they were exposed to: 'I thought sailors must be happy men to have such opportunities of visiting foreign countries.'\textsuperscript{168} And mariner John Nicol even recollected that his 'youthful mind could not separate the life of a sailor from dangers and storms, and I looked upon them as an interesting part of the adventures I panted after.'\textsuperscript{169} Many boys and young men with no family connection to seafarers would have perceived only the sailor ashore, who, dressed in his fancy shore-going clothes, enjoyed the time in between the voyages with the aid of his recently earned pay. Moreover, the boys probably identified only those as being sailors that lived up to the stereotypical image of a seaman, presumably in most cases young deep-sea sailors, sailors who had stories to tell of distant places, foreign cultures and women, and who were never far away from the theatre of war, providing them with the odd episode to tell from wartime service on board a naval vessel, a private man-of-war, or just an armed trading vessel furnished with a letter of marque.

Bold Jack, the sailor, here I come;
Pray how d'ye like my nib,
My trousers wide, my trampers rum,
My nab, and flowing jib?
I sails the seas from end to end
And leads a joyous life;
in ev'ry mess I finds a friend,
In ev'ry port a wife.\textsuperscript{170}

Building on the remarks about youth history in chapter one, that there was something comparable to today's youth in the eighteenth century, teenagers who experienced similar emotions, it might help to look at deep-sea sailors from a youth-cultural angle to show why the sailors' lifestyle could be so attractive to boys. Additionally this youth-behavioural approach can also deliver an interpretation of the sailors' culture in general.

Deep-sea sailing was a profession for young men, and for men who kept certain elements of 'youthfulness'. Various studies have shown that deep-sea sailing crews were very young, most being around the age of twenty-five and younger.\textsuperscript{171} Many deep-sea sailors 'settled down' in later years with shore-based occupations or working in the coastal trade.\textsuperscript{172} Roderick Random's master, in the quotation above, alleges that it was natural for 'a young fellow' to try his fortunes at sea, as he himself had done before settling down as a surgeon on land. Seamen were frequently described by contemporaries as being particularly boyish and immature in their behaviour and lifestyle. Various work-related factors might have promoted their 'youthfulness', and expanded it into their thirties. Marriage, for example, one of the key moments in the transition from youth to adulthood in Western Europe, was difficult to achieve for a sailor. Interestingly, Cindy McCreery has pointed out that, while there were undoubtedly also many married sailors

\textsuperscript{170} Jack in his Element, a song by Charles Dibdin (1745-1814), travelling entertainer and composer of many popular songs romanticising the sailor's life (in The Sea Songs of Charles Dibdin [1852?], pp. 96-97). Dibdin claimed his songs had produced more recruits than all the press gangs that swept through the streets of London (see Andrew Davies [1990], p. 24). During the wars of the French Revolution Dibdin was commissioned by the government to write war songs; he also received a government pension. Dibdin himself had never been a sailor (see Land [1999], pp. 17, 26).

\textsuperscript{171} See for example Rediker (1987, 1998), p. 299; or Rodger (1986, 1988), pp. 360-363. Admittedly, the fact that older seamen could progress to petty-officer rank also kept the crew's age average young.

\textsuperscript{172} See for example Earle (1997), p. 87.
– a quarter of all eighteenth-century seamen according to McCreery – popular art usually chose to portray the sailor as unmarried and thus open for any sexual adventure. Setting up his own permanent home, another key moment in the move from youth to adulthood in Western Europe, was also difficult for a sailor. Generally, saving any money or investing it in anything more lasting was complicated, as the sailor needed a trustworthy place to deposit it, for taking it on the voyage yielded the danger that the possessions would go down when the ship had an accident, or would have to be left behind when the sailor wanted to desert. Also the threat of the press gang taking him with no chance to settle his affairs did not encourage more sound investments than the next bottle of rum. Like apprentices, sailors sometimes had to be forced to work, and corporal punishment was common to discipline them; like any youth, they were housed and fed, and their movements were under strict control, and they lived like students in a close male-only community. Even captains sometimes used paternal language with regards to their sailors, referring to them as their children. Marcus Rediker has described eighteenth-century sailors as the harbinger of the free wage labourers of the industrialised world – in a way the first factory workers. Sailors did, for example, not own their means of production; employers and workplace could be changed at the end of each voyage or simply by running away. This created perhaps a more unsettled, a more ‘youth-like’ workforce than pre-industrial European society was used to.

The sailors’ ‘youthfulness’ was supplemented and embraced by a general feeling of otherness among frequent deep-sea sailors, that presumably resulted to a large degree

174 Artisans and others forced to wander around for work had similar problems to sailors with settling down, and perhaps a study of their behaviour could reveal similar ‘youth-like’ tendencies. Young journeymen, who were not married and continued to live with their masters, were in the popular mind often included with apprentices (i.e. youths), according to Smith (1973), p. 159.
176 In a more general view, one might argue that all types of wage labour in pre-industrial Europe was regarded as work specific to youths and bachelors (as done by Michael Mitterauer [1986], pp. 131-133).
from having to spend long periods away from England and society on land, from visiting foreign cultures and working with foreigners, from having to live in a close group of males who together had to master dangerous situations most men on land never experienced, and perhaps also from absorbing young men who did not conform to society on land and went to sea (or were sent) to escape from it. Many seafarers felt the need to express this otherness, be it by bullying the landmen on board, or by their behaviour or fashion when on land. Isaac Land has recently emphasised that the peculiar behaviour of many sailors was not the natural result of their work environment alone, but also a conscious attempt to distinguish themselves and their group from society. Indeed, even the most frequent deep-sea sailor would still spend large parts of the year in the harbour, or employed in trades near the coast and even on land, which is why any peculiar behaviour would have always also evolved out of the interaction with society on land. Isaac Land therefore proposed to view the sailors’ culture not as a specific maritime culture, but rather as a so called subculture, in the sense of the subculture models used by sociologists to describe youth cultures in twentieth-century Britain.177

If we count such groups as subcultures which show a conspicuous, intentional distinction from society’s norms in dress, hairstyle, jewellery (also tattoos),178 language, music, and behaviour, then the behaviour of many sailors could fit into such a model. Further parallels can be drawn, such as the non-conformity being accompanied by conformity within the group, the loyalty to group members and rejection of outsiders, the search for excitement, the understatement of danger and even death, and various provocative and hedonistic elements. Books, plays, music, and the fact that sailors were

---

178 According to Mitterauer (1986), p. 211, in modern youth cultures earrings often refer to the freedom of the corsair, while tattoos are used as an indefinite sign of belonging, as well as to emphasise masculinity and muscles. If eighteenth-century European society was indeed not very familiar with tattooing, then a proper Polynesian tattoo would have also been a reference to a different culture, or even a counter culture – perhaps William Bligh should have been alerted when young Fletcher Christian and several other men of the Bounty got their bodies tattooed during their stay at Otaheiti (Tahiti).
in constant contact with sailors from other regions and countries provided the ‘mass
media’ for this eighteenth-century subculture. Sailor slogans such as ‘a Rowling Stone
never gathers Moss’, or the praise of a ‘Short life and Merry life’, are even today
expected from anyone wanting to qualify as a youth-cultural icon. Many other sailor
maxims might have been unquotable, as sailors were generally acknowledged to be
champions in swearing – again something attractive to rebellious young men for its anti-
authoritarian tone. The members of this ‘sailor-subculture’ had kept many youthful
desires, but unlike younger boys they possessed physical and sexual maturity, and the
necessary ready money to fulfil these desires. It is therefore easily imaginable that this
sailor-subculture appeared attractive to boys and young men, and perhaps particularly to
those youths with the ‘restless and roving mind’, and those who saw themselves in
conflict with society.

Of course, this subculture model has limits, and one has to be very careful not to fall
victim of a later romanticization of seafarers (pirates) and their iconisation in many
subsequent epochs of youth culture. While some sailors would have fitted perfectly
into it, for the mass of them it probably goes too far, particularly regarding all those that
mostly worked close to the shore and went on short voyages only. However, it should be
said that this model is also a great deal about the public’s impression and a boy’s
imagination, and even the subculture models applied to twentieth-century youths
emphasise that the core of a subculture is made up of only a few, while the majority of
youths remain somewhere in the middle between conformity to society and sympathy

179 Quotes from John Cremer’s memoirs written in the 1760s, in Ramblin’ Jack (1936), pp. 39, 194.
181 Incidentally, for twentieth-century teenage cultures it appears also common that its avant-gardes are
already in their twenties.
182 Perhaps a study of the romance and reality, and the posthumous romanticization and iconisation in
youth culture, of nineteenth-century North-American cowboys could provide a good analogy.
183 Note, for example, that John Fielding’s observations about Wapping and Rotherhithe appearing like
a foreign country, quoted in chapter one, were the impressions of a blind man (although Fielding is also
said to have been at sea as a boy, prior to losing his eyesight).
with the subculture. The generations of young Hull fishermen, for example, were probably never driven to sea because the sailor was a youth-cultural icon, or because they wanted to escape from a depressing life on land into a life of adventure. Instead they went to sea simply because that was the livelihood of their fathers and their whole community; they knew the fisherman's reality, there was nothing glamorous about their choice of profession, it was just the only means of making a living – but then again, the sons of Hull fishermen were not the boys who appeared at the Marine Society's office.

In summary, trying to unearth John's motivations for turning up at the Marine Society's office contains a large element of speculation. Very often his poverty, the fact that so many of his comrades were orphans or fatherless and had no legal way of supporting themselves, but also occasionally John's undisciplined behaviour, had led adults or authorities to suggest he should visit the Marine Society. How voluntarily he then decided to go is debatable; the Society did its best to enquire whether it was of his own free will or not, at least after the initial troubles it had experienced with deserters, but the attempts were sometimes undermined by the laws and practice of poor relief, which often ignored John's own wishes, and by the fact that most of John's comrades were very young, immature, and easily put under pressure. Nevertheless, there were many among his comrades who were willing to join the Navy even without the permission of their parents or masters, and when one considers their alternative options in life on land one can easily imagine how the sea could appear as a materialisation of the escapist dreams in young John's head.
Chapter Five:

Youth at Sea

V.1. Tracing Ships' Boys in the Royal Navy: the Sources and the Samples

After having observed Marine-Society boy John, his appearance and physique, family background and motivations, we now have to leave the safe base of the land and follow him, or at least a sample of his mates, into the wooden world at sea. Eighteenth-century naval servants, in particular those merely destined to become seamen and not officers, are rather uncharted waters in historiography. The Marine Society's documents itself are also not much concerned with what happened to their boys, or their men, at sea, apart from the problems with those boys that deserted. Perhaps in particular regarding the men there would have also been no reason to feed back information to the Society just because it had clothed the recruit. The Society's correspondence would certainly be more informative, yet unfortunately none has survived. Our main aids to keep track of John's mates, and anyone else who went on board with them, are the Royal Navy's muster lists and pay lists. Other Navy records, such as the captains' logs or the captains' letters to the Admiralty, rarely mention ordinary sailors. Kept meticulously by captain and purser, with the assistance of the master and the boatswain, the muster lists (and the corresponding pay books), whose purpose it was to determine every man's wage, have survived in an impressive amount.¹ The thoroughness with which these lists were recorded and preserved is nowhere better illustrated than by the muster book with the

¹ In most muster lists the men are ordered and numbered according to their date of entry. A muster list normally covers about two months; the men were mustered weekly. Each weekly muster is represented by a small letter of the alphabet, which is entered behind the men's names—a tick instead of a letter indicates absence (usually lent to another ship), and Ss indicates sickness. The first page gives the dates, summary and total numbers of the weekly musters, then follow the musters for the men, and then for the marines, supernumeraries, runners and occasionally prisoners, pilots, shipwrights and caulkers, and on very rare occasions even a separate list for boys. For a more detailed introduction into the muster and pay books see N.A.M Rodger (1984, 1998). N.A.M Rodger is currently working on a new and more general guide to Navy records held at the Public Record Office.
Public-Record-Office reference number ADM 36/10744 (and pay book number ADM 35/216): like all musters it lists each individual recruit, the price of anything he had obtained on board from the purser and that had later to be deducted from his wage, e.g. beds, clothes, tobacco or medicines for venereal infections, as well as any occurrences of discharges, deaths and desertions with the exact date. What makes ADM 36/10744 so special is that it was kept by William Bligh and the ship was the infamous Bounty, and that even a year after the mutiny, and an odyssey of over three and a half thousand miles in the launch, Lieutenant Bligh, his master John Fryer and boatswain William Cole had completed their duty to sign the final muster books, listing every man’s wage deductions for what they had obtained on board, and recording every mutineer as a deserter together with the exact date they had ‘run’ – all for a ship that had actually never returned to England but had remained with the deserters at the other end of the globe.2

Given the meticulousness of the sources, historians have so far assumed that with the help of muster and pay books one could easily follow any sailor’s years he spent in the Royal Navy. Alas, just for servants this turns out not to be true, for while any man usually has, when leaving the vessel, his next ship recorded behind his date of discharge, servants who were discharged from their ship and their master at the same time have in most cases merely the word Request recorded, rather than the next ship. One explanation why the next stations for servants leaving without their master were so often not recorded could be that the boys were not paid by the Navy and therefore not of interest for the muster books. Servants were only of interest in connection with their master, who would be paid for them, and who in turn would pay their allowance out of his own pocket. It mattered only how many servants each officer had, while the career of the boy himself was not of interest. Yet, the lack of official interest in the servants’ careers is still

2 Bligh had taken the ship’s books with him from the Bounty and had held on to them throughout the journey in the launch.
surprising, particularly when considering the Admiralty's attempts to force captains to value seafaring experience when rating the crew, rather than being influenced by the recruit's family background and personal preferences. Another possible explanation for the incomplete servant-records may be that it was not always known where the boy would go next, considering that each ship could only employ a specific ratio of servants. Hence, ships employed as guard ships, as for example the *Royal Ann* and the *Princess Royal*, or the *Royal Sovereign*, at times acted as holding and distributing stations for servants, taking boys on for only short periods and then passing them on to other ships when a servant placement was found there.³ The guard ships might even have served as a 'training station',⁴ which could explain why many of the sampled servants were temporarily lent to the *Royal Sovereign*. A third possible explanation could be that ships kept additional muster lists for the servants, as was the rule in later years, and that these lists were simply not preserved,⁵ but then the question would arise why the boys were also entered in the normal muster lists with only their next service station missing. And a final possible explanation could be that boys thus discharged were merely taken off the musters but not off the ship. It is known that sons of officers (and women) were occasionally on board without appearing in the musters, a famous example being the boy Nicholas Young on board Cook's *Endeavour*: Nicholas, who was the first to sight New Zealand, only appeared for the first time in the musters when he replaced a dead seaman

---

³ Boys with no immediate placement were frequently sent to the *Princess Royal* first (MSY/A/1, 26/12/1760; ADM 2/80, 07/04/1758, pp. 252-253); and boys with no destination recorded in the Marine Society's registers often appear in the books of the *Royal Ann*.


⁵ There are indeed some, though very few, muster books of the Seven-Years-War period that contain separate lists for the boys. The Navy regulations also mention extra lists for all discharged men, which do not seem to be preserved.
at Otaheiti (Tahiti), while before there was no trace of him in the *Endeavour*’s muster. However, all the cases of sampled servants who had been discharged by *Request* and were retrieved on board other ships, or reappeared at the Society’s office, suggest that this theory can not explain all such discharges.

Whatever the reasons for the lists’ insufficiencies, the difficulties in retrieving servants, when they are discharged without their master, make following Marine-Society boy John’s naval service an arduous piece of detective work. Any flaw in the source-material, however, also provides the first finding: not only is the lack of interest in the servants’ careers surprising, but also the simple fact that servants so frequently changed their masters and their ships. When servants leave their masters to serve a new master on board the same ship, one can easily keep track of them. The servant reappears with a higher recruit number at the end of the same muster list; some diligent muster book keepers even noted down a link pointing to the new recruit-number, together with the information *SB* (ship’s books). The same process happened when a servant was discharged in order to be rated. There are also some servants (e.g. sick ones), who left their master, but reappeared on board a couple of weeks later with a higher recruit-number. Naturally, a late re-entry provokes some doubts as to whether it is really the same recruit, should no direct *SB*-number-link be provided. Often, if there are two recruits with identical names in one list, a small 1 and 2 were added to the names in order to distinguish the two recruits.

---

6 See Beaglehole (1955), p. 589. Glyn Williams drew my attention to Young’s case. See also the two sampled Marine-Society boys Benjamin Rice and William Singleton, who appear in the *Minerva*’s muster for the first time one and a half months after being sent there by the Society, replacing two discharged servants, and without having been on the supernumeraries list.

7 For proof that *SB* stands for *Ship’s Books* see ADM 36/6563, p. 204. If the recruit was transferred to or from the supernumeraries then there is often an *SL* referring to the supernumeraries list.

8 The case of Richard Taylor (MS-no. 2858), however, illustrates that even the book keepers were sometimes confused by a re-entry: the re-entered Taylor got the (2), even though the *SB*-number-link, and the fact that the master was exchanged, strongly suggest that it is actually one and the same boy.
Servants who were discharged from a ship together with their master are also easy to keep track of—occasionally the new ship or with master is noted behind their name; in most cases, however, again merely Request was recorded, but one can deduce the servant's next ship by checking if the master has an identical date of discharge and, if so, to which ship the master went. The real difficulties start when a servant left master and ship at the same time. Apart from a few exceptions, rather than recording the new ship, the muster books only give Request as a reason for the discharge. Unless one checks all other muster books of ships in proximity (with the help of the list books under ADM 8) it appears impossible to say where those servants went. As checking all musters of nearby ships was not manageable for a bigger sample, the research for any of the sampled Marine-Society boys stopped at that point.

To ensure that the analysis of the sampled careers does not produce a distorted picture, however, it is vital to ask whether the servants thus discharged without their master and lost for further study were all discharged for one particular reason. Was it that they were all promoted, or even the unlikely event that they were all entirely discharged, or was it merely a change of the master? To answer this question, some of the results of the careers analysis have to be called upon already at this stage. Various points make it impossible that all of the boys were lost for the same reason. As will be shown in section three, it appears likely that in many cases the servants discharged from ship and master were to be rated at another ship. However, there are also too many that would have been far too young and inexperienced to be rated. In order to test the nature of the Request discharge the careers of some servants were followed (in the third sample group), who had returned as servants to the Society's office during or after the war, and

---

*Often Request is recorded in most muster lists, but only in one (usually the one when the discharge actually happened) is a more specific reason given. On a few occasions merely Superseded (or Supersede(ended)) is recorded behind the master's name, rather than the name of the next ship—the ship then has to be identified with the help of the captain's letters (ADM 1) or the warrant books (ADM 6).*
it turned out that some of them were indeed last discharged with the Request information. Therefore a Request discharge cannot indicate a definite promotion.

Such boys returning to the Marine Society during the war show that it is also possible that some servants were simply discharged from their ship, in effect from the Navy, with no next vessel to go to – a problem the Society was alerted to by Captain O'Hara in 1758. The Additional Navy Regulations of 1756 indeed complained about captains discharging men or boys despite the tight manning situation. However, it is impossible that all Request discharges were entire discharges, for then the Society’s scheme would have been a complete failure and would surely have stopped. Furthermore, it is unlikely that those boys discharged in harbours far away from home, or those already lent to another ship at the time of their discharge, or those who had just recently received clothes or beds from the Navy stores, had been entirely discharged. The huge number of occasions when servants left with only Request recorded and reappeared at their master’s next ship support the view that neither an entire discharge nor a definite promotion was linked to the information. And also the many occasions on which the servant’s next ship is only recorded in one list of the muster book, while in all other lists merely Request is noted down (which forces the researcher to always check all available muster lists), deny a definite link to any of these two scenarios. Thus there seems to be no singular cause connected to Request discharges. The analysis has to live with the unknown quantity, hoping that the lost careers will not differ too much from those that could be followed.

A.G. Pitcairn Jones remarked in 1954, in the only publication I know of that stumbled over the problem of the many Request discharges among servants, that ‘It is rather a curious thing, by the way, how easy it seems to have been for a servant to be

\[10\] MSY/A/1, 27/04/1758.

\[11\] John Clarke (MS-no. 4135), for example, was discharged due to Request in Port Royal, Jamaica, with no hint as to where he was going.
discharged by request: everybody else was discharged by order, or discharged to hospital, or discharged dead or deserted." The scope for interpretation is certainly wide, though it is rather unlikely that the servants themselves had a say as to where they had to serve; at least in wartime such frequent *Request* discharges could have only been requests of individual captains or officers, and the high frequency of the changes would have made it impractical to consult the Admiralty on each occasion. That brings about the question why the officers requested discharges on such a regular basis, in particular when, as we shall see in section three, the relationship to their servants was anyway not a very close one? Again the first answer that comes into one's mind is that the servant was ready to be rated and a replacement was available. But, as argued above, for many boys lost from the sample group this was an impossible scenario. Furthermore, one would have to ask why the boy was then not rated on board his own ship. The most likely scenario for a requested discharge appears to be that an officer from another ship, that lay in the same harbour and was about to leave, had requested this boy. Ships about to leave were often desperate to fill their numbers. An officer leaving without his full contingent of servants would lose all the pay-bonuses, so the only solution might have been to request a servant from another ship that was staying in the harbour and whose officers could wait for new servants. The only other options for an officer leaving without his servant posts filled would have been to hope that he could pick one up on the way, in emergency this could even be a boy rescued from a shipwrecked merchantman or a French prisoner, or he had to invent a servant in the muster book. However, against the theory that the discharged servants were usually requested by a leaving ship speaks the fact that in the samples leaving servants were all too often immediately replaced by new ones, and thus theoretically the new ones could have gone straight to the other ship. The

---

only explanation to keep the hypothesis then is that the leaving ship was keen on having servants that had been trained already in the harbour, possibly even with sea-going experience.\textsuperscript{13}

The deficiencies of the muster and pay books with regards to the servants’ new stations disappear gradually only towards the end of the century, in particular with the reforms in 1794, when the boys were distinguished into three classes and listed in separate muster lists. In general, the quality of muster books improved as the century went towards its end: existing columns for background information concerning the recruit were filled in more thoroughly, and new columns emerged, providing us with an increasing wealth of information about the sailors’ ages, where they came from and whether they had entered voluntarily or been pressed. The Marine Society’s registers, by the way, showed a similar improvement, perhaps a sign of Enlightenment flowing into both institutions.

Because of the described problems any sampling of servants’ careers in the Seven Years War will have to live with losing boys through the Request discharges, and will over the years increasingly over-represent boys who remained servants to the same officer, or who stayed on board the same ship, as well as those who have been rated, for once rated their next ships are always recorded and one can easily follow them.\textsuperscript{14} Taking into account the number of muster books that have to be inspected to follow one boy, with the almost certain threat of losing the sampled boy somewhere on the way, it becomes clear that a proper statistical sample giving accurate estimates about the whole population is difficult to achieve. The study has to place greater emphasis on qualitative information. It is therefore also legitimate to let the applied sampling techniques to an

\textsuperscript{13} To put this explanation to the test one would have to select a ship that discharged boys with an unrecorded destination, then check the list books (ADM 8) to see if there were other ships nearby that left at just that moment, and to try to find the ‘lost boys’ on board these ships. The list books, however, were produced only on a monthly basis and are not the most accurate.

\textsuperscript{14} See also Appendices A.II.5 7.
extent fall victim to considerations of practicality, such as the available research time and the likelihood of getting useful results. Thus for this analysis not just individual servants were sampled, but instead the whole group of boys who entered the same ship at around the same time. That means that most boys were initially selected indirectly by belonging to a *cluster*, that is the ship. Naturally this makes the sample less representative. To get maximum results the group/cluster sizes were not adjusted.

Three sets of samples were derived: One set of seven (six)\(^\text{15}\) groups of boys has been selected from the whole through an almost systematic sampling, by taking every 684th\(^\text{16}\) boy recorded in the database, after a random start, which was given by the computer as number 41.\(^\text{17}\) This almost systematic sampling takes well into account the fact that most boys entered the Navy in the initial war years. Altogether the sample has 137 boys. A second set of seven groups of altogether 107 boys has been sampled by selecting groups in a yearly interval, starting with the first boys that had their ship recorded, in October 1756, and going until October 1762. This sample has been taken so that career information spread over the seven war-years could be obtained, and to have a higher likelihood of being able to observe what happened to the boys at the end of the war. In order to receive a maximum of information the largest group of boys going to the same ship in that month has been chosen. As big groups are chosen, this sample may be expected to over-represent boys sent to larger ships. Finally, there is a collection of eighteen careers which are not a random selection but have been followed either in order

---

\(^{15}\) The first group had to be omitted as no ship has been recorded for anyone in proximity to the first chosen recruit, and in fact the closest group, at recruit number 179, is already included in the second set of samples. When questions were tackled on the basis of the first sample set alone, this group around recruit number 179 from the second set has been included as a replacement.

\(^{16}\) That is all 4,788 boys, as counted by the Marine Society, divided by seven.

\(^{17}\) The few cases of boys that have earlier entry-dates than their position in the registers suggests, and boys that are suspected of having been double-counted, are not considered a problem. If a boy with an earlier entry would have been selected, I would have moved to the next. Boys with no ship recorded are also included in the count, should they have been chosen I would have also just moved on to the next (with the exception of the first group mentioned above).
to investigate the nature of the *Request* discharge, or out of curiosity for the individuals. Four of them were chosen because they returned to the Marine Society during or after the war; two others were picked for their German names (a purely subjective preference on my own part), one for being the son of a gentleman, Guy Earl of Warwick was picked for his name, and finally there is a group of ten boys from London's East-End parishes, four of them being labelled as thieves, and three of them being brothers.

Taking all three sample sets together the careers of 262 boys have been traced. *Table h.* shows how long these careers could be followed, and whether the boys were finally lost out of sight because they could not be retrieved in the muster books, or because their naval career ended due to death, desertion, or discharge from the Navy. The signing of peace was unfortunately always the definite end of the search, for when the ship was paid off, and the crew was not turned over to another naval vessel, there is no hint for us to find out whether an individual continued to serve on another Navy ship or was entirely discharged. The figures in the column on the very right, showing how many boys could be followed for how long, have to be kept in mind throughout the analysis, so that one can see on how many examples the various conclusions are based.

*Table h. Overview of the 262 Followed Careers.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Lost out of Sight</th>
<th>Service ended</th>
<th>Boys remaining at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the 120 boys who could be traced until the end of their service do not harm the value of the statistics, though one would have liked to be able to compare longer service-

---

18 For boys temporarily lost out of sight (e.g. those rediscovered when returning to the Society) the year when they were lost out of sight for good is counted.

19 26 boys did not appear at their first station.
times, the 116 lost out of sight mar the analysis. They are the servants for whom the muster books gave no or wrong information about their next ship, mainly the ones with the infamous Request discharge. However, there is a relatively high number of servants lost out of sight in their first year of service, which throws a more favourable light on the value of the statistics, since it is very likely that these losses are mainly the result of initial shifting around of boys to fill each ship’s contingent of servants, after which the careers of these boys might have resembled the careers of the others. Appendix two gives a tabular overview over the fates of all boys, as well as separate statistics for each of the three sample sets and for boys who were rated and those who were not. Appendix three lists in alphabetical order each individual servant’s career with the relevant source references. To save space, and to protect the text flow from being constantly interrupted by footnotes, the following analysis refrains from giving explicit references to the appendix or specific muster books, and instead merely mentions the boys’ names as references.

**V.2. Training the New Recruits**

For the vast majority of John’s comrades it was the first time they went to sea; most of them were as young as fourteen, and they had been given no pre-sea education from the Marine Society, apart from the short instructions read out to them at the office. This lack of training was not really in the spirit of the Enlightenment; however, the Society was to make up for this later in the century with Hanway’s plans for a naval school and the establishment of the Society’s training ship. For now, the only essential assessment all boys and men faced was the check of their physical condition. Any further education and training was in the hands of the Royal Navy. The Marine Society wrote in a letter to all commanders and officers that in ‘what concerns the Education of these Boys to make them able Mariners and good men, your own experience and Humanity will suggest to
you what is most proper'. Though the Society admitted that according to 'vulgar opinion' boys on board a naval vessel would certainly receive no moral instruction, it – at least publicly – expressed its faith the officers would guide the boys properly, since it would be in the officers' own interest to ensure the youngsters became reliable seamen and not a nuisance. Jonas Hanway also stated that under a good officer, who treated the boy like his own son, the youngster was taught by a schoolmaster, or an officer who acted as such, about the duties of a Christian, as well as the duties of a seaman. The Society wrote to the officers offering its assistance in representing to the Admiralty any matter of concern with relation to schoolmasters or anyone involved in educating the boys. However, like all statements regarding the treatment of the boys, this sounded in part like a reminder to the sea officers themselves. Also John Fielding's remarks about the boys' training, that the schoolmaster would teach them in navigation, the boatswain in the art of rigging, and the chaplain in the basic principles of Christianity, dealt more in ideals than realities.

Schoolmasters responsible for teaching the youngsters were only occasionally on board, yet Hanway leads us to believe that in their absence others could fulfil their duties, and that the main guard ships held schools for the boys. However, N.A.M. Rodger has remarked that the effects of the schoolmasters' teaching should not be overestimated, and that boys with ambitions to become officers were better advised to

---

20 MSY/A/1, 14/04/1757.
22 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 1st ed.), p. 10.
23 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 4th ed.), p. 10.
24 MSY/A/1, 14/04/1757.
26 The wage tables in Navy regulations quote the schoolmaster's pay only for third, fourth and fifth rate ships (Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty's Service at Sea [1757, 9th ed.], pp. 146-147). See also warrants for schoolmasters in ADM 6/185.
27 Hanway, Letter from a Member (1757, 4th ed.), p. 10.
get their mathematics and navigation in schools on land. Significantly, the Navy Regulations stated that the schoolmaster should not be paid without a certificate from the captain testifying ‘his Diligence in his Business’. Officially the schoolmaster’s task was ‘instructing the Voluntiers in writing, Arithmetick, and the Study of Navigation, and in whatsoever may contribute to render them Artists in that Science’ and ‘likewise to teach the other Youths of the Ship, according to such Orders as he shall receive from the Captain, and with regard to their several Capacities, whether in Reading, Writing, or otherwise’. Teaching was to take place on a daily basis, and idle pupils had to be reported to the commander in order to be corrected. Thus, officially, the Marine Society’s boys should have been taught. Jonas Hanway once stated that he did not expect their boys to be taught navigation, but only ‘the duties of oeconomy’ and how to keep themselves clean. John Fielding even thought that teaching them to read and write was dangerous, as it would only raise the boys’ expectations and make them reluctant to become sailors. Hanway, nevertheless, also felt that ‘if there is any boy of uncommon genius, it is but justice to the Community to give him fair opportunities of improvement, as it is constantly practised in such cases by the French.’

The question about how much education was beneficial for the children of the poor was much debated in the eighteenth century. As already pointed out in Chapter I.4., it was feared that too much education would make the children of the poor unsatisfied with their more servile work tasks and rebellious. However, Chapter I.4. has also underlined that the Marine-Society members recognised that (religious) education was needed to teach the children of the poor ‘due subordination’. These were roughly the two lines of the debate, one considering further

---

30 Hanway, Two Letters: Letter IV (1758), p. 29. Hanway also proposed to call the servants ‘King’s boys’, as he was worried about their low self-esteem and habit of neglecting themselves.
31 John Fielding (1769), pp. 9-10.
education of the lower classes as dangerous, the other as necessary, and, as Ruth McClure underlined, they differed only over the means while the ends were the same, that is the preservation of the hierarchical structure of English society as they knew it and thought it to be the most sound and natural. With regards to the Marine-Society boys' schooling on board we may assume that in theory they were to receive some basic education. Debatable is whether they would have been allowed to attend any further lessons held on deck for boys aiming at an officer's career, and whether they would have been socially accepted by the other boys and the teacher – it would certainly have required a very mature and ambitious character, and a supportive officer.

The main priority for the Navy was that the boys and landmen learned the duties of a seaman as quickly as possible. In peacetime the Navy mostly employed able and ordinary seamen only, which meant that there had been no need for an organised training system, as to a large extent the Navy profited from the education provided by the merchant navy. Training for the landmen in the Navy usually meant taking part in the practical work on board and getting advice from more experienced shipmates. However, with the great number of landmen recruits entering the Navy during the Seven Years War more organised training was needed, which was best begun before the ship left the harbour. The Admiralty therefore laid down additional instructions for training these men, while the ships lay in harbour, in performing the duties of a sailor and in using the great guns, some also in the use of small arms. Whether for landman or fisherman, this was the first reminder that sailing in the Navy also meant preparing for a man-to-man combat, just like soldiers. In 1758, the Admiralty felt the need to remind its captains to ensure that the training was carried out. All ships lying together at anchor were to perform their

---

35 See the 'Additional Regulations' (1756), in Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty's Service at Sea (1757, 9th ed.), pp. 191-232.
36 ADM 2/81, 30/08/1758, pp 62-63.
exercises simultaneously and captains were to encourage a competitive spirit to outdo the other ships. For the boys similar training orders were introduced: though John and his comrades were not yet trained to use small arms or the guns (they merely fetched the powder), they too had to practice sail handling while in harbour, also simultaneously with the boys on board other ships in order to create a competition among them to outdo each other. The training orders regarding the boys also reminded captains once more of the servants' main function, that is to act as a 'nursery for seamen'. The following two sections will investigate what it meant to be in this nursery. Apart from learning to become sailors, there were some specific tasks John and his fellow ships' boys were likely to be asked to perform: depending on the closeness to their master there were of course still domestic-servant duties for the officers, such as cleaning the cabin or fetching water; additionally there were various services for the whole ship to be done, that is anything from fetching food, shaving the men's heads, to the unpleasant task of emptying the crew's excreta. Most famously, during combat situations the boys had to get the powder from below deck, where it was kept for safety reasons, and run with it to the guns they were assigned to. Here, the Navy made the most of the boys' small stature and quickness. Olaudah Equiano left us a vivid description of his experiences as a powder boy during a battle with the French fleet at Gibraltar in 1759:

My station during the engagement was on the middle deck, where I was quartered with another boy, to bring powder to the aftermost gun; and here I was a witness of the dreadful fate of many of my companions, who, in the twinkling of an eye, were dashed in pieces, and launched into eternity. Happily I escaped unhurt, though the shot and splinters flew thick about me during the whole fight. (...) We were also, from our employment, very much exposed to the enemy's shots; for we had to go through nearly the whole length of the ship to bring the powder. I expected, therefore, every minute to be my last, especially when I saw our men fall so thick about me; but, wishing to guard as much

---

37 In Smollet's Roderick Random (1748, 1999) one gets the feeling that sometimes a boy might have been responsible for serving a particular mess (on p. 171 the surgeon's servant gives testimony, as well as the 'boy of our [the surgeons'] mess').
38 Equiano was able to earn some extra money by shaving the men (Equiano [1791,1995], p. 83).
39 The boys' good eyesight may have been another useful physical advantage.
40 Equiano (1791,1995), pp. 76-77.
against the dangers as possible, at first I thought it would be safest not to go for the powder till the Frenchmen had fired their broadside; and then, while they were charging, I could go and come with my powder. But immediately afterwards I thought this caution was fruitless; and, cheering myself with the reflection that there was a time allotted for me to die as well as to be born, I instantly cast off all fear or thought whatever of death, and went through the whole of my duty with alacrity; pleasing myself with the hope, if I survived the battle, of relating it and the dangers I had escaped to the Miss Guerns, and others, when I should return to London.

V.3. Being a Servant in the Royal Navy

The starting point of the ‘naval career’ of a Marine-Society boy was being a servant to a captain, other officer, or even admiral. Of the three sample sets 119 boys entered at first as a captain’s servant, 37 as an admiral’s servant, ten as a boatswain’s servant, nine as a lieutenant’s servant, eight as a carpenter’s servant, eight as a gunner’s servant, five as a master’s servant, 41 six as a surgeon’s servant, four as a cook’s servant, three as a purser’s servant, two as a chaplain’s servant, and 22 did not have a master immediately, but were kept as supernumerary boys until they were distributed as servants on board other ships. Few boys stuck long to their stations, though; the vast majority would change their master or their ship within a year or two. Often changing the officer also meant changing from one kind of officer to another, e.g. from a carpenter to a cook. Hence, it appears that apart from sailing the boys were not learning any specialist skills, which they would later be able to build upon at sea or on land, for if they had done so, each officer would have certainly taken care to hold on to a boy whom he had trained, or at least looked for a boy that had been servant to someone of the same rank. When studying the careers of young gentlemen historians have frequently discovered that they were often mustered with no apparent logic, going from servant to midshipman, to able seaman and back to servant, or whatever appeared convenient, while in reality they were

41 When referring to a servant’s ‘master’ in course of this analysis usually any captain, other officer, or admiral is meant; when talking about the master as an officer’s rank this will be made clear by wordings such as ‘the master’ rather than ‘his master’.
steadily educated to become officers. Hence also the frequent changes of Marine-Society boys may have been primarily the result of officers trying to fill their servant quota. However, since the Marine-Society boys not only changed masters frequently, but also went to a different ship with no officer accompanying them, we can assume that they did not have a special personal relationship to any officer on board. Admittedly, the quality of a servant is occasionally a curious one indeed, and one has to be careful when making interpretations. In desperation to fill a vacant position captains, eager not to lose the pay bonus, sometimes mustered prisoners, or survivors of shipwrecked merchantmen they had picked up, as servants, or young men who could have been rated, whereby the original idea of the servant as a trainee-sailor was disregarded. Some went as far as inventing a servant in the muster books, which had the advantage that no allowance had to be paid, and a son or relative studying navigation on land could be provided with a falsified history of seafaring experience. The celebrated James Cook was among the culprits of such fraud, and ironically also Lord Pawlett, who has been so influential in turning John Fielding's boy recruitment into a regular scheme, was once caught mustering his own son and the first lieutenant's without the boys being on board. The Society, aware of this misuse, wished some official in the homeports would check if all those servants, for whom the officers asked to be paid their wages, were really there.

Linking the trainee-sailor at least in theory to an individual officer, rather than to the Navy or ship as a whole, gave the Navy's nursery a very personal character, similar to

---

43 See for example the French sailors captured at Quiberon Bay being mustered as servants on board the Royal George; or the Swiftsure in 1760 (ADM 36/6702, pp. 19-20) where all servants have French names; and the Minerva, which in 1762 rescued sailors from a foundered merchant ship and entered some of them as servants (ADM 36/6127, p. 187, no. 1017 & p. 195, no. 105).
44 See Beaglehole (1974), p. 141 (my thanks go to Glyn Williams for this reference).
46 Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), p. 10 (fn.), (2nd ed., 1775, pp. 9-10). Officially, 22 George II, c. 33, s. II, par. 33 (1749) threatened any officer signing a false muster with dismissal from the Navy.
what was common in eighteenth-century apprenticeships. Like most masters in an apprentice-ship, the officer had to provide the boy with clothing (and bedding), for which purpose he had to allow each servant around 40s a year,\(^1\) that is the same sum a master in the merchant navy usually had to spend for his apprentice, though there, as already said, many parish apprentices received a lot less or even nothing. Accommodation and food (the same rations as a man),\(^2\) however, were of course not provided by the master but by the Navy. The officer received for each servant the monthly wage of an ordinary seaman. That the officer received the boy's wage, as it is often phrased, is slightly misleading, since that ordinary seaman's wage had nothing to do with rewarding the boy's work and was solely for the purpose of encouraging officers to recruit boys and train them. As the Marine-Society boys had just received a free new set of clothing and bedding, at least the Society seems to have thought that any unused funds of their yearly allowance would be paid in cash to the servants.\(^3\) However, Daniel Baugh writes that officers always tried to pay as little as possible to the pauper boys,\(^4\) and with the boys frequently changing masters before the year was over it must have been difficult to ensure that the officers shared between them the payment of a steady yearly allowance. Yet, despite Daniel Baugh's fear of the officers' greed, most of the sampled servants soon received new clothing (worth between 1s and 15s, one even £1 8s), and new bedding (10s to 11s), sometimes already in their first year. On some ships a whole group of servants were newly furnished all at once, as for example the boys on board the *Neptune*, the *Swiftsure*, the *Nightingale*, and the *Ramilies*, suggesting that the decision

\(^1\) Most Marine-Society sources and newspapers quote 40s, yet occasionally the allowance is also quoted as being 50s (see for example *Gentleman's Magazine*, April 1757, p. 149). In *Letter from a Member* (1757, 3\(^{rd}\) ed.), p. 10, Hanway gives the impression that the allowance was not fixed, but that it was usually no more than 40s to 50s.

\(^2\) MSY/A/1, 26/06/1760.

\(^3\) See Baugh (1965), p. 97.
to obtain new equipment depended to a large degree on the captain, and what he considered necessary, rather than the servant himself; indeed the discussion in chapter three, of the powers of captains to order men to obtain new clothing, would suggest that this was so. Buying tobacco, on the other hand, was something almost no servant did or was allowed to do. Only three of all the sampled boys – John Carpenter, William Williams, and John Bunyon, all aged fifteen to sixteen – obtained tobacco, while the rest could have smoked or chewed only when invited by their master or one of their shipmates. Also none of the sampled servants had any deductions for medicines to cure venereal diseases, though three of them needed treatment after they had been rated (a painful reminder for Nicholas [O’]Brian, John Goodman, and Thomas Ham of the Marine Society’s instructions they had to listen to years earlier). Once rated most boys immediately obtained a large amount of new clothing, whether voluntary or not is not clear. In all, John’s pay as a servant in the Royal Navy compared favourably to what he could have expected in any apprenticeship at sea or on land – and that even disregarding the possibility of gaining prize money and the shorter time of servitude.

The main difference between a servant and an apprentice on land or at sea, however, was the training and supervision. As said above, in theory the naval servant had the same personal dimension incorporated in his education, the link to one particular person – a system in which the quality of the instruction depended largely on the specific relation between the individual master and boy. However, it is questionable how much, if at all, servants received individual instruction from their officers. Supervising the boy was an additional duty for the officer, and since he received his wage bonus anyway as long as the servant was on board, regardless of how much progress the boy made, there was no financial incentive for him to supervise the boy. The Navy’s ‘nursery’ lacked a control

---

51 Equiano, however, appears to have been allowed to buy tobacco as a boy (Equiano [1791, 1995], p. 3).
mechanism which could assess or reward the training efforts that each captain or officer undertook, and it had to rely on the officers' or captains' general interest in having a well working crew. The Marine Society hoped that a good officer would take care that his servant was properly guided, because he knew that otherwise the youth could become a nuisance, or he might even lose him and thus also the wage bonus. Yet, in reality this pressure was not really there, for the officer did not profit as directly from his servant's progress as a master on land could profit from his apprentice or his servant, and a naval servant could also very easily be replaced, since he was not personally bound with his master through anything like an apprenticeship indenture. Thus, unless there was some other incentive to instruct the boy, such as the servant being a relative, a son of a friend, or of wealthy parents that offered an additional reward, we can expect that the typical Marine-Society boy would receive his training and supervision by working and living with the crew rather than through personal instruction by his master. With regards to the captain, with his whole bunch of servants, this was perhaps also the only practical way, as he certainly would not have had the time to monitor the progress of all of them. Furthermore, we are after all still within the relative immobility of eighteenth-century society and its ideas about appropriate education: John, the Marine-Society boy, was expected to become an able seaman, not an officer, and hence it was more logical to let him learn among the crew, rather than to allow him to learn close to the captain or an officer. Nevertheless, there was still space for the personal dimension, and theoretically there was the possibility that an officer felt a particular responsibility or sympathy for his Marine-Society boy. Lieutenant John Ides of the Assistance, for example, wrote to the Marine Society in 1762 that if the next boy it sent to him would be as good as the one he

52 See for example Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account (1772), p. 8 (fn.). For proper naval apprentices to warrant officers see chapter six. For cases of admirals with apprentices see also N.A.M. Rodger (1986, 1988), p. 27.
had before, he would turn the lad into an officer. Having a close contact to at least one officer was essential for reaching a higher career, which is why for most of the Society’s boys, who never stayed for long with one master, it would have been difficult. The Navy was an organisation divided into many separate divisions, that is ships. Whoever wanted to make a career in this organisation, had to stick close to those at the top of these divisions, choose a patron, and follow him through the ranks of the organisation.

One could expect that perhaps the contact between the officers other than captains and their Marine-Society servants was closer than between a captain and his, given that they only had one or two servants, which meant that the boy also had to perform many personal services for the officer. Warrant officers, such as carpenters or surgeons, could certainly benefit from a boy who had learned some of their specialist skills. Remarkably, in chapter three it was already noticed that a comparison of the sampled boys’ entry-dates in the Marine Society’s registers with those entry-dates of the Navy’s muster books shows that particularly servants to the other officers were the ones that had an earlier entry date, and can therefore be suspected of having entered independently of the Marine Society. Perhaps the other officers preferred to recruit their servants themselves; captains might have done the same with those particular servants that worked close to them, while being less worried about the character of the rest. However, the career analysis shows that nevertheless the servants to other officers did not stay significantly longer with their first master than the captains’ servants did.

There were some exceptions among the Marine-Society boys, though, who stayed for a long time with the same master. When William Thornton, for example, went sick on shore, his master, the surgeon, waited for him for a month and took him on again on his return, despite the fact that William obviously had not fully recovered and was still too ill

53 MSY/A/2, 04/11/1762.
for service for the first three weeks. George Flowers and Martin Hoffman were surgeons' servants for three to four, if not even more years. However, both boys had entered the Navy before they were clothed by the Society, Martin at least two months earlier, suggesting that they had originally enlisted independently. Martin’s father was a silver chaser in the Strand, likely to have been better off than most other fathers, while George was from Gravesend and had, unlike all the other boys who were entered in the Society’s registers at the same time, no information about his parents recorded – perhaps a hint that he had applied by letter and had family links to the Navy. Guy Earl of Warwick (probably a bogus name for a non-British boy) followed his captain over three years and four ships, and even after being absent for two months, probably sick in Plymouth, Guy rejoined his captain on his old ship.\textsuperscript{54}

The majority of the Society’s boys, however, were not as closely attached to their masters, and hence they found themselves primarily in the company of the Royal Navy’s seamen – a company many contemporaries considered not the most healthy for young boys. Remarkably, the most depressing description of how the boys fared on board in the Seven Years War is preserved within the Society's own publications: a reprinted anonymous letter written to the \textit{Grand Magazine} of 1760, complaining about neglect and misbehaviour of the boys, to which the Society added its response.\textsuperscript{55} In the letter the author claims that a gentleman of the Navy had told him that the officers paid no attention at all to their boys, nor did anyone else on board. They were allegedly known under the name of \textit{Scape Gallowses}, and the first things they learned were blasphemy, chewing tobacco, and gaming. And from there they proceeded to drinking and ‘talking bawdy’, thus becoming within a short period the vilest part of the entire crew.

\textsuperscript{54} One explanation for this may be that Guy was the captain’s slave.
\textsuperscript{55} See British Library’s edition of Hanway, \textit{Account of the Marine Society} (1759), pp. 145ff. James S. Taylor regards the fact that the Society reprinted the letter as a good indication for its grown confidence (Taylor [1985], p. 72).
Furthermore, they avoided any work, usually under pretence of having to do some task for their masters, and instead hung around together in the hold, the round tops, or the booms. The letter writer concluded that the youths would be much better off on board colliers or merchant ships, where smaller crews and a higher workload would guarantee that they were better supervised and employed than in the large warships. The Society felt the letter was grossly exaggerating, and it surely must have been, for otherwise neither Navy nor Marine Society would have continued the scheme then and in the future. The Society replied that according to its experience the officers usually took care of their boys, although it also acknowledged that there were some officers who neglected their supervisory role. In all, the Society was convinced that the boys were still better taken care of than at any time during their prior life on land, and that misbehaviour, such as blasphemy, was surely much more toughly punished on board than on land, while obtaining tobacco and alcohol on board would have been very difficult for them (as supported by the study of the muster books). And the Society also added: 'That lively boys on board ships, should sometimes be saucy, is very easy to be conceived; and it often happens that the same vivacity, under some restrictions, is one reason of their making the best seamen in the world.' – one Admiral the Society spoke to allegedly laughed when he read the complaint that the boys hung out in the round top, and told the Society that there would surely not be a better place for them to gather if they were to become good seamen. Of course, it is easily conceivable that some Marine-Society boys were ill-disciplined, after all, unruly behaviour, a bold character, and lack of paternal supervision or affection was what had brought many of them to the Society in the first place. One suspects that the Society’s advertisements warning local authorities to send only volunteers were not just a reaction to wrong-doing by these authorities, but also to

56 See also 22 George II, c. 33, s. II, par. 2 (against profane swearing).
Navy complaints about more serious cases of undisciplined boys and deserters. However, the stories of pranks and misbehaviour committed by the boys on board are a part of sailors' memoirs of all times;\(^{37}\) in fact they are part of almost any published memoirs of a 'working-class' life on land. Perhaps the anonymous letter-writer had assumed that the boys' lives in the limited space of a warship were much more strictly controlled, a misapprehension he presumably shared with many magistrates who sent boys to the Navy.

What the anonymous letter to the *Grande Magazine* did not mention was any possible misbehaviour from the crew, or officers, towards the boys themselves, other than that the boys were being neglected – perhaps a topic the author's contact person in the Navy was less likely to talk about. Jonas Hanway expressed the belief that a good officer would always take care that his boy was properly treated by the crew.\(^{58}\)

Apparently, to supervise and protect the boys better they were, in larger ships, often berthed in the gun room with the gunner, who was encouraged to take his wife with him to sea, who then could take care of the boys.\(^{59}\) Surely, despite their fine new seamen's clothes, many of the boys, and even more so the landmen, would have had to endure the sailors' beloved and more or less light-hearted rituals of bullying, such as being ducked into water (or even the ocean) when they passed the equator for the first time.\(^{60}\) Bullying would always remain a problem on board, when so many men worked and lived for such a long time in such a small space, lacking any privacy and with boredom constantly gnawing at the men's nerves. Hierarchies had to be fought out and maintained; and

---

\(^{37}\) See for example *Ramblin' Jack: The Journal of Captain John Cremer, 1700 1774* (1936), pp. 45-48. Cremer's 'gang', however, was made up of officers' sons. Olaudah Equiano remembers that he and the other boys on board 'were always together, and a great part of our time was spent in play' (*Equiano [1791, 1995], p. 65*).

\(^{58}\) Hanway, *Letter from a Member* (1757, 1st ed.), p. 10.


claustrophobia, unused energies and frustrations had to find their release – hence the Admiralty's instructions to keep the men constantly at work.

One of the few recorded actions in the Society's minutes that seem to hint at a case of mistreatment of a servant might be the collection organised by members in 1757 in support of a boy who had apparently been 'accidentally disabled by a blow from a seaman'. The fact that the boys' ability to testify at a court martial was sometimes disputed made them actually more vulnerable to bullying than the landmen. When, for example, the black boy Alexander Nairn was thrown overboard there was some doubt in the Admiralty whether the two prime witnesses, two boys aged around thirteen, could be allowed to testify against the man charged with killing Alexander. Perhaps this case, and the Society's collection, are two extreme examples, preserved in the Admiralty's and the Society's records for being exactly that – cases to which one could find equivalent stories in all navies and armies at all times, as well as equivalent stories among impoverished boys living in London. Unfortunately, as always it is difficult to assess how much happened that remained unrecorded; the Society's records certainly had a habit of avoiding controversial issues. In March 1758, however, the minutes mention a complaint of several boys being 'used ill' on board the Active, and one of the boys was ordered to attend the committee. Yet that is all the minutes record about the case, and nothing is ever mentioned of it again. Also the Active's captain, Richard Hughes, wrote nothing about the affair in his log or letters to the Admiralty.

A classic example of the difficulties of assessing the extent of bullying by crewmembers, or by officers, is the question whether it included forcing boys to sexual

61 MSY/A/1, 27/10/1757. According to Equano he and the other boys were occasionally encouraged to fight each other, for the entertainment of the gentlemen, who afterwards paid the boys between five and nine shillings as a reward (Equiano [1791, 1995], pp.65-66).
62 ADM 2/1056, 24/10/1760.
63 MSY/A/1, 16/03/1758, and MSY/H/2, no. 2226 (Arpin).
64 ADM 51/3748, ADM 1/1893, Richard Hughes.
acts. Homosexuality in the eighteenth-century Navy, or – as the sexual act was referred to by the Navy act that categorised it as a capital offence\textsuperscript{65} – ‘the unnatural and detestable Sin of Buggery or Sodomy with Man or Beast’, is in general a controversial topic. The controversy about its extent arises as the relatively low number of evidences for it can be taken as a proof that the sailor’s world was very heterosexual, or as a sign of a general cover-up (in view of the harsh punishment) and Navy personnel turning a blind eye to homosexuality, the latter under the assumption that in such an isolated, male-only world the men’s sexual frustrations would more frequently tempt some to approach other men or boys, and furthermore that homosexual men would chose the Navy specifically for the close male-only environment (though the work environment hardly tolerated any effeminate character traits).\textsuperscript{66} Possible indicators, such as the sailors’ overstated machismo, hedonism or use of homophobic swearwords, can also be used for differing interpretations. The debate remains at a standstill, and whenever the topic is discussed during (or after) historical seminars one wonders, as so often with academic debates, how much the debaters’ interpretations are influenced by the source material itself, and how much by their personal (conservative or critical/progressive) attitudes.

When homosexuality does surface in the sources it is indeed very often the case of a men having (forced) sexual contact with a boy, though naturally cases of sexual contact between two consenting men are less likely to surface, as there is no party with an interest in making it public. Throughout the Seven Years War there were only nine courts martial in which people were tried for sodomy, and six out of these involved

\textsuperscript{65} Phrase in 22 George II, c. 33, s. II, par. 29 (1749).
\textsuperscript{66} Rodger (1986, 1988), pp. 80-81, for example, describes homosexuality as having been an insignificant issue, while Gilbert (1976) suggests that officers often looked away when presented with evidence of sodomy or preferred to punish the men involved with the lash rather than a court martial. Lavery (1998), p. 372, argues that since homosexuality was so severely punished it is impossible to write a full history of it (also acknowledged by Gilbert [1976], p. 72), as homosexual sailors would have had to be very discreet. Many older naval history books have no discussion at all of the subject.
servants. Some cases relate to one incident only, others to an abuse over a longer period. In 1762, for example, Richard Chilton was hanged for forcing William Hoskins/Hodgkins, a fatherless London boy, who had been brought to the Marine Society by his mother three years earlier and who had become one of the fife boys, to commit sodomy. For a boy like William it was crucial to prove that he was subjected to physical or verbal threats and did not consent, since no difference was made between a man raping another and two consenting men having sex: both were capital offences. Thus Thomas Finley, for example, embarked in 1761 on what was probably the shortest of all seafaring careers of Marine-Society boys: Thomas, the son of a London butcher, had been equipped by the Society on 11 June 1761 and was sent to the Ocean. Only three weeks later he was court-martialed for committing sodomy with a seaman. Thomas not only admitted that he had consented, but also that before entering the Navy he was accustomed to 'run about the Bird-Cage Walk in St. James Park', suggesting that he had had regular sexual contacts with men, or possibly had even been involved in prostitution, though he did not elaborate his statement further. Thomas’ father did what he could for his boy, testifying that he had always been a good son to him and his wife, that he used to help in the business, but that he had been inclined to go to sea and that one Mr. Barratt had enticed him to join the Navy. It was all in vain, there was no mercy for the fifteen-year old: he was hanged together with the seaman. Thomas’ free admission that he consented remains remarkable: perhaps he was unaware of the consequences. His case illustrates that boys did not always have to be forced or

---

67 See ADM 12/26 for an overview, and ADM 1/5295-5302 for more detailed courts martial records of the time (see also Rodger [1986, 1988], pp. 80-81, eleven courts martial).  
68 ADM 12/26, pp. 33-35; MSY/H/2, no. 4153.  
69 Also Findall.  
70 MSY/H/2, no. 4334.  
71 ADM 1/5300, 02/07/1761 (Newton/Finlay).  
72 The Bird Cage Walk at St. James Park, leading from Whitehall to Buckingham Palace, appears to have been one of the main meeting places for homosexual men (see Rictor Norton [2000 & 2002]).
threatened to tolerate a man’s approach; naivety, susceptibility to bribes, or genuine affection could also have been the case, as exemplified by other recorded courts martial, in which seamen tried to lure boys with money and presents, and telling them that there was nothing wrong in what they were doing.

Young boys were certainly easy targets, likely to be silenced by threats, and with a difficult stand as witnesses at a court martial. The Society’s boys were particularly vulnerable, since they had no advocate on board, due to their frequent changes of ships and masters, and no influential parents in support. The same day that saw the court martial of Thomas Finley, another trial was held in which the Marine-Society boy William Layer, a fatherless boy from Pettycoat Lane aged around fifteen, together with two other boys accused a seaman of the Crown Storeship of having attempted sodomy with them. Since William was illiterate and did not know the meaning of taking an oath, the court ruled that he was not able to give evidence. The seaman was finally acquitted, as was, in 1759, William Tremuen of the Thetis, a servant himself, who had been accused by the Marine-Society boy George Veaux of attempting sodomy with him, but the court martial thought George’s statement did not appear credible, and none of the other crewmembers had seen anything. According to Arthur Gilbert, boys owed their difficult status at a court martial partly to their reputation of frequently trying to rid themselves of disliked shipmates by wrongly accusing them of attempted buggery. Gilbert delivers examples of crewmembers discrediting the trustworthiness of boys that made such charges, and points out that such buggery claims by boys usually had only other boys as prime witnesses. The latter, however, one could easily imagine as resulting from the fact

73 See for example ADM 1/5300, 02/07/1761 (Berry), for a boy initially not making any complaints to the captain out of fear that he would be flogged.
74 Also Lyrer.
75 ADM 1/5300, 02/07/1761 (Berry).
76 ADM 12/26, pp. 16-21, MSY/H/1, no. 1183.
77 Gilbert (1976), pp. 75ff.
that the boys berthed together, or even more because they stood by each other against bullying, while the rest of the crew might have been reluctant to send one of their company to the gallows, regardless of whether they thought him guilty or not. Significantly, also in the above-mentioned case against the sailor throwing the black boy overboard no man but two boys were the main witnesses. Courts martial demanded detailed evidence for a conviction: to prove sodomy usually needed a witness testifying to penetration and emission; hence only two of the nine courts martial ended with the accused being hanged, while in three the defendants received between 300 and 1,000 lashes for 'uncleanness or other scandalous actions', and in the four others the accused were acquitted. If the defendant got away alive, then the boy certainly had a problem on hand. Initiating a court martial could potentially not only turn the accused, but the whole crew against the new boy. Thus, however morally corrupted some Marine-Society boys might have been, most of them would have been very careful with making unfounded accusations against a sailor motivated solely by a dislike for the accused. And even if it is true that boys often made such claims, then the low number of courts martial only shows that in such cases captains probably preferred to preserve their ship's reputation. Requesting the boy's discharge to another ship, and punishing the alleged offender with the cat of nine tails, would have certainly been a less troublesome solution than a court martial, in particular when in the war against France every able seaman was needed. Hence one may expect that sexual abuse of boys was not that rare as the few recorded cases suggest. Regarding homosexuality in general it has to be noted that though the fact that it was punished with hanging indicates how detestable and subversive it appeared to the legislature, this at the same time made sure that sailors or officers would have been very reluctant to denounce otherwise trusted and well-integrated shipmates.

Having thus analysed the potential difficulties John and his comrades were facing, as well as creating, during their integration on board, we can now move on to investigate
whether they smoothly progressed to proper seamen despite these problems and in spite of all the other dangers that awaited them at sea.

V.4. Desertion, Death, and Promotion

How well did John and his fellow ships' boys perform in their new profession, and what dangers and what rewards lay ahead of them? The previous section has already shown that there were some concerns about John's discipline. Unfortunately, it is impossible to say how many boys were among those discharged due to Request and lost from the sample who were indeed entirely discharged from the Navy – the Navy regulations forbade this, yet it nevertheless happened. Another obvious indication for a failed integration would be a desertion, and chapter four has described how desertions of Marine-Society boys were seriously harming the Society's work and led them to select their recruits more carefully. Surprisingly, despite all the mentioned troubles none of the sampled boys was recorded as a deserter in the muster books, that is as long as they were merely servants. Even more, in general, looking through the Navy's muster books one hardly notices any servant ever being recorded among the deserters. The most likely explanations for this discrepancy are that, firstly, most of those deserters the Navy complained about ran before they even reached their first ship, or ran when changing ships, and therefore never appeared in the muster books, and, secondly, that the muster books once again neglected servants. A boy who had never appeared on board his first ship was of no consequence for anyone's pay, he was also not a proper deserter, for he had not yet entered the books, and thus it seems plausible that the muster books

---

78 See Appendix II.5.
79 The only two I came across were John Agnus (perhaps a Marine-Society boy, MSY/H/1, no. 749) and Thomas Wood, who both ran at Spithead from the guard ship Royal Ann (ADM 36/4989, p. 202, nos. 13, 16). When the book keeping regarding servants improved towards the end of the century, one also finds more cases of boys deserting being recorded.
80 In the samples boys running when changing ships would hide in the statistics among those 'Lost out of Sight'.
disregarded him, possibly not even knowing his identity. 27 of all sampled boys did not turn up at their first ship; however, they include a group of ten boys from London’s most deprived parishes, who had been chosen for the third sample of individual careers out of interest for the fact that four of them had been labelled as thieves. It is very likely that these ten, and also the other seventeen, had run away before reaching their ships. However, there is also the possibility, as happened with other boys, that they had been diverted to another ship, or that the wrong ship had been recorded,\(^1\) or even that the ship had left before the attendant and the boys had reached the harbour.\(^2\) A boy running away when changing his ship was, though a proper deserter, also of no consequence for anyone’s pay on board his new ship. For a man the books were prepared to record such desertions: when, for example, the gunner destined to serve on board the Firedrake never appeared this was recorded in the muster list of the Firedrake, while nothing is mentioned about what happened to the two Marine-Society boys William Ascon (Axter) and Francis Talbot he had taken with him from his previous ship.

To test whether the muster books perhaps neglected deserting servants a check was made of the books of those four ships which were specifically named (or their captain) in the Society’s minutes in connection with complaints about deserters: the Neptune and the Princess Royal in 1757; the St. George in 1758; and the Minerva in 1762.\(^3\) In the Neptune’s muster books there is no record of runners; just one boy of the group that was meant to go there did not appear on board. Furthermore, all boys also arrived safely on

---

\(^1\) For boys appearing on a different ship to the one recorded in the Marine Society’s registers see for example William Betts (MSY/H/1, no. 2083), recorded as being sent to the Princess Amelia, but never arriving there; instead he appeared on board the Nassau (ADM 36/6231, p. 223, no. 1108). Also John Udal (MSY/H/2, no 4160), recorded as going to the Essex, never arrived there (ADM 36/5470), but reappeared at the end of the war at the Marine Society after apparently serving three years in the Navy (MSY/H/3, no. 274).

\(^2\) For boys missing the ship see MSY/A/1, 25/09/1760.

\(^3\) MSY/A/1, 30/06/1757 (Neptune), 15/09/1757 (Princess Royal), 21/09/1758 (St. George), 16/02/1762 (Captain Benjamin Marlow, Minerva).
their following station.\textsuperscript{84} The \textit{Minerva}, whose captain had complained about six boys having run away, also records no deserting servants in the musters,\textsuperscript{85} and the \textit{St. George}'s muster books make no mention of any deserting boy either, only discharges.\textsuperscript{86} What is interesting about the \textit{St. George} is that Captain Gayton's letter to the Society sounded as if the deserters he was complaining about had been boys that were already serving on board, and not new boys that were supposed to come to his ship and never arrived. Only the \textit{Princess Royal} recorded two boys as having deserted and six as having never appeared on board.\textsuperscript{87} However, these eight absent servants from the \textit{Princess Royal} merely appear on a separate list for boys from the Marine Society; they do not reappear in the following muster lists, and remarkably they do not even appear on the separate list for run men. Thus, there are signs that again the muster books neglected the servants, and failed to record their desertions, or did so in separate documents which are not preserved. This, however, appears mainly plausible for boys who never reached their first ship, perhaps also for those who never reached their following station, while any servant deserting while on board could hardly have been ignored in the books – despite the example of the \textit{St. George}, where this still might have happened. In general it appears therefore that once on board the boys hardly ever deserted, and the example of the \textit{St. George}, where the boys were put on board guardships while she was in the dock, also shows that if servants did not appear trustworthy their freedom of movement could be greatly limited. When the officer went on leave, the boys usually stayed on board, or were lent to other ships. Additionally, their young age would surely have made them very hesitant to run away in a harbour far away from home.

\textsuperscript{84} ADM 36/6217, pp. 57-58; ADM 1/1759, Michael Everitt, 02/06/1757; ADM 36/6944, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{85} ADM 36/6127; as usual also no mention in the captain's letters (ADM 1 2114, Benjamin Marlow).
\textsuperscript{86} ADM 36/5733; ADM 36/5734.
\textsuperscript{87} ADM 36/6536, p. 192. Five of them were only to receive their clothing once they had reached the tender, suggesting that they were perhaps rather unwilling recruits or suspected to turn thieves (see MSY/H/1, nos. 1513, 1514, 1516, 1517, 1518).
Once the Marine-Society boys had become landmen or ordinary/able seamen, cases of deserters start showing up.\textsuperscript{88} Of the 30 sample-boys who were promoted,\textsuperscript{89} six deserted. Here it is important to underline that the majority of those 30 could not be followed beyond their second year of service, mainly because the war ended and they were paid off.\textsuperscript{90} Two of the deserters ran in their first year as rated sailors, one in his second, and three in their fourth year. Hence out of a total of only nine recruits who could be followed for longer than three years of service as men, three deserted (independently of each other), which is, though low in absolute numbers, a remarkably high proportion. Before they deserted they bought mainly clothes, but also tobacco, for considerable sums – having high deductions due certainly increased the temptation to desert, as the clothes partly made up for the loss of wages. Thus the Admiralty’s strictness when it came to giving out clothes, criticised in chapter three, appears more understandable. The reasons why all these Marine-Society lads deserted only after being rated can only be guessed. Maybe they had become disillusioned, realised that their youthful expectations of naval life had nothing to do with its bleak and dangerous reality, or perhaps desertion had always been on their minds and only now were they entrusted with more personal freedom, which gave them the opportunity to desert. Perhaps now they felt mature enough to dare to escape. However, they had not only matured, they had also learned a profession that was much in demand at the time and could earn them much more money in the private sector – and if they themselves did not realise their value, then a crimp in the harbour might have let them know. Hence the high ratio of desertions does not necessarily indicate that the recruits had been generally unhappy about having ended up in the Navy, purely financial reasons could have led them to desert. The roles of

\textsuperscript{88} See Appendix II.6.
\textsuperscript{89} 29 if we leave out the afterwards disrated.
\textsuperscript{90} See Appendix II.7.
Royal Navy and merchant navy had thus been turned around: now the Royal Navy was left to contemplate the fact that it had nursed and trained these boys (and landmen), while the merchants and privateers harvested the fruits. The Navy could only hope that its press gangs could reverse this flow of skilled workers once more.

Four of the six deserters of the samples ran away at foreign shores; two ran together while visiting the North American colonies. The colonies, and Charleston in particular, were popular places for deserters, since there was always a demand for sailors, but also because many of the ships were destined to go back to England.\textsuperscript{91} But the colonies were also the relief channel for many restless and bold young men, who found life in England too restrictive or bleak. The two deserters, Nicholas O’Brien and John Goodman, had entered the Navy via the Marine Society together; they had served as captain’s servants on board the \textit{Union} and the \textit{Neptune}, and as able seamen on board the \textit{Zeyphir}, which brought them to North America. The month they ran saw many men deserting the ship; the crew had been very sick in the summer with fevers and fluxes, and O’Brien, Goodman and others had also outstanding wage-deductions for using medication against venereal diseases.\textsuperscript{92} Sick ships not only made desertions easier, because the ships had to stop more often at harbours to discharge ill men; they also scared healthy men, encouraging them to desert, and to overcome the fear of being punished for desertion – after all, according to Dr. Lind, diseases were the greatest danger seamen were facing. This takes us straight to the discussion of the second and saddest possible ending of a Marine-Society boy’s career as a naval servant, that is his death.

Death was a regular shipmate of naval sailors in times of war. Chapter three has suggested that on most occasions death did not come in the form of a cannonball fired by

\textsuperscript{91} See for example Rediker (1987, 1998), p. 56.

\textsuperscript{92} See also ADM 1/1834, William Greenwood, 23/08/1758. The Captain’s and Lieutenant’s logs do not give any further information.
an enemy ship; he did not storm on board with cutlass and pistol; instead he crawled silently on board in the form of a disease, taking his victims slowly and unspectacularly. The lives of John and his fellow Marine-Society boys were indeed in great danger: on the basis of the systematic sample, being the most representative of the three sets, one can conclude that at least 35% of the boys either died, became sick and never returned to their ship, were shipwrecked, or were captured by the enemy. Even worse, this statistic plays down the dangers, since half of the sampled boys had been lost out of sight, and most of them even very early in their career, which is why theoretically the percentage of Marine-Society boys having died, become unserviceable, wrecked, or captured could have been as high as 85%. Based on all three samples together, the boys’ chances for surviving just one service-year at sea unharmed were on average between 69% (the unlikely worst-case scenario) and no more than 85%.

In absolute numbers, all three sample sets together feature 17 boys who were recorded dead (four of them after being rated); 15 who were discharged due to sickness and did not return to their old ship (three of them after being rated); one who was discharged for being unserviceable; up to 28 who were shipwrecked; and three who were probably captured by the French. Based on the samples, sickness and shipwrecking appear to have been the greatest dangers to the boys. The exact fate of those shipwrecked, as well as those captured, is left open in the study, not only in consideration of the extra research time, but also because of the problem that, with the

---

93 The second, yearly sample set would play down the dangers, as the set relatively over-represents boys who enlisted towards the end of the war and were soon paid off again.  
94 See Appendix II.2. (plus first group of the second, yearly sample). Stephen Gradish writes of only 1,512 deaths of seamen and marines through combat and accidents during the Seven Years War, compared to between 60,000 and 90,000 deaths and discharges due to sickness (Gradish [1980], p. 120).  
95 Likelihood of occurrences such as death, shipwreck etc. are (for all three sample sets together) 10-39% in the first year, 7-21% in the second, 21-37% in the third, and 22-39% in the fourth.  
96 Admittedly, sampling the boys in clusters of shipmates does make the sample very sensitive (in both directions) towards ship losses, though the boys quickly changed their stations and spread out to different ships.
muster books being lost together with the ships, there is always the possibility that some boys changed stations shortly before the ship sank or was captured. The six boys that had been on board the *Essex*, lost during the battle of Quiberon Bay when she ran on the Four shoal, should reappear in the musters of some of the other ships present, since her whole crew had been evacuated before the ship was set on fire to prevent it from falling into French hands. The boys had taken part in one of the most celebrated naval victories of the eighteenth century – a victory that led David Garrick, London’s most famous actor and friend of John Fielding, to compose the much sung *Heart of Oak*. A less glorious and more certain end faced seventeen other Marine-Society boys on board the *Ramilies* in 1760, when she was wrecked off Devon because of a mistake by her master. None of the boys appear on the list of saved men, which is scribbled on the front page of the muster list.

Three other boys, William Finch, James Gray and John Woolett, all three fatherless and from Cambridgeshire, went to the *Prince George*, where on 13 April 1758 a fire broke out that killed half of the crew. Marine-Society member Rear Admiral Broderick had been on board, and, upon realising that the rescue boat put into the water for him was going to be overloaded, had to strip himself stark naked and jump over board, according the ship’s chaplain Dr Thomas Sharp. Broderick was picked up after an hour in the water by a merchantman. Meanwhile, among those still on board terror and chaos reigned, as the chaplain Sharp remembered: ‘I must be deficient even to attempt a description of the melancholy scene that was now before me, shrieking, cries, lamentations, bemoanings, raving, despair, and even madness itself, presented themselves’. Sharp complained bitterly that many more lives could have been saved, had the merchantmen not kept a safe distance and been more concerned with fishing up

---

97 See also ADM 2/84, 01/11/1759 – 31 05/1760, pp. 169-170; and Spavens (1796, 1998), p. 27.
98 Marine-Society boy William Glover, however, appears to have been paid a month after the disaster, according to the *Ramilies*’ pay book.
geese, fowls, tables, chairs, and other goods from the burning ship than with picking up her crew. Another Marine-Society boy, butcher's son Richard Taylor, served on board the Duke Aquitain, which foundered in January 1761 during the Pondicherry hurricane, in which most of the men perished. Ed Griffiths, brought to the Marine Society in 1758 as a tender twelve-year old boy living in a London workhouse, went to the Marlborough, the ship whose lieutenant produced the famous series Britannia's Triumph, depicting the capture of Havana – the Marlborough foundered when returning from Manila in 1762. All these disasters happened without the enemy playing any immediate part in them (except indirectly in the case of the Essex); unlike the enemy, the sea did not seem overly impressed by the conquering Hearts of Oak and Britannia's Triumph, it still demanded its toll of lives, and did not care of what young age these lives were. Enemy forces only played a direct role in the end of the naval careers of fourteen-year old Thomas Downe – his father had already been killed in the Army – and that of the farmer's son Christopher White, who were both captured by a French privateer in 1759 while serving on board the Hawke, as well as in the end of the career of Robert Quelch, the son of a gentleman, who was taken while serving on the Armed Tender Experiment.

The 17 sampled Marine-Society recruits who were recorded dead in the muster books appear mainly to have been the victims of sickness and personal accidents. Only one recruit, twenty-year old Samuel Steads, who had already been rated as an able seaman, died from wounds he received in action when fighting three privateers. One boy drowned, one boy and another one already rated were killed by a fall, three have at sea

---

100 London Magazine, July 1761, pp. 386-387.
101 According to Rodger (1984, 1998), p. 51, DD ('Discharged Dead') alone, without any further specifications, in the muster book may be assumed to indicate a death resulting from illness. However, as with the discharges of servants, it is important that one always checks all available muster lists, or at least precisely the one of the month during which the death occurred. Joseph Coleman, for example, has in ADM 36/6944 merely DD recorded, while in ADM 36/6943 Drowned is added to the DD
and one has *on board* as reasons for their deaths recorded, which both probably also indicate a death through accidents. Two others have merely an anchor place, *Spithead* and *Engl. Harbour* (Antigua), recorded behind their double D - sickness appears to have been the most likely cause. The remaining seven died at the Hospital, at least six at Haslar Hospital. Three of them had in the muster books merely a discharge due to sickness recorded, but their names appear on a list of deaths at Haslar Hospital. The three are part of altogether eight boys who were discharged due to sickness to Haslar and did not reappear at their old ship. The other five of these eight did not appear on Haslar’s death list. This quota, three out of eight having died at the hospital, though small in absolute numbers, shows that one may also fear the worst for all those recruits, ten to be precise, who were discharged sick to other places and never returned to their old ship. Among those discharged sick was also the boy John Read, who has not only *Ds* for the discharge due to sickness recorded, but also *wounded in action* written behind his name. We may therefore assume that all other recruits with *Ds* suffered from illnesses and diseases.

A worrying aspect about the boys discharged disabled is that it appears that there was no automatic provision in place for them. When the Marine-Society members organised the earlier mentioned collection for the boy disabled by a blow from a seamen the minutes recorded that this was done because no public provision was made for such boys. If that is true, it would surely be a gross injustice. The pay books suggest that

---

102 Based on the fact that Sam Furrow has *at sea* together with *killed by a fall* recorded.
103 See ADM 102/374.
104 Perhaps the two discharged sick in Portsmouth could also be included in the calculation.
105 The relevant pay books for these ten do not give any further indication whether they had stayed alive, since the servants were anyway not paid and furthermore some pay books are missing (only Ben Simpson, who had already been rated, has a representative collecting his pay). The muster books often record a *q* (query) behind the *Ds* (discharged sick), which was given to any man that did not return to his ship as soon as he had left the sick quarters, or was left at the sick quarters when the ship departed (see *Regulations and Instructions Relating to His Majesty’s Service at Sea* [1757, 9th ed.], p. 59). The *q* was only to be taken away, when it was clear that he had joined another ship or was discharged for being unserviceable. Unfortunately this leaves all scenarios open, and the *q* is of no use for this analysis.
106 MSY/A/1, 27 10/1757.
officers received the net wage of an ordinary seaman for each servant, that is the contributions to Greenwich Hospital and the Chatham Chest appear to have been deducted, which could have formed a basis for a claim on a disabled boy’s behalf. However, the efforts of the Marine Society after the war on behalf of a blind boy show that neither of the two funds helped out automatically: the boy received nothing from the Chatham Chest, but thanks to the efforts of Jonas and Thomas Hanway the boy was eventually admitted to Greenwich Hospital, after half a year of waiting. Taking into account that there was a queue of seamen waiting to be admitted to the Hospital, it would probably normally have been impossible for a boy to get in.

With disease and shipwreck as major threats, being a boy did not mean that one was a great deal more protected than the men, since literally the whole crew – men and boys – sat in the same boat. The boys who entered the Ramilies in 1757 had undoubtedly the worst fate. Having been checked and considered healthy by the Marine Society’s surgeon, two thirds of those who did not move on before the end of the year became sick. Four of them died in consequence at the hospital (another one a little later), and a further two were discharged for sickness and never returned. The rest of the crew began to recover its health, and in 1760 up to seventeen Marine-Society boys were serving on board the Ramilies when she sank and took over seven hundred men and boys into her watery grave. ‘Come, all you pretty fair maids, weep with me, Who lost your loves on the Ramilies’, the sailors were to sing. The wreck of the Ramilies was rediscovered in 1950, the Marine-Society boys and the rest of the crew, however, were forever lost. Their careers as Navy servants were short ones and unhappy ones.

The happiest end to a servant’s career would certainly have been a promotion. The Marine Society, the boys, and the Admiralty, all hoped that the servants would fairly

---

107 MSY/A/2, 28/02/1765, 07/03/1765, 14/03/1765, 25/04/1765, 01/08/1765. Nothing is said about the possibility of the boy becoming an out-patient like most of the seamen supported by the Hospital.
quickly progress to be rated as men, and thus ease the Navy's manning problem and make space for the placement of new servants. There was always the danger that some officers would be reluctant to give up their servant, but the Marine Society was confident that as long as it guaranteed that they would immediately get a new one, captains would be willing to rate the boy as early as possible. Whenever the Society's publications discussed the rating of their servants, the boys' age, more than their seafaring experience, is the decisive factor in the calculations. The Society advertised that the closer the boys would be to eighteen, the sooner they would be rated. This emphasis on age is something that does not surface in the Navy regulations, which were concerned only about seafaring experience: for example an able seaman had to have served at least three years at sea. Below the able seaman was the rating of ordinary seaman, commonly assumed to be one who had served at least one year, and then the landman, the level at which the Society's men entered, with no seafaring experience at all. Progressing to able seaman was the norm, as long as a man served long enough.

Of all the three sample groups, 30 Marine-Society boys could be followed long enough to see them being promoted to the quality of a man, that is landman, ordinary or able seamen. Looking at the different ratings it becomes obvious that no step by step career ladder existed, and that captains were quite free in the way they mustered the boys. Eleven boys went straight from servant to able seaman. Eight servants progressed first to ordinary and then to able seaman, only one was first promoted to

---

110 For advertisements see for example MSY/A/1, 05/05/1757.
112 Peter Earle, in his study of English merchant sailors, mentions that there were some, albeit exceptional, sailors that remained ordinary seamen (Earle [1998], p. 44).
113 One of them, the labourer's son James (Joshua) Reed, was even first rated as midshipman and then as able seaman, though there is a little doubt whether the boy in the muster list was really the Marine-Society boy.
landman and then to able seaman, one remained a landman for more than three years without any further promotion, and one, William Shadows, was mustered as a landman and then went back again to being a servant. The quality of a landman appears to have been rarely part of the boys' career ladder; it was primarily used for adults who had never set a foot on board before. The example of William Shadows suggests that mustering the boy as a landman had more to do with getting the servant ratio right. However, the cases of the other two promoted to landmen, the boys Price and Pope, hint that mustering some of the younger boys as landmen might have been done not only in order to get the servant ratio right and an extra servant on board, but also to acknowledge greater abilities that placed the boy on the same level with the inexperienced landmen recruits: Zach Price, mustered as landman in his first year, was not only already seventeen years old when he entered, but at 5ft 4in also one of the tallest Marine-Society boys, while the boy Pope, also promoted to landman already in his first year, though only fifteen years old and not very tall, was the son of a fisherman.

How long did it normally take the boys to be rated? And was their seafaring experience in any way valued, despite the fact that the muster books seem uninterested in their careers? Of the 30 promoted servants eleven received their first promotion already within their first year of service; another eleven received it during their second year; four in their third; three in their fourth; and one was promoted during his fifth year of service.

114 Among the eleven rated in their first year are Robert Quelch from the third sample set, whose career had been traced because his father was recorded as being a gentleman, and also two young men, Samuel Steads and John Coxhill, who were rated as able seamen as soon as they entered. Both had a slightly earlier entry date in the muster book than in the Marine Society's registers, suggesting that they had enlisted independently of the Society and perhaps already had some seafaring experience.
Table 1. Rating per Service Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Landmen</th>
<th>Ordinary Seamen</th>
<th>Able Seamen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course these figures give a distorted picture, due to the muster books' deficiencies, the cases of boys dying or being paid off, and the resulting difficulty of following a larger number of boys over several years. *Table j.* (on the next page) therefore sets the promotions per service-year in relation to the numbers of boys whose careers could be followed over the years.

**Table j. Rating per Service Year and Number of Careers traced:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Number of Servants at Start of Year</th>
<th>Servants Rated During Year</th>
<th>Boys that Remained at End of Year</th>
<th>Number of Servants Lost</th>
<th>Number of Ratings at End of Year</th>
<th>Ratings Lost: Previously Rated &amp; Lost Year &amp; Lost</th>
<th>Total No. of Recruits at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One still has to be careful when drawing generalisations from these statistics. In the section V.I. it was argued that the infamous *Request* discharge did not mean the servant was definitely promoted, but the important question now is whether there was a higher (or lower) likelihood of a servant going to a new ship without his master being rated? Apart from the cases of those servants who were lost and rediscovered on their return to the Marine Society, there are only a few occasions on which servants leaving without their master could be kept track of. The earliest group contains some boys who left without their master to become servants on board the *Essex*, but also two others who left
without their master to become able seamen on board the Zeyphir. The second group of the nearly systematic sample has a large group of boys leaving without their master to become supernumerary boys on board the guardship *Royal Ann*. Among all those who were discharged with their master, there is only one pair of servants who were rated at their new ship when they arrived with their master. Thus there seems to be no strong evidence to suggest that the discharged and lost servants were more likely to be rated. However, the boys must have left their original servant position for one or the other reason, and a check of their ages reveals that there were many among the boys lost due to a *Request* discharge who had reached the end of their teens and would theoretically have been old enough to enter the Navy as landmen.

If we do not want to draw any conclusions about those lost out of sight, one can at least state that with certainty 5% and at absolute maximum 33% of the boys were promoted in their first year of service; 9% to 23% of the remaining servants were promoted in their second year; 5% to 23% in their third year; 9% to 33% in their fourth; and 10% to 40% of the remaining servants in their fifth year of service. The margins do not seem to change much, that is they do not appear to increase dramatically with the service years, as one has to expect if seafaring experience was valued. Seafaring experience does not appear to have played a major role in the rating of a servant. The percentages are slightly higher (5-38%; 10-26%; 8-37%; 15-50%; and 17-67%) if we disregard all those lost through crews being paid off, and those lost through death, sickness and shipwreck, as Thornton and Hanway preferred to do it in their published calculation.115 Also the fact that many servants were rated as able seamen so early in their careers, contrary to the Navy regulations, which demanded a minimum seafaring
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experience of three years, suggests that the seafaring experience of servants was not valued.\textsuperscript{116}

Instead of seafaring experience age seems to have been the more decisive factor, as already suggested by the Marine Society's advertisements. If we disregard for a moment the general age distribution of the Society's recruits and the distortion by the losses problem, it appears that the servants were rated as ordinary seamen mainly between the age of 17-19, and as able seamen between 18-21. Fifteen-year old Pope, for example, though immediately rated as a landman, remained on that quality for more than three years without being rated ordinary or able seaman, and the only explanation for that appears to be that he was not old enough to be rated – an explanation perhaps not good enough to Pope, who finally deserted. In all three samples there are altogether ten boys who could be traced for more than four years and were not rated during that time, and all of them had joined the Navy aged fourteen or younger,\textsuperscript{117} and thus had not yet or had only just turned eighteen. Of the rest, those, whose careers have been followed until the age of around eighteen, were at that age either rated or lost after being discharged without a destination recorded. There are only sixteen boys who were undoubtedly older than eighteen and still serving as servants,\textsuperscript{118} but most of them had only recently entered the Navy, and they were soon rated or lost through unspecified discharges.\textsuperscript{119}

However, among the recruits rated with less than the officially-demanded years of experience are not only the older youths, but also a few extraordinary young ones. The rapid career of one, Robert Quelch, might be explained by his father being a gentleman,
which was initially also the reason why his career has been traced; his purchases of
clothes and tobacco, as well as the pay book, suggest that he was also paid as an able
seaman. Rating a privileged boy as able seaman or midshipman was fairly common.
However, the quick progress of three other Marine-Society servants, rated able seamen
at a very young age, remains surprising (if the Marine Society had recorded their ages
correctly): John Bunyon, rated able seaman before he was seventeen, had no parents, but
his expensive supply of new clothes and even tobacco hint that he nevertheless came
from a better off family; William Newman, even below fourteen when rated, was also
fatherless; and James (Joshua) Read, below fifteen when rated, had his father recorded as
a labourer (though there is some doubt about Read’s identity). None of them has an
earlier entry date in the muster books compared to the Society’s registers, which could
have pointed to previous seafaring experience. Additionally, there are James Wells and
Sam Furrow, who made it with little seafaring experience to ordinary seamen at the age
of fourteen or fifteen (unfortunately no information is recorded about their parents). One
senses that these ratings had something to do with an oversupply of servants and a
demand for men on board a specific ship, for Wells and Furrow, for example, were both
rated around the same time on board the same ship. Nevertheless, they could have been
rated as landmen or ordinary seamen instead, so it appears that occasionally there were
some very good bonus points to earn for a diligent servant. Yet, one has to be cautious
here, for at times the captain’s mustering was indeed curious. During the whole time
William Shaddows was mustered as a landman aboard the *Union*, for example, he was
actually never on board; while the *Union* had recorded his return from sick leave he had
in reality never reached the ship and had been at the *Royal Sovereign* as a
supernumerary. Only when he went from there straight back to hospital did the *Union*’s
muster list reveal the truth by noting behind his name that he went to hospital from the
*Royal Sovereign*. When William eventually returned to the *Union* in person, after his
second sick leave, the *Union*’s captain mustered him again as a servant and not a landman. The most curious career example in the musters for someone of his age, however, remains James (Joshua) Read, the labourer’s son, who had been brought by his former apprenticeship master to the Marine Society as a thirteen-year old. As said earlier, there is some doubt whether the servant on board is really identical with the labourer’s son of the Marine Society, but regardless of that it is still a remarkable ‘muster-book career’ for a servant: he started as a supernumerary boy, then became lieutenant’s servant, midshipman, able seaman, and finally even captain’s clerk. Despite the Navy regulations against rating anyone above his ability and experience, and stating that a midshipman had to have served four years at sea and had to be ‘in all Respects qualified for it’, Read had been mustered as a midshipman at the age of fourteen and in his first year at sea since being clothed by the Society. However, during the time of his second station as a midshipman, at the *Royal George*, he was in reality lent to another ship (like Shaddows to the *Royal Sovereign*, perhaps in order to be trained there with other boys) and on his actual return to the *Royal George* he was rated as an able seaman. Despite all these impressive ratings, once the war was over Read’s naval career ended. He even left the sea entirely; the Marine Society sponsored his apprenticeship with a cutler. On his return, the Society’s registers this time recorded his father as being a distiller in Southwark and not a labourer. Furthermore, they recorded Read as having been a captain’s servant not clerk. Read’s example should serve as a final reminder of the deficiencies in the source material: captains took great liberties when mustering the crew, their decisions might have sometimes been strongly influenced by what was needed to fill up the ship’s contingent or by personal preferences, rather than by what the boy really did. Furthermore the Marine Society’s registers were not safe from erratic recordings,

120 For cases of disratings from midshipman to able seaman see also Ptcarrn Jones (1954), pp. 215-216.  
121 *Regulations and instructions Relating to His Majesty’s service at sea* (1757, 9th ed.), pp. 29-30.
from boys giving wrong information, and from a range of social circumstances hiding behind an occupational title such as labourer or distiller.

These oddities apart, it appears that the Navy had an age concept according to which servants were usually rated as ordinary (around the age of eighteen), and/or as able seaman (around nineteen to twenty), regardless of how many years they had been collecting seafaring experience. Thus it is also no wonder that the muster books were not too concerned about the servants’ careers. Furthermore, there was no step-by-step career ladder from landman via ordinary seaman to able seaman. Rating all boys at the ages from 18-21 was in any way only logical, as others at that age and without any seafaring experience could enter the Navy at least as paid landmen – a ‘rating’ which the Marine-Society boys, presumably because they had already been trained, were able to skip in their career ladder.

The quick rating of the boys, even to well paid able seamen, shows that the Navy was in line with the Society’s views, not tight with money, and willing to make the Society’s project as successful as possible. Turning 17- to 21-year olds into wage earning adults differed very positively from the long servitude boys faced in apprenticeships, which must have delighted men like Hanway, who considered the long apprenticeships, and the prolonged stage of dependence, the source of many evils. With regard to the general history of youth, the Navy and the Marine Society together prove the existence of an age- and physique-orientated concept of youth similar to our modern one, covering roughly the ages from fourteen to eighteen/twenty-one. Both institutions did not intend to expand this intermediate stage between childhood and adulthood as long as the contemporary apprenticeship system did (although, as argued in the previous chapter, culturally the profession of a seaman kept many elements of youth). John, the Marine-Society boy, faced great dangers when he set his foot on board, dangers his teenage mind had probably not been aware of, and of which the Marine Society failed to warn him, but
if John managed to stay alive it was guaranteed that the social misery of an orphan or the servitude of an apprentice, that once drove him to sea, would soon be a thing of the past.

Yet, was this a permanent improvement, or only temporary? – a question that will be tackled in the following, final chapter on the Marine Society in the post-war era.
CHAPTER SIX:

Epilogue

The Post-War Years for the Marine Society and its Recruits

Initially the Marine Society had thought its work completed once its boys and landmen were safely on board; even more, the members believed that their institution would only last for the duration of the war, as with peace the reason for its being and thus the public subscriptions would cease. Surely, the purely military object of the Society ended with the war, but what about the charitable aspect and the public-safety interests? One thing was clear when the end of war appeared in sight: the Royal Navy's basic wartime manning problem was not solved for the future; its manpower would be reduced to the small peacetime dimension, and the greatest part of its men and boys would therefore have to be discharged. All sampled boys who could be followed until the end of the war were paid off with their crews, with no hint that they continued to serve on another naval vessel. With regard to all those who had become adults and able seamen, the scenario that most of them would be discharged was something the members of the Marine Society could live with: the boys had been trained as sailors and would be readily available for the merchant service, as well as for the Royal Navy in the event of another war. Regarding the not-yet-rated servants, however, Navy Captain O'Hara had already in 1758 alerted the Society to the problem that boys were, even during the war, sometimes just discharged in the harbours, with nowhere to go and nobody to turn to.¹ The committee felt obliged to advertise that all such boys should visit them, and that they would be given priority in new servant placements. But O'Hara's letter also aroused the Society's awareness that in the event of peace there would be a whole mass of young

¹ MSY/A/1, 27 04/1758.
servants discharged in the same manner, many with nowhere to go. The Society formed a subcommittee, led by Hanway and including some of the most active members, with Michael Adolphus, William Mayne, Richard DuHorty, and William Wood, to discuss possible measures that could be planned for the day war ended. After all, the Society had once promised the parents or local authorities of Marine-Society boy John that their boy would be in good hands with them. Furthermore, if seafaring was only to be a temporary solution for the youth, how could the members so concerned about increasing the number of seamen have hoped to convince more parents to let their sons go to sea?²

In March 1759 the Society finally presented its so called plan ‘for the disposal of the boys after the war’.³ The plan related only to boys not yet rated (and initially only those below the age of sixteen); older former Marine-Society recruits were not considered. However, the Society’s offer extended not only to boys who had been equipped by it, but to any naval servant with nowhere to go. As usual, Hanway had put the subcommittee’s ideas into a written pamphlet. John Fielding at the same time was not idle either and also put together a plan of how all the discharged boys and men could be employed after the war. Fielding, too, only did so after being alerted to the problem by a Navy man, in his case Sir William Rowley, one of the Lords of the Admiralty, who had enquired if Fielding had any measures in mind.⁴ However, Fielding also immediately realised the urgency, for certainly the last thing he wanted was to see those he had so efficiently removed from the streets back in their old environment. The usual animosities between Hanway and Fielding probably stood in the way of any coordinated action.

² In later war years Marine-Society advertisements for boy recruits included the assurance to parents that the Society was resolved to use every possible means after the war to take care of boys that were unable to find their own support (see for example MSY/A/1, 29 05/1760)
³ MSY/A/1, 04/01/1759, 22/03/1759; see also 1760 edition of Hanway, Account of the Marine Society (1759, 6th ed.), pp. 163-170, held at British Library. An early version of the plan appeared in Hanway, Two Letters: Letter IV (1758), pp. 32-34.
⁴ John Fielding (1769), pp. 15-16; also MSY/A/2, 25/11/1762, 02/12/1762.
The core of the Marine Society's plan was to place the boys as apprentices in the merchant navy or in waterborne trades, so that the boys could build on their seafaring experience, remain closely connected to the sea, and thus ensure the much-wanted overall increase in the number of seamen. Although the boys would now finally end up in an apprenticeship again, the Society hoped to be able to induce the masters to take them for three to five years only, depending on how long the youngsters had already served at sea, so that they might be out of their apprenticeships about the age of nineteen.\(^5\) Thus Hanway and the Marine Society once again hoped to spare their lads from the long binding ages they would have faced in a common apprenticeship. The Society finally stopped clothing boys in November 1762; the war was now considered over, and the committee felt it had to concentrate its attention and its dwindling finances on implementing the plan for aiding those who were going to be discharged from the Royal Navy, for which purpose it opened a separate new fund.\(^6\) Advertisements were inserted in the papers and posters put up in public places to invite all boys who had already been discharged to turn to the Society.\(^7\) Captains of paid-off ships were asked to send all boys of sixteen and below, who had no means to support themselves, nor any larger sums of (prize) money due to them, and who also were not likely to be rated soon and/or kept in the Navy, to specific ships lying in the harbour where they would be held and victualled for up to three months, or until the Society found an apprenticeship for them. In Chatham, Portsmouth, and Plymouth the Society even had some old naval vessels at its own disposal – the Lords of the Admiralty had requested them from the King, in

\(^{5}\) See also *Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account* (1772), pp. 32-33, 46-48, for laws granting immunities of towns, and freedom to exercise trades, to apprentices that have served for a certain number of years in the Royal Navy.

\(^{6}\) MSY/A/2, 11/11/1762.

\(^{7}\) See for example MSY/A/2, 10/02/1763
acknowledgement of the many good young seamen the Society had provided and of the importance of preventing the danger that any would turn vagabonds or thieves.\(^8\)

Lists were prepared of all the boys, recording how long and in what quality they had served, whether their parents were alive and, if so, whether they were able to care for their son. The lists were sent to the Society’s secretary in London, and the Society would then invite owners and masters of ships and others of water-related businesses, or any other interested masters, to inspect the boys as potential apprentices.\(^9\) Their indentures were to be made out by the Society’s secretary – Hanway had produced a standardised indenture where only the names and the length of the apprenticeship had to be inserted\(^10\) – with one part of the indenture staying with the new master, and the other at the office, except where parents appeared on behalf of the boy. Of course, once again the question of how voluntarily the boys participated arises; Hanway thought that:

It is not to be conceived, but that several of the boys will desire to be left at their liberty to dispose of themselves; indeed I know not how there can be any compulsion used, though persuasion and encouragement will go a great way, and necessity still farther (...); but neither policy, nor humanity, will permit that any of them should be turned on shore to become vagabonds.\(^11\)

According to the Marine Society it was made plain to the boys that their participation was voluntary,\(^12\) yet in the end everyone knew that pauper children had only a very limited freedom of choice regarding their apprenticeship. Unless a boy was extremely unwilling, nobody would have criticised the Navy and the Society for directing the youths into the scheme with gentle pressure if necessary, not least after complaints of several discharged boys ‘lurking about’ in the streets appeared.\(^13\) Hence unwilling boys

---

\(^9\) For advertisements for masters see for example MSY/A/2, 07/04/1763. In far-away Plymouth the operation was to be organised entirely by an agent.
\(^10\) See MSY/A/2, 20/01/1763.
\(^11\) Hanway, *Two Letters: Letter IV (1758)*, p. 34.
\(^12\) Hanway, *Christian Knowledge (1763)*, p. 67.
\(^13\) MSY A/2, 25/08/1763, also 16/12/1762 (Thomas Hanway warning that the boys have to be taken care of quickly).
were more likely to show their opinion by simply running away, as the two boys committee member Charles Dingley had taken did,\textsuperscript{14} or by their undisciplined behaviour: the master of the Hoxton workhouse, for example, visited the Society and complained that the lads temporarily lodged at his place behaved badly. His complaint was supported by the Society’s apothecary Henry Haskey, who, when visiting the accommodation, found that the youths were very insolent towards him.\textsuperscript{15} The workhouse master begged the committee not to send any more older boys, as they appeared uncontrollable.

The total number of boys the Society could account for at the end remained far below the 2,000 to 2,500 boys they had originally anticipated, leaving us to wonder where all the others went. Up to May 1763, only 342 boys appear in the Society’s registers as either having received an apprenticeship, continued as servants, or been given financial support to go off on their own.\textsuperscript{16} However, the pool of servants at the end of the war would have been much lower than in 1759 when the first calculation had been made. The last two war years had seen only five hundred new boys being equipped by the Society, so that in 1763 most of John’s comrades would have been too old to be considered for the Society’s scheme. Nevertheless, the 342 boys in the registers also include some who were older than sixteen. Remarkably there were far fewer orphans among the boys helped after the war, while one normally would have expected the opposite – perhaps this was the result of caring parents ensuring their boys would visit the Society, while many of the plan’s prime addressees, the friendless orphans, had gone off on their own.

Finding placements for the boys was never going to be easy, especially when at the same time ‘so many much abler persons are set adrift together’, as John Blake emphasised in his amendment proposal to Hanway’s plan.\textsuperscript{17} Even towards the end of

\textsuperscript{14} MSY/H/3, nos. 46-47.
\textsuperscript{15} MSY/A/2, 17/03/1763, 31/03/1763.
\textsuperscript{16} See MSY/A/4. There might have been an unknown quantity of boys that did not appear in the registers because they were not considered eligible to any support.
\textsuperscript{17} MSY/A/1, 10/07/1760.
1764 the Marine Society still advertised for interested masters to apprentice discharged naval servants, even for masters from the colonies, if the boys were willing to go.\(^{18}\)

Ideally, in accordance with the plan, all boys would have received apprenticeships at sea, seeing that that was the profession they had learned and the profession where they appeared to the Society most valuable. However, the Society was disappointed with the response of maritime masters: by December 1763, out of 295 former servants the Society had placed only 29 in the merchant navy, 15 with fishermen, and 9 with watermen and lightermen, while 71 had been placed in a ‘mechanic trade’, 17 with manufacturers, 6 in public houses, one in agriculture, and 67 had been given some pocket money so that they could return home and find themselves some work, either because that was what the boys wanted or because no master was interested in them.\(^{19}\) However, there were also 80 boys whose naval officers agreed to keep them for three more years as servants.

As masters were difficult to find there was the danger that some youngsters ended in apprenticeships where they were misused as cheap labour, as was often the case with parish boys placed in maritime apprenticeships. In fact, Hanway had once even used this to make Queen Anne’s acts for maritime apprenticeships more attractive to masters, by pointing to the economic rise of Liverpool, which in his view had largely stemmed from the fact that the local colliers worked with great proportions of apprentices.\(^{20}\) Another concession the Society had to make was that many boys still had to be bound until their early twenties, rather than finishing when they were nineteen. According to John Fielding, the difficulties in finding masters on land were partly due to the fact that the boys were often rejected merely because they had been at sea.\(^{21}\) What Fielding did not mention, though, is that the boys’ bad reputation probably did not just come from having

---

\(^{18}\) MSY/A/2, 04/10/1764.

\(^{19}\) MSY/A/2, 01/12/1763.

\(^{20}\) Hanway, Reasons (1759), p. 98.

\(^{21}\) John Fielding (1758), p. 25.
served in the Navy, but rather more from the fact that he himself had sent so many
former young offenders to the Society, and that both Fielding and the Society had so
often portrayed their activities as a police measure, so that the public now naturally
feared that a boy coming from the Marine Society would be a troublesome youth. At
least two masters found their new apprentices indeed too undisciplined: one waterman
came to the Society complaining that his apprentice John Rustoll, a sixteen-year old son
of a soldier, behaved 'most dangerously bad'; the committee could only advise him to
seek the help of a magistrate. Another master returned his boy, complaining of his very
evil conduct in drinking, swearing and such like, and the Society cancelled the
indentures, lodged the boy in the Hoxton workhouse, and started to look for a master at
sea – once again the only solution for a misbehaving boy appeared to be a maritime
apprenticeship. Use of 'naval language' had also put an end to Ramblin' Jack-author
John Cremer's short interlude as an apprentice on land: 'being bred on board a man-of-
war', he writes, he addressed his master's maid as 'bitch', which apparently delighted his
fellow apprentices, but led the master to terminate the apprenticeship and Jack’s family
to realise that the only solution for Jack was to send him off to sea again.

Another problem for the Society was that, as before, there was no shortage of crooks
trying to defraud it: boys appeared before the committee keen to collect the Society's
two guineas support for new clothing, but without a certificate from their captains, or
producing forged certificates, when investigations found that they had never served in
the Navy. Some, who had never served, even came in the company of officers, and
others appeared together with what was probably already their apprenticeship master, or

---

22 Also argued by Hutchins (1940), p. 95.
23 MSY/A/2, 20/12/1764; MSY/H/4, no. 342.
24 MSY/A/2, 04/10/1764.
26 See for example MSY/A/2, 13/01/1763 (no certificate), 04/08/1763 & 06/10/1763 (never served),
15/09/1763 (forged certificates), 29/11/1764 & 11/04/1765 (fake masters).
merely an accomplice, acting as an interested master and hoping to receive the two guineas for a boy who had never seen a naval vessel from the inside.

Only in July 1766 did the committee finally conclude that there would presumably be no more applications for help from boys who had been sent to the Navy during the war, and that its task was completed.\textsuperscript{27} The Society had done what it could for those youngsters who had asked for help. For the older youths and men, however, there had been no plan of disposal. They had all been trained to become sailors, they had fought for King, country and commerce, but now they faced an uncertain future. How easily they could find employment in the peacetime economy is debatable. The Marine Society claimed, in July 1764, that much the greater part of the ten thousand men and boys had found employment in the King's or the merchant service, though the Society was honest enough to add that they were referring only to those of the ten thousand who had survived the war.\textsuperscript{28} As cynical as it sounds, the high number of casualties might have indeed made the problem of Marine-Society recruits being discharged at the termination of the war less complicated than expected. Furthermore, the Royal Navy did not reduce its manpower to the previous peacetime level of ten thousand but to fifteen thousand, which would have kept a number of Marine-Society recruits in the King's service. There are some economic factors on the other hand that suggest that not all Marine-Society recruits would have found employment in their newly acquired profession: Peter Earle has shown that throughout the eighteenth century the employment of merchant sailors stagnated at around fifty thousand, despite the growing business for the now emerging world empire.\textsuperscript{29} Additionally, the real wages of sailors fell in the late 1760s below the

\textsuperscript{27} MSY/A/2, 03/07/1766
\textsuperscript{28} MSY/A/2, 12/07/1764 Kemp (1970), p. 131, overlooks the dead in his assessment, as well as the fact that assistance was only offered to the younger boys.
\textsuperscript{29} The reason for that being that the tons per sailor ratio increased simultaneously due to an increase in the size of the ships (Earle [1997], pp. 75-80). See also Peter Linebaugh (1991, 1993), p. 127; and Ralph Davis (1962, 1972), pp 58-80.
level at which they had been in the 1730s, suggesting that there was a surplus of sailors.\textsuperscript{30} However, the end of the war also meant that the extraordinary allowance for foreigners on board British ships went back from three quarters to the one quarter directed by the Navigation Acts, thus many Marine-Society recruits could have replaced foreign sailors. Furthermore, David J. Starkey has argued that the emergency of the war had not only drawn foreigners into British shipping, but also forced older seafarers to return, who would now have vacated their positions again, though also Starkey suspects that only able seamen would have easily found employment.\textsuperscript{31} Starkey also points to another indication of low unemployment among sailors: the level of piracy, which did not increase as much as at the termination of previous wars.\textsuperscript{32} The recruits' fate remains debatable, perhaps there can also be no definite answer, as being a sailor was never a permanent employment, but generally it appears that the majority who survived the war could find employment in their new profession, if they wanted to.

For the Marine Society, the most uplifting aspect of the immediate post-war years was that, contrary to its expectations, the subscriptions, far from ending with the war, revived. This allowed the Society to supply also those boys with new clothing and travel money who decided to return home or had become invalids.\textsuperscript{33} When the plan for the boys' disposal was first drawn up in 1759, the committee had still thought that it could never be turned into practice without government money.\textsuperscript{34} Now this turned out to be unnecessary, as the Society managed to revitalise private donations, even attracting once again large donations from merchants in the colonies;\textsuperscript{35} at the same time the recruitment

\textsuperscript{30} Earle (1997), p. 83. Nominal peacetime wages of sailors remained at 25s per month, see for example Davis (1962, 1972), p. 137.
\textsuperscript{31} Starkey (1990, b), p. 39.
\textsuperscript{32} David J. Starkey in interview with author (10/12/1998). Peter Earle argues that the low level of piracy had maybe more to do with the Royal Navy's successful anti-piracy campaigns in the 1720s (Earle in interview with author [08 09/1999]).
\textsuperscript{33} See for example MSY/A/2, 17/02/1763, 21/04/1763, 24/02/1763, 14/04/1763.
\textsuperscript{34} MSY/A/1, 03/01/1760, MSY/F/1, p. 261-262.
\textsuperscript{35} See for example MSY/A/2, 18/10/1764, 01/11/1764, 21/06/1764.
had been stopped and staff costs reduced. In January 1763, the Society also received a legacy of £500 from Robert Smith. 36 The biggest financial boost of all, however, had come three months earlier: Hanway had reported to the general committee that William Hick(e)s, a merchant in Hamburg who – apart from a £21 donation in 1759 – had never been active in the Marine Society, but had befriended Jonas Hanway when the latter travelled through Germany, 37 had bequeathed an extraordinarily large legacy of £22,000 to the Society, on condition that it would be used to continue the Society’s work. 38 The word must have been going around before, for the meeting had an unusually high attendance; the office was crowded with familiar old faces, but also with many who had never appeared before, and this was to happen whenever the Hicks legacy was discussed. And there had to be more meetings regarding the affair over the following years, since the bequest was contested by Hicks’ relatives. Most of these meetings were held outside the regular committee meetings, with Hanway vacating the chair for such less active but socially higher-standing visitors as Sir Charles Asgill or Sir Robert Ladbroke. Nevertheless, to fulfil the will’s requirement of having five representatives as administrators, the ‘usual suspects’ were appointed: Hanway, John Thornton, Thomas Walker, John Lodge, and the Russia and Hamburg merchant James Matthias, who had also been employed as an agent by the executor of Hicks’ will – a blatant overlap of interests. When the will’s executor complained about Matthias’ double-function, the Society quickly replaced Matthias with Robert Nettleton as the fifth administrator. 39

With the prospect of Hicks’ bequest, many other subscriptions coming in, and fewer former servants asking for assistance than anticipated, the Society found itself in the unexpected position of having more funds than it needed. To make the best use of the

36 MSY/A/2, 27/01/1763 14 04/1763 (also Richard Smith).
37 See Pugh (1787, 1788 , p. 144.
38 MSY/A/2, 07/10/1762
39 MSY/A/2, 29/12/1763
money, and also in anticipation that Hicks' legacy, if paid out, would require them to continue the Society, the committee began in mid-1764 to think about the best ways to continue its operations. As usual Jonas Hanway was asked to come up with a written plan, which he duly did and presented the next week. Hanway argued that, since Queen Anne's law regarding maritime apprenticeships for parish boys lacked coercive authority and did not fulfil its purpose, that is to train up more seamen, the Society would try to act as an agent and sponsor, by collecting distressed orphans and vagabond boys and arranging apprenticeships for them. Promoted apprenticeships had to be either with the merchant navy, fishermen and watermen, or with related trades on land such as shipwrights or sailmakers. The Society would provide clothing for the boys and even pay an apprenticeship fee, something that a boy with a settlement in his parish should normally have received from his parish authorities. Again the Society also intended to pay to cure the boys of illnesses. Remarkably, the Society's plan explicitly stated that any boy found in the country would be taken, regardless if he was born in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America – naturally immigrant boys would have fallen through the safety net of parish-poor relief by not having a settlement in their parish. The fact that the Society included this in its mission statement indicates that there must have been already a noticeable number of immigrant children from other parts of the world living in London.

Hanway's plan was put into practice, but surprisingly there were not too many applicants for the Society's charity. In the meantime the contest for Hicks' legacy became more intense and costly. Such a large bequest would always cause various claimants to come forward. Thus the Society was not just arguing with his relatives, but also with the Company of Merchant Adventurers of England in Hamburg, which had

40 MSY/A/2, 21/06/1764, 28/06/1764, 12/07/1764.
41 See also MSY/A/2, 25/10/1764.
42 See MSY/A/2, 17/01/1765, 31/01/1765, 29/08/1765, 10/10/1765, 21/11/1765.
posthumously fined William Hicks £2000 for improper and dishonest behaviour; the Society could not help expressing its bewilderment how the Company could come up with this fine three years after Hicks' death. Uncertainty about how high the legal costs for claiming the legacy were going to be, combined with the low number of boys applying, led the committee to stop their apprenticeship program completely until the case was decided. Furthermore, the Society's activities had also lacked the necessary input from its members, for while the meetings concerned with recovering Hicks' bequest were always well attended, the normal gatherings were anything but, leaving most of the workload to Hanway alone. At least Hanway had, through his work at the Society, finally received his eagerly-sought position of a Navy commissioner (for victualling), which bound him also professionally with the Navy and made him financially independent. John Lodge, and also John Skelton, Jacob Gonzales, Henry Haskey, and William Wood were among the few other members that frequently appeared at the meetings. Nevertheless, on the odd occasion that Hanway was out of town the remaining committee did not feel confident to take any important decision. From 1765 the meetings became less regular, first fortnightly, then there were long intervals when meetings where arranged only when something had to be discussed. The year 1766 only saw six meetings, and three of them were in December.

Early in 1769 a compromise about Hicks' bequest appeared finally in reach, and the Society prepared to restart its activities based on the plan Hanway had drawn up back in July 1764. In the end the Society had to be satisfied with half of the legacy. Perhaps a further incentive to restart now, at least for Hanway, came indirectly through John

---

43 MSY/A/2, 17/10 1765.
45 See for example 29/09/1763. It is also noteworthy that although Hanway did not return until October that year he confirmed and signed all the committee minutes for the period.
46 See (also for cooperation with West India merchants) MSY/A/2, 16/02/1769, 09/03/1769, 16/03/1769, 23/03/1769, 06/04/1769.
Fielding, who revitalised his activities at the same time, and had even received small subscriptions from Marine-Society members Charles Dingley, Michael Adolphus and John Mayor. However, once again the animosities between the institutionalised charity and Fielding’s one-man enterprise, often inflamed by Fielding regarding young offenders as the prime object, stood in the way of any fruitful cooperation. The Marine Society intended to apprentice boys to masters of trading ships, coasting vessels, colliers, fishermen, watermen and lightermen, as well as to Navy warrant officers (note: as apprentices, not servants), to whom the Navy regulations allowed apprentices in peacetime. Advertisements asking for interested masters and boys to come forward were put up in the streets. Children found in distress, with no or a distant home parish, and orphaned sons of sailors and soldiers were to be treated preferentially. The Society paid for clothing, bedding, the apprenticeship fee (£2 at the beginning, and another £2 after two years), as well as for medicines and medical treatment, the costs of making the indentures and a book with instructions to the apprentice. However, William Hicks had through his legacy also forced the Society to look upon an entirely new group as objects of its charity: girls. Hicks had demanded that a part of his legacy had to be used for apprenticing girls, not for the sea service but any trade on land.

The Hicks bequest, or the difficulties in obtaining the same, was also one of the major reasons that prompted the members to incorporate the Marine Society, which was completed in July 1772. Romney remained the chairman, and Thornton the treasurer, but Jonas Hanway now received for the first time an official position within the Society, that of deputy treasurer, though it was pointed out that the he had already served in that capacity without formal election for the past years. The problems of the teenaged

47 The post-war quarrel with Fielding is described in Hutchins (1940), pp. 96-98.
48 MSY/A/2, 06/04/1769; also MSY/A/4, 25/06/1772 (also to commissioned officers).
49 MSY/A/2, 27/04/1769.
50 MSY/A/4, 25/06/1772.
population of the growing and modernising metropolis in the meantime appeared to the Society more worrying than ever. The first official publication of the newly incorporated Society painted an even more apocalyptic picture of the state of London’s youth:

We now lie open to a nursery of thieves, bred up in this metropolis, with the effects of blood and rapine, and the untimely death of many victims to the gallows: The employment of such boys, may prevent their being branded by any marks of infamy, that may render them unfit to be employed with reputation, or restore some young delinquents to the world, purified from their stains (...)

Once again the Society bemoaned that ‘the morals of the poor are in so much a worse state than they were, that is hardly credible’, and complained about the ‘Danger of the present indulgence of young persons’, about parentless youths who were an easy prey for older villains, and that many of them were so ignorant of religious and moral duties that they committed crimes without dread, and that they even learned to laugh at the gallows.

But there was also a noteworthy difference in this publication: the naïve ‘economic charity’, the belief that anything that was good for business also healed any social wounds was gone:

The encrease of wealth, adds to the encrease of poverty; and whether by the force of example in extravagance, a dependance on the munificence of the opulent, or the inequality of the distribution of the produce of the earth, misery sprouts up in rich and plentiful countries, as well as in poor ones (...)

The tasks for the charities appeared more difficult than ever before, bringing about almost a period of resignation in the charity movement, and one of the most famous child charities, the Philanthropic Society, founded in 1788, saw no other way than to take the children away from their parents and environment at an early age, and occupy the children with organised/institutionalised education and vocational training – something we still do today, even by applying the force of the law.

The Marine Society was not to be disheartened; it went on to sponsor boys willing to begin a career in the merchant and (particularly in times of war) in the Royal Navy. From

---

51 *Regulations of the Marine Society: Historical Account* (1772), pp. 42-45 (also following quotations).
52 See for example Andrew (1989), pp. 182ff..
1769 on to the beginning of the twentieth century it equipped 28,394 boys for the Royal Navy, 3,760 for the Indian Navy, and 27,436 for the merchant navy. The Society also became more active in the education of the boys, both to prepare them for life at sea, as well as to provide the moral instruction the boys were apparently lacking. Hanway was convinced that the Navy's officer-servant model was insufficient in terms of breeding up and educating seamen; the French way of teaching seamanship in academies, perhaps the more Enlightened way, appeared more effective to him. The only comparable schools the Royal Navy had were institutions such as the Greenwich Hospital School and Christ's Hospital School, but they operated on a smaller and more selective scale and were intended to raise officers not ordinary seamen. Hanway, Thornton, the Reverend Samuel Glasse, Hanway's secretary John Pugh, and others eventually set up a Maritime School in 1779, though their school also focussed on teaching the sons of officers (particularly orphans) and noblemen. The school was never really connected to the Navy and eventually had to be closed due to a lack of subscriptions in 1783. More directed at the Society's usual boys, Hanway proposed in 1783 a plan for so-called County Naval Free Schools, schools that should be set up in every county and take impoverished boys, employ them in agriculture, so that the schools could be self-sufficient and also so that the boys were kept away from the corrupting city. The schools were to be provided with ships on dry land, so that the children could be taught seamanship. This model went far beyond the simple concern for an institution to breed up new sailors: it was a step towards a nationwide and harmonised education and vocational training for the sons of the poor. This plan of the now grand old member Jonas Hanway appeared far too ambitious and expensive to the new generation of Marine-Society members, and it was rejected in 1786, the year Hanway died. Instead, the Society accepted a modified plan of

---

53 Figures (until Dec. 1905) according to report to Board of Trade in 1906 (MSY/J/3, Appendix A, p. 3).  
54 See Hutchins (1940), p. 104.
committee member Alderman Brook-Watson, which included the acquisition of an old merchant ship, the *Beatty*, which was moored between Deptford and Greenwich, and turned into a training ship for boys. The *Beatty*, or *The Marine Society*, as she was renamed, could take between fifty and a hundred boys at once; the twenty-five boys who were chosen to attend Jonas Hanway's funeral procession were the first to be trained on board. The ship remained the corner stone of the Society's training over the next century; the *Beatty* being replaced by a succession of six other ships, the last one being decommissioned in 1940.\(^{55}\) Additionally to assisting boys the Society equipped landmen volunteers in times of war until the end of the Napoleonic War; in total, including those landmen that entered during the Seven Years War, they fitted out 39,360 men.\(^{56}\) Following the direction of Hicks' legacy the Society also sponsored the apprenticeships and studies of nearly two thousand girls between 1771 and 1978.\(^{57}\) In the second half of the twentieth century, realising that many of its tasks were now taken over by the state, the Marine Society shifted its focus to mainly providing educational opportunities to seafarers through charities that had merged with it, such as the Seafarers Education Service and College of the Sea. Still actively supporting seafarers today, the Marine Society resides in Lambeth Road, South London.

---


\(^{56}\) According to a report to the Board of Trade in 1906, in MSY/II/3 (Appendix A p. 3) All landmen registers are held at the National Maritime Museum, and Roderick Floud, Kenneth Wachter and Annabel Gregory have also deposited a large sample of the registers in the form of a computer database at the Data Archive of the University of Essex (not including the recruit *names, see Floud [1986], SN: 2132). However, if the total number of recruits is correct then the records of about 10,000 men, who probably entered the Navy in the period of 1794 to 1797, must be missing.

\(^{57}\) See MSY/T/1-17. Somehow some boys had sneaked their way into the registers.
Conclusions

The readers of most of London’s papers in April 1757 would have discovered one of the regular Marine-Society adverts claiming:

When it is considered how many Men and Boys have been rendered useful who would have been Disturbers of the Peace; how many Lives of Men as well as Boys have been preserved, which would probably have been lost to God and their Country, we must thank heaven for inspiring us with such Inclinations to do good to our Fellow Creatures.¹

Now, after having assessed the dangers and having estimated the death rate that the boys were facing at sea, the Marine Society priding itself in having preserved so many lives sounds slightly irritating. No doubt, what initially led many men to the Society’s founding meeting was not so much the idea of rescuing boys from poverty, as recruiting boys and landmen who would fight the war, a war which threatened many members’ trading enterprises and which forced the Navy to press the merchant navy’s workforce. However, to the Society’s supporters one motive did not have to exclude the other: chapter one has emphasised that with poor relief being ill-designed to deal with migrant and friendless children, and with a law enforcement that handed out death sentences to youths, many London boys would have indeed been likely to fall victim to malnutrition, disease and illness, crime, and even the Tyburn tree, and sending them to sea, and away from the city, could thus appear as practical charity. ‘If we only remove young persons from greater to less danger, and give them a fair opportunity of learning good, we perform an important office’,² the Society reasoned, in a rare instance of acknowledging that life at sea was not going to be a safe-haven for their boys. To critics, who complained the Marine Society would only serve the Navy and do no good for the boys,

¹ MSY/A/1, 07/04/1757.
² See introduction to Regulations of the Marine Society (1772, 1775), p. xxi; also Hanway, Three Letters: Letter II (1758), p. 9
Jonas Hanway responded that if they saw how filthy and ragged the boys arrived at the office they would appreciate that cleaning, clothing, feeding and giving them an employment was a great charity.\(^3\) Generally, the Society's members and its subscribers perceived a great part of urban youth as endangered, as suffering from a lack of (religious) education, supervision, social support and employment, and thereby being turned into a burden and threat to the public. The Marine Society was to be a solution for these troubled youths, and compared to other common measures, the house of correction, transportation and even the death sentence, the Society was certainly a progressive step. One could object that sending troublesome and unwanted youths into war as cannon-fodder can hardly be called progressive, yet it has to be acknowledged that becoming a naval servant was also a vocational training, the boys were trained in a profession that was also needed in the private economy. Also, by experience the dangers that were most likely to threaten them at sea were not so much the enemy's cannons, but accidents and diseases, something that would have threatened them in civilian life too, though admittedly to a lesser degree. The Marine Society continued its operations after the war, equipping boys for the merchant navy, a less controversial enterprise to the modern-day observer;\(^4\) and Hanway even drew up plans for nationwide naval schools, which were to provide the children of the poor with education and naval training. In the long run it was to turn out that something like the Marine Society could not cure all the problems the youth of urbanised and modernised society was facing, and that an institutionalised universal schooling was needed, which placed the education and supervision of every youth in the hands of professionals employed by the state.\(^5\) We


\(^4\) It only becomes controversial when one regards the dangers the merchant sailor was exposed to as a facet of an exploitation of the working classes (see for example Rediker [1987, 1998]).

\(^5\) There is, however, no reason for complacency: delinquency among orphans and foster children remains even today at an extraordinarily high level, which only appears less alarming because modern medicine and living conditions have dramatically reduced parent mortality. Also the levels of violence and crime among children and youths appear to rise rather than to decline.
should regard the Marine Society as one step in the evolution of this universal education system, despite the fact that the Society's founders were too much stuck in the hierarchical world of eighteenth-century society to imagine that one day the children of the less privileged could be offered equal educational opportunities and be allowed to go all the way to university education. The mental step from a private recruitment enterprise to such central concerns of youth care is not too great, as a look at the Society's members, and the mid-century philanthropists, shows that for many of them the Marine Society was one piece of a whole 'portfolio' of voluntary associations they were setting up, trying to find remedies that improved the conditions of the poor as well as of the entire country.

The mid-century philanthropist was usually the middle-class merchant or businessman; arguably the social mobility he enjoyed in Britain gave the country a competitive edge on other countries, a mobility-advantage the country was to lose in later centuries first to the United States and then to many of its European neighbours. Concerned about the level of social misery the urban philanthropist witnessed on his doorstep, and confident that with the same zeal and methods that had made him prosper he could improve the whole country, he turned his attention to the state of the poor, their employment and education. The foundations of all these voluntary associations marked the birth of the extraordinary charity business that is still present in modern England. Although continental Europe too was to witness such foundations of societies, it generally was to shift a great deal more of the social issues into the hands of the state, something which English society hesitated to allow, being suspicious and sceptical towards the creation of any new government agency and new taxes. The two different experiences will become more apparent in the future, as English society has to make its mind up whether it regards a closer European Union as yielding the prospect of improved state-guaranteed health and social services, or as a costly and devious
‘superstate’. In this context comparative studies of private versus state relief between different European countries would be interesting, and so too would be an investigation of mental consequences when one or the other form dominates, that is for example the question whether private charity manifests a class structure more, by making the poor depended on voluntary help, compared to the rather anonymous financial aid coming from the state? Comparative studies in general always appear a promising direction, for as our present society becomes more international, so will the questions it asks history. However, writing this thesis has also taught me, that despite the globalisation of culture, economy, and politics, we still grow up with a great deal of information-isolation against anything that happens and happened beyond our country’s borders, and that it still takes a lot of work until one reaches the point where one can make profoundly backed-up comparisons between even two countries. I feel it takes much more than being able to draw on foreign language lessons received at school; living at the geographical location of the history studied, to improve one’s language abilities and to take in the country’s wider history and culture, appears almost essential, at least until our upbringing, our education and media etc. become more international.

A look at the way the Marine Society was run indicates that private charity certainly had its advantages: from the start the Society’s operations were conducted in a very regulated manner, anyone employed by the Society was always very carefully watched, in order to prevent any fraud. Anyone wishing to have a say in the running of the Society had to be committed to the cause, for he needed to sacrifice at least the prime time of one working day. Understandably, few were able to do this regularly over a longer period, but this did not hinder the operations much, as the day-to-day work could easily be done by a small number of members together with the paid staff. Most of the intellectual input came from just one source, Jonas Hanway, the tireless author and policy-formulator for the Society; in that respect the association still resembled the more
traditional approach of charity as a one-man business. For sensitive questions Hanway took other prominent members into a subcommittee, but generally the members of some fame, be it from the world of politics, business, or even philanthropy, had very little input into the running of the Society. In particular the post-holders were really primarily there to give the Society credibility and to establish valuable connections to potential donors. With the posts being mere honorary titles, the policy making of the Society fell, as in other charities, to the most regular attender, those with the most intellectual input, the best orators, and the ones who managed to bring a number of friendly members to the meeting when votes had to be taken — the polis London had its Athenian democracy.

While Jonas Hanway was the dominant figure, the other members that regularly attended the weekly meetings were of remarkably little fame. There is a suspicion that some of them were also in business contact with the Marine Society. Such an overlap would be no surprise; in a wider sense the opportunity to meet other businessmen was always among the motives for some people to become members of voluntary associations. This intermixture of charity and business interests might also explain why the Society got at all involved in arranging its own equipment, rather than just paying the Navy to supply the Society's recruits with the Navy's clothing and bedding. However, this is not to say that here private charity fell victim to corruption, for the debatable question is whether these overlaps constituted a waste of resources, or whether they perhaps even brought the Society cost-saving business deals? Seeing that the Marine Society contained such a variety of businessmen, one tends to expect that, had these business-offers by members not been competitive, opposition would have been voiced by other members.

While the work input of the better-known members was limited, their financial input was invaluable, not because of their personal payments but for their connections to wealthy organisations. The most important financial contributions came from the City Companies, and the committee did well to ensure that leading characters of the City,
such as the current Lord Mayor or the City’s Members of Parliament, were given posts
in the Society. Nevertheless, the Society could also bank on numerous smaller private
donors, a number surely unrivalled by other voluntary organisation, so that the Marine
Society initially did not even feel the need to ask its members for continuous donations.
With all its subscriptions the Marine Society was able to equip ca. 13% of the recruits
that joined the Navy from the Society’s foundation until the termination of the war –
surely an impact unmatched by any other private manning scheme, as Admiral Boscawen
had rightly suggested. Probably the majority of all the Navy’s ships’ boys, the captain’s
and officer’s servants, employed during the war were at one point wearing the Society’s
uniform. That the Navy was so receptive to the Society’s boys illustrates how badly it
needed an organised recruitment of servants, if it wanted its so-called nursery for seamen
to work and produce a reasonable number of seamen, and not just young officers.

However, the Marine Society’s manning impact has to be scaled down, for many of
these men and boys had indeed just been equipped by it, but not literally recruited by it,
as is usually phrased in the secondary literature. It is impossible to say how many recruits
had been genuinely attracted by the Marine Society, and how many would have enlisted
anyway and were just told by the Navy to apply for clothing, or were clothed by the
Society on board a tender because they appeared in need of clothing. In the end even
men pressed into the Navy by magistrates and ordinary seamen were provided with the
Society’s clothing bounty, which originally had been intended for landmen volunteers
only, and which is why anyone attempting to estimate the percentage of volunteers in the
Seven-Years-War Navy should take care not to count all the Society’s recruits as
volunteers. The recruitment of the boys was to a larger degree the Society’s own
recruitment success, yet even among them were many that had already joined
independently of the Society. However, that all these men and boys were clothed was in
the best interest of everybody involved: here the Marine Society could indeed pride itself
in saving many lives, for by clothing all those who went on board dressed insufficiently or in filthy rags, and through its advocacy of personal cleanliness, it not only protected these recruits themselves, but also limited the likelihood of typhus epidemics, which had so often been brought on board in the clothes of those men whose social misery had led them to the Navy, and which usually cost the lives of incomparably more sailors than any enemy force did. Thus, while the Society’s contribution to the recruitment of new sailors has so far been overestimated, its contribution to the preservation of serving sailors has been greatly underestimated.

With the discovery that the Society did not limit its attention to the destitute young Londoners, and that it probably even equipped the majority of the Navy’s servants, the Society’s boy registers acquire a much more representative character. The boys who received the Society’s uniform were much younger than the Society had planned. It had hoped to attract a much greater share of the older youths, thinking that these would turn more quickly into seamen and thus make space for new boys. However, after the Society recruited roughly one to two percent of London’s older youths in its first year, it appears that either the Society could no more reach the greater part of that age group, or that the problem of youth-unemployment had fallen to a level that was – at least by modern standards – less dramatic. The general age-span of the naval servants reveals that Marine Society and Royal Navy had a similar age-idea of youth as we have today, with the start at 13-14 and the end at 18 19 years. By turning all who reached the end of this age-span into paid seamen the boys became independent much earlier than the eighteenth-century apprenticeship system normally allowed. Physically, the boys’ heights were most remarkable, they indicate similar deficiencies to those boys from later decades studied by Floud, Gregory and Wachter (1990). Little under half of the Society’s boys came from London, the Society’s original catchment area. Almost another quarter came from the surrounding counties in South-East England, while the remaining quarter came from
great distances, like the Scottish boys who make up almost 10% of the total. A majority
of the boys came from inland towns, which, together with the finding that fewer boys
than expected had fathers working at sea, despite the Society’s advertisements offering
their equipment specifically to the sons of seamen, is remarkable: while seafaring in the
eighteenth-century is generally regarded as having been self-recruiting, a large part,
perhaps even the majority, of the Navy’s Seven-Years-War servants came from families
and even communities unconnected to the maritime world.

Little less than half of the Society’s boys had a father, and a sixth had no adult at all
responsible for them. If they had fathers, the fathers’ occupations were mostly recorded
as labourers, or as being in the clothing and textile industry, such as shoemakers, tailors,
and weavers, or in the armed services as soldiers or indeed sailors. Though these are in
general lower-class professions, there still remains a degree of speculation about the
fathers’ social circumstances, how well they fared in their professions and if they were
currently employed at all. And there are also a number of fathers whose professions
suggest that it was clearly not poverty that drove their sons to sea. Trying to assess the
boys’ motivations for going to sea naturally contains a large element of speculation. The
Society’s publications give us the impression that poverty, unemployment, and a
troublesome character were the prime reasons, all rather ‘negative’ motives that make
the sea service appear as a remedy for social ills and not something any boy in less
problematic circumstances would have chosen. In fact, they are so ‘negative’ that it was
essential to investigate whether the Society’s boys had indeed enlisted voluntarily, as the
Society claimed. The investigation revealed that the committee tried to ensure that the
youngsters entered voluntarily, at least after the initial troubles it experienced with
deserting boys. As laudable as the Society’s efforts were, however, poor relief and the
measures for policing the poor anyway greatly limited the freedom of choice for pauper
children and those who were considered a burden to society. Hence we may expect that
local authorities and private men continued to push youths into the arms of the Society, and many of the boys themselves might have felt that going to sea was an order they had to obey. In the end even the members of the Marine Society, though they had to be careful that the boys would not run away, were convinced that for most of the youths going to sea was the best solution for themselves and society. Having said that, there is on the other hand also evidence that many boys did not need to be directly pressurised by authorities or unemployment and poverty: the numerous runaway boys, who enlisted without the consent of their parents or apprenticeship-masters, are the best proof. Compared to the bleak prospects of the apprenticeships parish boys were often placed in, the Navy could appear very attractive and liberating, despite its reputation for tough discipline.

The Navy offered the boys the chance of being turned into wage-earning adults while still in their late teens, and lured them with the prospect of prize money and a life that appeared much more adventurous than the dire existence of an unpaid weaver’s apprentice, who had to serve his master until the age of twenty-four, only to afterwards join the mass of weavers struggling to find work. And there was more to life on the deep sea, which made it attractive not just to parish boys, but also to youths from less destitute backgrounds, who, like many modern-day youths, struggled to accept their restrictive life as apprentices: the stereotype of the sailor carried the marks of a youth-cultural icon. What turned the sailor’s stereotype into such, was that the work environment not only favoured a young workforce, but also formed the sailors’ characters in a way that made them likely to keep youthful features – features that in the preindustrial world appeared even more out of the ordinary, and hence more attractive to teenagers, than they would today. By absorbing unsettled and non-conformist youths, who were either sent to sea for being exactly that, or who went there for feeling exactly that, deep-sea sailing acquired numerous new workers who were reinforcing the sailors’
otherness, even intentionally attempting to distance themselves from the rest of society, thus forming, in the words of Isaac Land, a subculture. Of course, such a model has its limits, and as in the context of modern youth sociology, from which it is taken, it cannot claim to describe an entire profession or age group. It may be of limited validity for the masses of sons of fishermen and merchant seamen from seaside towns who followed in their fathers’ footsteps because that was the life they were born into, and not because going to sea meant an escape from the ordinary. Such boys, however, do not represent the majority of the Marine-Society boys. For the Marine-Society boy enlisting for the Navy, with no family-connections to the sea and coming from an inland town, the model could on the contrary be very helpful indeed. Nevertheless, more studies of seafaring boys in different periods should be undertaken to test the model, and it would also be interesting to research whether the sailor enjoyed a similar status in other countries.

There are a few further aspects where the youth-cultural approach opens up interesting questions that can only be briefly mentioned here: it could, for example, explain why many boys would not have been too much deterred by the threats to their lives awaiting them at sea, as glorification or deliberate trivialization of dangers are an ingredient of many youth cultures, and certainly also something that was present among sailors. Another interesting angle is that with the sea service being in this study portrayed as the relief channel for unsettled and impoverished youths, one may argue that it had a stabilising effect on British society at home, similar to that of the American colonies, absorbing great numbers of adventurous, unsettled, and potentially subversive young men. A final suggestion for further research into the connection of seafaring and

6 Furthermore, society in general seems to have a tendency to blend out such occupational dangers. Today, on average two workers die on British building sites each week, yet one never hears of anyone not opting for a career as a construction worker simply on grounds of the dangers involved.
youth would be that if deep-sea sailing was indeed, as argued in this study, something many men turned to only during a certain period in their life, that is in their teens and twenties, and if seafaring in general was very often only a casual employment, then a far greater share of the British population than one would expect had at one point been at sea – perhaps a share big enough to talk of a ‘maritimisation’ of society? One contemporary observer, in 1772, reckoned that one in seventy was a seaman, yet with the war dragging so many at one stage of their lives temporarily to sea the ratio of people with maritime experiences would have been much higher.

Trying to follow the service years of mid-century Navy servants is a difficult task, as the usually-so-meticulous muster and pay lists often fail to record the boys’ subsequent ships. Only when the Order-in-Council of 16 April 1794 replaced the servants with the ratings of first-, second- and third-class boys, and introduced separate lists for them, did the musters gradually improve in this respect. These changes in 1794 confirmed what was anyway the case, that is that – though servants by title – boys like the Marine Society’s, with no family connection to any officers, and with no influential parents, would have had little interaction with their masters, and instead would have been trained by working among the crew. It is notable that with its officer-servant model the Navy held at least in theory on to the system of paternal guidance, which also governed the lives of eighteenth-century youths on land in the form of the master-apprentice relationship, whereas the reality on board looked very different and resembled more the dawning world of the (manu)factories, where one ‘master’ supervised a large workforce, with the youths being trained among the workers and in an increasingly regulated manner. This is even more remarkable, as holding on to the paternal concept prevented
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7 Nauticus (1772), p. 30, calculates with 120,000 seamen to a total population of 8.5 million.
8 This, however, does not mean that they did not have to perform personal services for their officers. And also after 1794, third-class boys would have had such duties (see for example Lewis [1960], pp. 90, 152-154).
the Navy from creating a larger nursery of seamen, since the number of trainees was always limited to the number of servants allowed. One would think that it might have been more sensible to take more boys on board, rather than having to reject any of Society's recruits because there was currently no servant placement. However, Glyn Williams has objected that this would have run contrary to the Navy's general philosophy that all its ships had a fixed complement, with fixed positions and an exact idea of how wide the hierarchical pyramid on board could spread at the bottom in relation to the top.9

Thus, David J. Starkey is probably right when he writes that what ultimately provided the much needed nursery of seamen was the war itself,10 as it increased the Navy's demand for servants, and as it furthermore led landmen and former or occasional sailors into the Navy, where they learned or brushed up their seamanship.

With the officer or captain having little contact with his Marine-Society boy, there was a danger that nobody else on board felt responsible for supervising the servant, whereby he could become disruptive, or fall victim to abuses by the crew. However, the lack of any cases of desertions among those sampled servants, who had arrived at their first station, suggest that overall they settled successfully into their new life at sea, that is if we assume that among those lost out of sight was not a great number of boys who were entirely discharged or had deserted. Furthermore, the vast majority of the boys managed to progress to ordinary and able seamen when they reached the end of their teenage years, which meant that youths who normally would have faced a long servitude as apprentices, too long for many to cope with, were now turned early in life into wage-earners. Thus the boys had an excellent chance to get away from the poverty that had led many to sea, and to earn comparatively good wages. Once the boys were rated a high ratio of desertions occurred, yet the statistical population for this ratio is too thin for a

9 Glyn Williams in discussion with author.
sound generalisation, and furthermore this high ratio does not have to be an indication for the deserters' unhappiness, but could have also been the consequence of the boys having learned a profession that was much in demand and more highly paid elsewhere.

The positive picture of the Marine Society's whole operation is, however, tainted, as already noted at the start of these conclusions, by a high death toll. The high toll did not come from the enemy's fierceness, but from the likelihood of sickness, diseases and shipwreck. Certainly the boys would have been at risk in other walks of life too, but the figures that come out of this study, blurred as they may be through the insufficiencies of the source material, suggest that life on land would not have ended prematurely for that many Marine-Society boys, certainly not after the analysis of their social and geographical backgrounds revealed that they were by no means all endangered London orphans. On average, even in London, children who reached their teens had passed the greatest dangers and actually had the lowest death rate of all age groups.\(^\text{11}\) It is difficult to assess how aware the Society's members were of the dangers, but they certainly hardly ever mentioned them in their publications and advertisements, nor were they discussed in the fair minutes. The story thus ends in controversy, leaving men like Jonas Hanway, who dedicated their lives to the children of the poor, and who not only campaigned for the Marine Society but for numerous other charities and hospitals, open to the accusation that they sacrificed these youths for a war that - to widen the controversy and question the legitimacy of the war - mainly served their own trading interests. The territorial gains of the war certainly quietened many critics. Yet, while the Marine Society thought that it had 'pleased divine Providence to involve this Nation in a further War',\(^\text{12}\) there were nevertheless some people who criticised the war for being

\(^{11}\) Based on estimates given in Landers (1993), pp. 99-100, 180 (1,000 burials per year). Only 1.25\% of the London youths (that is from both sexes and all social backgrounds though) aged 10-19 would have died - a stark contrast to the 35-85\%-estimates for the Marine-Society boys to die, become unserviceable, shipwrecked or captured at sea.

\(^{12}\) From advertisement copied in MSY/A/1, 08/01/1762.
nothing but a deliberate continuation of commerce by other means. Horace Walpole, for example, wrote that he was anxious to have peace and did not care a farthing for the interests of the merchants: 'Soldiers and sailors who are knocked on the head, (...) are to my eyes as valuable, as a lazy luxurious set of men, who hire others to acquire riches for them (...) I am a bad Englishman, because I think the advantages of commerce are dearly bought for some, by the lives of many more.'

The Marine Society, however, could always point to the fact that their recruits had entered voluntarily, and that they often clothed – and thus protected – men and boys who were anyway joining the Navy. In the end it is evident that attempting to pass some sort of moral judgement on the Marine Society would involve not only judging the necessity of the war, but ultimately also debating the legitimacy of the social order of eighteenth-century Britain, something that would lead a little too far for a study of the Marine Society. Hence, at this stage it will only be remarked that, even though the Society had tried its best to ensure that the boys entered voluntarily, one always has to remember the social circumstances, in which these boys made their decisions, and their young age – an age, when, as Hanway once remarked, 'their bodies and minds may be formed to any thing'.

With the hindsight of such extreme experiences of the twentieth century, where Japanese teenagers allegedly 'volunteered' as Kamikaze-pilots, and German teenagers were thrown into the final battles of World War II, we ought to be a little more critical of the adults responsible for making use of these boys' disregard for dangers, and for allowing and enabling youths to take part in a conflict which they are too young to understand, or to judge its necessity.

Enticing mature but impoverished men with bounties and high wages into war-service also appears not as a perfect example of Christian brotherly love, at least not to the modern-day observer, who wonders whether the enemy was really threatening the

---

freedom of the *Hearts of Oak*, as Garrick made them sing, thereby justifying their sacrifice. In acknowledgement of the obvious risks involved the Marine Society should at least have been sensitive enough to refrain from selling itself as a charity – here we encounter perhaps the downside of private charity, that it can move into an area where only those were supported that repaid the philanthropist, an area where in the ‘Unity’ of ‘Charity’ and ‘Policy’ the latter played the dominant part.

Another factor that weighs heavily in the assessment of the Society’s success is the question what happened to those who survived the war? Answering this question involves a degree of speculation. Those who had grown up to become able seamen would have at least had reasonable employment chances in their newly-learned profession, at least better ones than they had been facing in their pre-seafaring days. Of those who had not yet been rated and had returned to the Society near 80% were given an apprenticeship (or continued as servants). The remaining 20% were again clothed and sent home, either because they wanted to return home, or because the Society was not able to find an apprenticeship for them. What happened to all those who did not return to the Society is impossible to say; the Society had done all it could by offering its assistance. There were problems with some boys being of a troublesome character, which also made it difficult to find employers, yet to blame the boys’ misbehaviour solely on the Navy, as some contemporaries did, would mean forgetting that it had often been a problematic character that had originally brought the boys to the Navy. One may argue that in their case the Navy had failed as an educational or disciplinary institution, yet the Navy itself had never intended to act as such, and furthermore even this criticism is open to debate: did Hogarth’s *Idle Apprentice*, for example, end at the Tyburn gibbet because sea service was one more step on his way down, or is it that he was, during his time at sea, at least kept away from the corrupting influences of London’s underworld that were to lead to his premature end once he rejoined them? John Fielding noted that remarkably
few of the boys whom he had sent to sea had later reappeared at his court for criminal
offences, though once again the death toll, and also the fact that the boys had matured
in the meantime, might have blurred Fielding's perception. Generally it appears that, even
though the end of the war threatened to turn the Society's scheme into a mere temporary
solution, the demand for seamen in the private sector and the Society's financial strength
ensured that the vast majority of the Society's former recruits found employment or an
apprenticeship after the war—that is, of course, the vast majority of those who had
survived. Encouraged by this success, and by Hicks' bequest, the Marine Society
continued its operations as an incorporated society, concentrating on helping
impoverished boys, by equipping and training them for the merchant navy, but also, in
times of war, by recruiting men and boys for the Royal Navy. As the Society progressed
its records became more detailed; we find for example information being recorded
regarding the boys' previous employment, reading and writing abilities, or their weight.
The Society's correspondence is also preserved, and the Navy's muster lists improved
simultaneously, making it easier to follow servant careers. Hence there is enough
material to continue studies similar to this one for the following decades, and to see
how the Society developed within the greater changes in the economic, philanthropic and
political world. Floud, Wachter and Gregory (1990) have made use of only one aspect of
this wealth of information, that is the height data; and from Hanway's death onwards,
which marks the endpoint of research for his biographers, there is also a large ground to
be covered in the Society's institutional history.

Sitting in the London Public Record Office and skimming through successions of
muster lists for the names of Marine-Society boys often reminded me of the 1940s movie

---

15 John Fielding (1769), p. 15.
16 Dianne Payne is currently working on the Marine Society's registers of the 1770s for her doctoral
thesis on the children of London's poor (at the University of Hertfordshire).
Thunder Rock,\textsuperscript{17} in which Michael Redgrave, living in a lonely lighthouse with the books of a passenger liner, which had sunk nearby a century before, as his sole entertainment, uses all his imagination to fill the names in the ship's passengers list with life. An academic study cannot draw conclusions based on one's imagination, yet in the end this study shares a common goal with Michael Redgrave, and that is that writing history is not just about the grander developments and interpretations, but also about bringing back to life those that have been forgotten at the bottom of the sea, and to give at least some of those anonymous young men killed in the endless row of European conflicts a name, to remind us that the Nelsonesque hero's death is an exception, if not fiction, and to warn us to never overlook this cost in lives when studying the past or making decisions for the future. Every thunderous broadside fired cripples and kills lives, ruins families, produces new fatherless boys for the Marine Society. Furthermore, despite all the criticism that has been voiced here against the members of the Marine Society, this study is also there to remember these men, who undertook great efforts to improve the fate of the poor in the way they thought would be most proper for the poor and the country. For these men too are neglected, particularly by popular memory. Jonas Hanway, who dedicated his life to his charities rather than enjoying the sweet life of an early retirement, has not even a street in London named after him. When one wanders today through the City's East End, where Hanway has once been so active, one finds not a single reminder of him; instead the pavements are blocked with people tracing Jack the Ripper, who, unlike Hanway, did not build an asylum for destitute prostitutes, but instead brutally murdered a handful. Perhaps it is time that historians make an effort to direct the general public's attention to people more worthy of being remembered.

\textsuperscript{17} Thunder Rock (GB, 1942), directed by Roy Boulting, based on a play by Robert Ardrey.
Memorial to Jonas Hanway at Westminster Abbey (with kind permission of the Westminster Abbey Library). Currently hidden from the main tourist route, the memorial was unveiled in 1788, but reduced in size in the late nineteenth-century.
APPENDIX ONE:

The Marine Society's Registers for Boys sent to the Royal Navy during the Seven Years War (MSY/H/1&2)

To facilitate the analysis, and to provide a tool for other researchers wishing to analyse any aspect of the Marine Society's boys, I have produced a computerised database of the Marine Society's boy registers. The database is on the disk attached to the thesis and will also be deposited at the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich. The computerised database tries to be as close as possible to the original source; however, at some stages interpretations had to be made, for example when information was clearly entered under the wrong column. Another aspect requiring interpretation arises from the fact that the headings for columns keep changing over the years. If the database faithfully followed the original, it would have to be subdivided whenever column headings change, and it would be very difficult to get overall statistics. Therefore, the columns recording apparently the same information have been merged, though in case of any doubt they can always be subdivided again with the help of the MS-numbers given in the column heading.

The individual columns of the database are as follows: The first column UID gives a unique identifier to each recruit/data-carrier. MS-no. is the number the recruit has in the column of the Marine Society’s original register. UID and MS-no. are not always identical, as the Marine Society’s registrar committed a few miscounts, and furthermore
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1 The database is on Microsoft Excel 2000
2 On a typographical note, the very frequently (especially under Place of Abode) used superscript abbreviations, such as Cap" for Captain, have been entered as Cap.n rather than Cap", in order to save time. A particular problem is the information about the boy’s parents entered as ‘Friess’ in the database (see also definitions below): it is not clear whether the clerk meant F'less (with a subperscripted r), or indeed Friess.
3 The numbers MS-no. 372 and 387, for example are left out in the registers, while the boy between MS-nos. 460 and 461 has no number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Port of Embarkation</th>
<th>Port of Destination</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>James Brown</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>Mary Davis</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there are some boys from a loose paper list (lying between the pages) that are not all entered in the official registers. For the latter boys <loose paper> was entered instead of a MS-no., and there is also one boy, between MS-nos. 460 and 461, with <no MS-no>.

The **date of entry** corresponds to the column in the original register – usually the date is only given in the first row, and the following boys are assumed to have entered at the same date. Apart from a few exceptions, the recruits were listed in chronological order by the Marine Society. Next follow the **forename(s) and surname** of the boys. I have kept the spelling of the registrar (unless a forename was undoubtedly misspelt), but spelling is obviously a problem: apart from the lack of conformity of spellings, the specific circumstances of on the one side the boy, sometimes with no adult accompanying him and often not being able to write, giving his name, and on the other side the Marine Society's registrar noting down whatever he understood, make it very likely that sources of the Navy or others will use a different spelling. Surviving loose papers with lists of names illustrate how after the transcription into the proper registers the name **Book** became **Beck**, while **Burk** became **Buck**, and **Stalker** became **Stocker**. The Society's registers particularly struggle with the spelling of Scottish surnames (the **Mac**s): the double-counted boys **Macquin** turns into **M'queen**, and **Macknish** to **M'Aish**. Incorrect deciphering on my behalf is certainly also another danger. The forenames are mostly written in a superscript form, e.g. Wm instead of William. For optical reasons and to make the entry work easier I have spelled the names out, unless I was unsure (**Jos.** could be Joseph [which cases of double-counts suggest], but also Joshua, or Josiah).

There are a few boys who have no name, but since no personal information is recorded about them one may assume that their names have merely not been recorded. However, there is also one boy Jacob, 'a black', who has no surname recorded, in whose case the blank probably indicates that he did not have an English surname and did not know his original name.
The next columns give the boys' age and stature. The accuracy of the recorded ages might have suffered a little from the possibility that some boys were perhaps not too sure about their real age; the post-war register in MSY/H/3, for example, had as a column headline 'real or reputed age'. Records of the Royal and merchant navies, and in the eighteenth century in general, often show inconsistencies when ages are recorded, but one may presume that in general the Society took care to record the ages as accurately as possible, seeing that for the boy recruits age was a very important factor. Nevertheless, a crosscheck with the ages in the registers for boys who returned to the Society after the termination of the war (MSY/H/3) reveals a few inaccuracies: Thomas Page, for example, had been recorded as being sixteen years old when entering in 1760, and in 1763 he was again recorded as being sixteen years old; George Watts had apparently been thirteen when entering in January 1761, and was still thirteen in 1763; and Acteon Jefferys' age had been recorded as thirteen in 1759 and fourteen on his return in 1763.  

From October 1756 onwards the ship or tender the boy was sent to is usually recorded in the heading for a group of boys. Some have merely the word Tender recorded, others have no ship recorded or just the harbour, admiral, or captain – as I found boys with no ship being recorded in the Navy's muster books one may assume that they entered a ship immediately, like everybody else, and that the name of the specific ship was not known to the Marine Society’s registrar. If Westminster, or just a W, are recorded, the boy has probably been sent to the house in Tothill Fields, in order to be trained as a fifer.  

Wherever I was not entirely sure if a boy belonged to the group that went to a specific ship I noted the ship's name in chevrons < >. In most cases I have kept the spelling of the Marine Society's registrar, even if the spelling of the same ship varied on different occasions (see Glasgow and Glascon, or Ramallies and Rammilles).

---

4 See MSY/H/2, nos. 4082, 4205, 3525; MSY/H/3, nos. 129, 21, 119.
5 Many of them will appear a second time in the registers, when they were sent to a ship.
Occasionally the **location of the ship** was recorded in the heading too (*P.mouth* presumably indicates *Portsmouth* rather than *Plymouth*). As a further specification a **receiving person or the name of the captain of ship** was recorded sometimes in the heading; from MS-no. 3975 on to the end the name of the captain is in most cases given and therefore from there on recorded in this database-column. Again the registrar's spelling was kept. Before MS-no. 3975 the information would usually be first the rank (captain, admiral etc.) and then the surname, after MS-no. 3975 the captains' name is recorded with surname followed by forename. From MS-no. 3975 to the end another column was started in the original registers, which recorded **for which officer on board** the boy was destined (until MS-no. 4511 the column is called *Captain's name & for what Officer*, afterwards it is just *For what Officer*) – this information makes up the next column. The information usually comes in the form of the officer's rank (captain, carpenter, gunner etc.) with occasionally the name added. Blanks are left as blanks, as in most cases with the database the likely meaning of a blank is that the information merely was not recorded, or was not known.

Next follows the background information about the recruit. The columns recording information about the **parents** vary over the years; they are compressed in this database into one column, but with the help of the MS-nos. they can be separated again. From MS-nos. 1 to 184 the column is called *Parents or Fatherless* in the original; from MS-nos. 185 to 764 the information is recorded under a column with no heading, though it is most likely to be the same as before. From MS-no. 765 to 780 the column is simply called *Parents*, and for the long period between 781 and 2853 there is again no heading. From MS-no. 2854 to 3974 it is called *Parents or Friendless*, with the exception that

---

6 There are a few boys for whom two ships are named and of which both captains are recorded.
7 The Society's 'Agenda Book of Business' (MSY/F/1), also kept at the National Maritime Museum, has the names of officers for a few more boys.
between MS-nos. 3730 and 3744 it is called Parentsless [sic!] P or Friendless F. From MS-no. 3975 to 4511 the label is Parents Name, D dead, F Friendless. From MS-no. 4512 to 4700 (including the boy with no MS-no.) the information for the computer-database column is derived from two columns in the Marine Society's registers, which are the column By whom recommended, Friendless F and the column Parents Name, If dead..D. The information about by whom recommended is entered under the column By whom brought etc. in the computer database. From MS-no. 4701 to 4719 the database's information comes again from two different columns in the original registers, that is Parents name, D.Dead, F.Friendless and the column Parents Name, If dead..D. (note the apparent overlap of column-titles in the original registers). And from MS-no. 4720 on to the end the two original columns are By whom recommended, Friendless..F and Parents Name, If dead..D.

The column-headings towards the end appear a little confusing and overlapping, and indeed even the Marine Society's registrar seems to have been unsure about what he had to record where (which is in case of the overlapping column headings for recruits nos. 4701 to 4719 even understandable). The quality of the information entered in the column varies, in most cases it is either Father, Fatherless or Friendless, but there are few other entries, and it is a great problem that these entries were nowhere defined, and occasionally appear even inconsistent in their meaning. The following list shows the types of information and my interpretation of them:

- Blanks: Most blanks appear in clusters and accompanied by blanks in the other columns about the boy's background, and therefore they seem to indicate that the registrar merely did not write down the information. Theoretically, blanks could always indicate that whatever is given in the column's heading does not exist or is not known, but in the case of this column one can expect this kind of information to be given in the form of Friendless rather than a blank. The exception to this rule are those cases with blanks where a profession is given as well. It is important to note that from MS-no. 2854 onwards one of the few decisive interpretations of this database is done, that is that a blank in the parents' column is interpreted as Father if a profession is recorded under the Parents Trade-column for the same boy. The justification for this
interpretation is that previously a large part of the register was kept with no headings and the parents' and professions' columns had been merged into sentences such as Father a Taylor behind the boy's name, written across columns or just under one, which have also been interpreted as a living father. Furthermore, shortly after MS-no. 2854 we find already boys with a blank in the parents' column and not only a trade recorded, but also the information that the boy was brought by the father. The clerk probably thought it was obvious that if he gave the profession and did not mark down Friendless, dead or similar, the father was alive. This interpretation shall also make the database easier to use. Doubts about this interpretation arise only in a few instances: There are for example some boys, who are F'less, but have a business recorded - these professions are probably the ones of the now absent fathers. Furthermore, among the very last recruits there are a few, where the mother's profession might have been recorded.

- **D**: The meaning of D (dead) alone is uncertain. It is defined as Parents Dead by various column headings, however some boys with a D were brought by their mother, suggesting that only the father was dead. It seems safer to interpret D as just Fatherless, which is in any case a valid statement, but with no conclusion about the mother. Doubts about this interpretation arise only in one case: MS-no. 4729 has a D and is recommended by the father (perhaps a stepfather).

- **F**: The meaning of F appears to differ over the years. F is first defined in the row for MS-no. 1097 as Fatherless (though it is used already shortly before), and later it is defined in the column heading for MS-nos. 3730 to 3744 as Friendless but not used. From MS-no. 3745 onwards the column heading changes to Parents or Friendless and F appears frequently. However, there are a few boys with an F that were brought by their mothers. From MS-no. 3975 onwards the column heading reads Parents Name, D. Dead, F. Friendless and from here on there are no cases speaking against F meaning Friendless. For any general analysis I suggest to assume F as being Fatherless for all recruits before MS-no. 3975, also because it is a valid statement as at least there is no father while it is not clear whether there is a mother. From MS-no. 3975 to the end it appears safe to interpret F as Friendless.

- **F & D**: Beginning with the column headings for MS-no. 4512 onwards. In consideration of the definitions of F and D, it is most likely to mean that not only were the boy's parents dead, but also that there was no adult responsible for him.

- **F&M & D**: entered only at the end either under the By whom recommended, Friendless...F (in which case it is a small d) or under the Parents Name, If Dead...D (in which case it is a capital D) column. It seems to indicate that father and mother are dead, at least when entered under the Parents Name-column; if recorded under the By whom...-column it might have a different meaning.

- **Father**: for a living father (no conclusions about mother drawn).

- **Father dead** (no definite conclusions about mother, presumably alive).

---

8 Only when the information came as was a Taylor, or son of a snuffboxmaker/son of a leather pumpmaker, the blank in the parents' column is left as a blank, since it is unclear whether this is to indicate that the father had been unemployed, retired or died.
• *Father killed* (no definite conclusions about mother, presumably alive).
• *Father run away* (no definite conclusions about mother, presumably alive).
• *Fatherless*: Father can be dead or just not there – one is recorded as having fled because of a debt. No definite conclusions about mother.
• *Fd*: only for MS-no. 4777. This might indicate that the father is dead and the profession recorded would then be either the mother’s or the deceased father’s.
• *Fless*: can be Fatherless or Friendless (only three cases). Probably the registrar just omitted the superscript r, and thus the boys are more likely to be Fatherless (which again is in any case a valid statement).
• *Fr*: not clear, either father, or it means F, for F is used frequently for the nearby MS-nos. For this analysis the three cases where Fr was recorded were left out.
• *Friendless*: assumed to be boys with no adult (parents, relatives etc.) responsible for them, or orphans. Hanway and Thornton in *Three Letters: Motives* (1758), p. 3: ‘Therefore they [the Marine Society] seek for these young recruits among those who are most destitute; whose parents have left them in extreme poverty, or friendless and exposed to those complicated miseries which are most disgraceful to human nature’. MS-no. 3450 has friendless recorded but is also brought by the aunt, which suggests that in this case friendless indicates that there were relatives alive, but they did not take care of the boy.
• *Friess*: Most likely to mean Fatherless. Although the typed version of this abbreviation gives the impression it would indicate Friendless, it has to be said that superscript abbreviations are used throughout the registers, the word father for example is in most cases shortened to F, and the information Friess, though the writing is often not clear enough, is more likely to say Fless. The cases of Friess boys with mothers recorded support this interpretation (for example MS-nos. 2754, 2824, close to them are other boys recorded as Fr4less). However, there is also one returnee (MS-nos. 2262, 3720), who is first recorded as Friendless and the second time as Friess, and one boy on a loose paper in January 1758 suggesting it means Friendless. This study has interpreted Friess as Fatherless.
• *Mother*: In this analysis assumed to be fatherless.
• Name of the father, recorded as surname followed by forename (for later period, no conclusion about mother). For the few cases where the name of the mother is given I have recorded just mother and entered the name under Additional Information.
• *P*: (only two cases) Probably indicating that there are no parents, but the boy is not friendless. According to the column-heading for MS-nos. 3730 to 3744, P stands for Parentless; however, it does not occur under this column heading. The only two P’s occur shortly afterwards, when the column heading reads Parents or Friendless, and the information entered are either F or P. Thus there is a slight doubt over this interpretation. For this analysis these two cases have been left out.
• *Parents run away*
• *Parish boy* (no conclusions about parents, but in my analysis assumed to be friendless)
Never used, although it is defined in the row for MS-no. 1097 where it says F if fatherless, R if fatherless.

Run Away: only for MS-no. 4533 and entered under the column Parents Name, If dead...D, presumably indicating that father and mother had run away. It is possible that the registrar did not always distinguish properly between 'fatherless' and 'friendless'. One also has to expect that many boys had lost contact with their parents and simply were not sure if they were alive.

The next column of the database gives information about the trade of the parents. Again the column headings in the original source vary over the years, and they are compressed in this database into one column (they can be separated again with the help of the MS-nos.). From MS-nos. 1 to 184 it is Trade of Parents; between MS-nos. 184 and 764 there is no heading; between MS-nos. 765 and 780 the profession is recorded under the Parents-column; between MS-nos. 781 and 2853 is a long period with no heading; from MS-no. 2854 to 2870 it is called Business; from 2871 to 2886 Fathers Trade; and from MS-no. 2887 to the end Parents Trade. The original spelling has been kept even if it differed from case to case, thus one has Gardiner, Gardener or Gardner, and Labourer, Laborer or even Lab'. Occasionally the proverb was indicates that the father has died, retired or gone missing. The spelling of occupational titles which consist of two individual words put together, is problematic, as they are sometimes written separated, sometimes connected with a dash, and sometimes written together but with the second word often starting with a capital letter (Bailmaker, Shoe-maker, Button Maker and BasketMaker). If there was a capital letter then the occupation was usually transcribed in two separate words. All trades recorded appear to be the occupations of the boys' fathers; in the few cases at the end where the mother's occupation is given I have entered this under Additional Information. Blanks are left as blanks – where the

---

9 For MS-nos. 2854 to 2870 it could be that the trades of the fatherless boys refer to the boys' previous occupations.
column regarding the parents is left blank too, it seems safe to assume that the
information was merely not recorded; for *Fatherless* and *Friendless* boys it makes sense
that no trade is recorded; while those cases where a father is recorded but no profession
are open to interpretation whether this indicates that the father had no profession, or
whether the boy did not know, or whether the clerk did not or could not (applications by
letter) ask the boy.

The next column gives information about the places the boys came from. Again the
original column headings vary over the years; they are compressed in this database into
one column, but with the help of the MS-nos. they can be separated again. From MS-no.
1 to 184 it is called *Place of Abode*; from MS-no. 185 to 764 there is no heading; from
MS-no. 765 to 780 it is *Country or Parish*; from 781 to 2853 there is again no heading;
from MS-no. 2854 to 3974 it is *What Parish or Street belongs to*; from 3975 to 4511 of
*what Parish & Street*; and from MS-no. 4512 to the end it is under *Parents – Parish
and/or Street*.

The main reason for noting down a place was to have a contact address, ‘so that the
boys may be traced out, in case they run away, in order to acquaint their Captain that he
may send for them and punish them as is necessary on many occasions.’ In that sense
one would expect the places entered here to be the address of the boy’s last home or of
some responsible adult connected to him. There are a few cases such as *Born at Sea* or
boys from Ireland (not those being sent in a big group from Ireland or Scotland, but the
individual ones), where it appears that the information recorded is the place of birth
rather than the latest address. Non-standardised spelling is again a problem, thus we find
in the East End of London *Whitechap(p)le, White Chaple, White Chapple, White
Chappel*, or *White Chappell* in all variations; also *Spittlefields, Spittle Fields,*

---

10 MSY/A/1, 14/09/1758.
Spittalfields, or Spittal Fields; and Bethnell Green, Bethnall Green, Bethnelgreen, or Bednal Green. Furthermore, there are Holbo(u)rn(e); Debiford and Deptford; Gloucester(shire), Glocestershire and Glostershire; or Kirc(h)aldy and Kilcaldie. All were transcribed as they were recorded and not standardised. As with the trades there is the problem of names being often separated, such as Shore Ditch and Shoreditch; Christ Church and Christchurch; or East Bourne; and also Bricklane as one word. Another area where the spelling becomes slightly irregular is the omitting of apostrophes or second ‘s’ – again, in general the original spelling and diversity of St Giles, St Giless, St Giles’s; St James and St James’s; and St Ann’s or St Anns was kept. The abbreviation St for Saint was left, but St for Street was spelled out. Other abbreviations where usually kept (unless entirely sure even about how the clerk would have spelled it out), that is as St Geo., Berks, Bucks, Herts, Wilts, or 7 Dials, White/Red X Street etc. Any computer-analysis should also be aware of further specifications of the place, e.g. there are boys from St Giles near Colchester, St James Colchester, or St Marys Colchester. If the boy’s father was at sea this was sometimes recorded under places of abode and sometimes under the trades’ column – in the first case the information has been entered under both columns in the database (so that a computer-analysis gets all sailing fathers), in the second case the place-column was left blank if no other place was entered. All blanks were left as blanks. As most blanks appear in clusters, and are accompanied by blanks in the other columns about the boy’s background, they seem to indicate that the clerk merely did not or could not record anything, rather than suggesting that there was no home. What makes any statistical analysis difficult is the differing quality of the information: While the London boys usually have the parish, and sometimes even the street recorded, the others usually only have the town or even just the county.

The next three columns are closely linked: from the start the registrar occasionally recorded by whom the boy was brought, sent or recommended, though initially no
proper column existed for this information. In the computer database three separate columns were opened to transcribe this information; I have kept them separate because I do think the words could make a difference, even though the registrar in the later period does not appear to have been too concerned about differentiating between them. The verbs brought, sent and recommended have been omitted at this stage, in order to make an analysis easier, as they are obvious because of the heading. From MS-no. 2854 onwards a column was introduced in the original registers with the heading 'By whom brought', and from that point on the computer database merges the three separate columns into this one, in which the verbs brought, sent or recommended are kept. From MS-no. 3294 to 3729 it is called By whom brought or sent; from MS-no. 3730 to 3974 it is called By whom brought or recommended; from MS-no. 3975 to 4511 it changes to By whom recommended; from MS-no. 4512 to 4700 (incl. the boy with no MS-no.) it merges with a part of the parents-column to By whom recommended, (if) Friendless...F (the F-information is transcribed into the database under the parents-column). There is again no column for it between MS-nos. 4701 and 4719; and from MS-no. 4720 to the end it is again called By whom recommended, Friendless...F (F-information goes under parents-column in database). Chapter four delivers sufficient examples that a blank in these columns does not necessarily mean that the boy came on his own, or had not been sent by somebody.

The now following columns do not exist in the original documents, they have been created for any extra information. The first marks those boys that were trained to play the Fife. Usually the term Fife(r) is noted behind the boy's name. At one point the registrar started to count them and to note the number in brackets behind the name, but the counting does not go until the end, and the registrar's count is also marred by five-

---

11 It appears that at the beginning the Society primarily took care to note the 'senders' when dealing with boys under the age of fourteen and with no relative responsible for them.
boys being irregularly entered twice in the registers. Boys that are recorded as being sent to Westminster or W. are marked as probably/perhaps Fife-trainee in the database, assuming they were sent to the house in Tothill Fields, where the fife-boys were lodged and trained. Boys sent to Fife were interpreted as Fife-trainee. The boy with the F behind his name and stature is recorded with Fifer?.

The next column is for the thin ticks, which appear in front of the boys' names in the first year of the Society's existence. Their meaning is nowhere defined; it might indicate that the boy has received his clothing, or has arrived safely at the ship. To interpret the big clusters of blanks does not seem advisable, as it looks more like a carelessness of the registrar, the blanks which appear in smaller groups or alone may be interpreted, though because the ticks are so thin and easy to forget one should be very careful with giving any meaning to these blanks.

Under the column Additional Information the database records any additional information the original source gives at any point, which did not fit into one of the other columns. There are many little treasures in here, such as information about the boys previous apprenticeship. The abbreviation h.c. appears frequently when boys have been sent to the fife training house or to a tender, and is most likely to stand for 'has clothing'. The column data-entry-comments gives any assumptions and explanations, in particular if I was not entirely sure about the way I entered the information.

The subsequent columns are the result of interpretations and categorisations made, and are designed to aid a computer analysis of the database. First, to solve the problem of double-counted boys two additional columns were introduced which indicate which boys are suspected to be one and the same, and whether they were probably counted twice, or if they appear to have applied for a second time to the Society after having already been at sea. Admittedly, in an ideal database those double-counted boys would not have two different UID's, and should be merged to one; there remains, however, an
element of speculation about the boys being identical, and there is also the problem that their background information differs occasionally (e.g. for a returnee it is only natural that his age is higher at the second entry). Hence I have left them separate, so that no data is lost. Cases where I was not entirely sure are marked with a question mark (and an exclamation mark, so that the Edit/Find-function of Microsoft Excel notices the cell).

Under **Research-Remarks about Career & Background** other sources or information I came across mentioning the particular boy are given, and those whose careers have been sampled are indicated. The final columns show how each father's **occupational title**, and each boy's **home** were categorised for this study. Admittedly, some occupations would have deserved more thorough research before being classified, yet especially when they were named just once, time-considerations allowed only limited research. The separation of the recorded addresses in **Inland, or at/near Coast** is the result of a rough check, and the example of London illustrates that the existence of rivers requires a much more sophisticated analysis. Floud, Wachter, and Gregory's differentiation in rural and urban areas is taken from their study *Height, Health, and History* (1990), (pp. 131-132).  

---

12 Their differentiation has been designed to suit eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Britain, hence the categories are not ideal for this database, as they are influenced by the changes caused by Industrialisation. Floud, Wachter, and Gregory have used the county borders prior to the changes in the late twentieth century; and Surrey, Kent, Middlesex, and Essex are all included in London. English rural are: Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Somerset, Gloucestershire, Sussex, Hampshire, Berkshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, Hereford, Cardigan, Brecknock, Radnor, Montgomery, Flint, Denbigh, Merioneth, Caernarvon, Anglesey, Rutland, Lincoln, Yorkshire (East Riding), Yorkshire (North Riding), Cumberland, Westmorland. English urban are: Monmouth, Glamorgan, Carmarthen, Pembroke, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Cheshire, Lancashire, York (West Riding), Durham, Northumberland.
APPENDIX II:

Sampled Careers of Marine-Society Boys: Overview

Appendix II.1. All three Sample Sets together

Total of all three samples: 262 Boys

Did not appear at first recorded ship: 26 Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked</th>
<th>Ship captured</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Unserviceable</th>
<th>For being Apprentice</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
<th>Boys left at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II.2. ‘Systematic’ Sample Set (+ first group of the yearly set)

Total of careers: 137 Boys (+32)
Did not appear at first recorded ship: 11 Boys (+1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Unserviceable</th>
<th>For being an Apprentice</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
<th>Boys left at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>37 (+9)</td>
<td>9 (+1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 (+21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>12 (+1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49 (+20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>10 (+1)</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (+15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4 (+2)</td>
<td>(+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (+6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (+3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (+1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>64 (+15)</td>
<td>12 (+4)</td>
<td>3 (+3)</td>
<td>8 (+2)</td>
<td>21 (+6)</td>
<td>13 (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix II.3. Yearly Sample Set

Total of careers: 107 Boys
Did not appear at first recorded ship: 5 Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked</th>
<th>Ship captured</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
<th>Number of Boys left at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II.4. Set of Individual Careers

Total of careers: 18 Boys
Did not appear at first recorded ship: 10 Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship captured</th>
<th>Ship paid off</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
<th>Boys left at End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix II.5. Sampled Careers excluding those rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked or captured</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Unserviceable</th>
<th>For being Apprentice</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix II.6. Sampled Careers of Ratings only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Service</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked or captured</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix II.7. Sampled Careers of Ratings only

(counting the year of the rating as the first)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Destination unknown</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Desertion</th>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Ship wrecked or captured</th>
<th>Crew paid off</th>
<th>Returned to Marine Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE:

Individual Careers of Sampled Marine-Society Boys

This appendix lists all 262 sampled Marine-Society boys, sorted in alphabetical order (whenever the spelling of the boys’ names differed grossly to the Marine Society’s registers both version are given). The table’s individual columns are the following:

**Group Code:** Indicates as part of which sample set, and as part of which group within that sample set, the boy was selected. SS stands for the (almost) systematic sample; YS for the yearly October sample groups; and IS for the individual samples (YS.1 serves also as SS.1).

**Number in MSY/H/1&2:** The recruit’s number in the Marine Society’s registers.

**Length of Service:** Arrival- and leaving dates are taken from what was entered in the Navy’s muster book for the boy, or for the recruits immediately before him.

**Quality:** Mustered quality:

- ab = Able Seaman
- boy = Boys kept as supernumeraries without a master
- bs = Boatswain’s Servant
- cc = Captain’s Clerk
- chs = Chaplain’s Servant
- cks = Cook’s Servant
- cos = Commander’s Servant
- cps = Carpenter’s Servant
- cs = Captain’s Servant
- gs = Gunner’s Servant
- lm = Landman
- ls = Lieutenant’s Servant (+rank)
- mid = Midshipman
- ms = Master’s Servant
- ordy = Ordinary Seaman
- ps = Purser’s Servant
- SN = Supernumerary/in connection with other quality
- ss = Surgeon’s Servant
Ship: Stations where the boys were mustered. Intermediate stations are often ignored by the muster books, they sometimes become only apparent through the whence-column, thus also in this table they are in most cases not listed. Ships the boys were lent to are listed under References.

Discharge: Reason for discharge from the quality, and whether the boy left the ship with or without his master. When the ship was wrecked or captured there is the slight possibility that the boys had been lucky enough to leave the ship shortly before it happened, as the latest ship books are not preserved.

References: Document references of the Public Record Office in Kew, London. Only those references are given that are necessary to follow the boy’s career and that give the most detailed information. Most references are from ADM 36, the ships muster books, while documents from ADM 33 (pay books), as well as ADM 1 (captains’ letters), ADM 6 (warrant books), ADM 25 (half pay lists), ADM 51 (captains’ logs), ADM 102/374 (Haslar’s deaths list), and Adm L (lieutenant’s logs held at the National Maritime Museum) are only included if they provided, or were expected to provide, further information. The numerous sources that have been checked unsuccessfully when a servant was lost out of sight are not listed. Additionally, there are occasional comments recorded under References, when for example the muster alphabets show that a boy has been absent (ticked) or sick before the discharge, or when individual muster lists give a wrong information.2

---

1 A list of all the seamen who died at Haslar Hospital between 1755 and 1765. Note: William Woolmore, whose ship’s muster records him as having died at Haslar Hospital, does not appear on this list. Furthermore, the list is not exactly chronological, and some death-dates do not conform with the muster books. The list also has an odd way of counting: from August 1755 until November 1762 it counts 2,100 deaths, but from then on the next three hundred deaths are not counted as 2,100, 2,200 and 2,300, but as 3,000 and 4,000 and 5,000. The last death has number 5,045, which in fact is the 2,345st name.

2 However, not all errors in the muster lists are mentioned, as they are too many, which in a way underlines once more the lack of concern for the careers of servants. One muster book of the Union, for example, declares that the servant Joseph Coleman had died in June 1757, in the Union’s next book, however, Joseph is back among the living and discharged due to Request in August 1757, while being once again declared dead in an overlapping book for the same period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in MSY/N/182</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>801</td>
<td><strong>Allen, William</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4</td>
<td>3601</td>
<td><strong>Andersy / Andrews, Richard</strong></td>
<td>(08/10/1759) - 20/01/1763</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td><strong>Ascon / Axter, William</strong></td>
<td>09/09/1757 - 26/10/1757</td>
<td>bs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/05/1758</td>
<td>gs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firedrake</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The gunner deserted at Portsmouth &amp; never arrived on board the Firedrake. Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>187</td>
<td><strong>Ashman, Samuel</strong></td>
<td>(29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/09/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 26/03/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4764</td>
<td><strong>Avery, Phillip</strong></td>
<td>(01/04/1762) - 08/12/1762</td>
<td>cks</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3.</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td><strong>Bailey, Peter</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Hawke</strong></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, pp.9, 49, no.199.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(16/10/1758) - 29/12/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hawke</strong></td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p.79, no.87 &amp; p.192, no 61 (occasionally mustered as cos).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 07/09/1759</td>
<td>cs(cos)</td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 35/5311, p 2, no no. &amp; p.27, no 16 (initially meant to go with captain to Success).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 19/12/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 35/5311, p 48, no 126 &amp; p 219, no 139 (wrong year of discharge) &amp; p.255, no.139.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10/02/1761</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>ADM 36/5311, pp.222, 258, no.198, ADM 36/5312, p 10, no no &amp; p.139, no.198.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/05/1762</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>No more books. Crew perhaps paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5312, p. 233, no. 198; ADM 33/633 (1763), no p, no.198, ADM 51/188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/06/1762 - Feb 1763</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3.</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td><strong>Bale/Bayles, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>cps</td>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>Carpenter died</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp 2, 143, no.17; ADM 36/6684, p.205, no.17; ADM 36/6685, p.88, no.17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 04/1757 - 04/03/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6685, p.110, no. 17 &amp; p. 240, no. 7. ADM 36/6686, p.185, no. 4; ADM 36/6687, p.171, no. 4. ADM 36 6688, p. 3, no. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10 03/1762</td>
<td>cps</td>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3463</td>
<td><strong>Bateman, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Royal Ann</strong></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4969, p.30, no.1021; ADM 36/4997, p 11, no no ; ADM 36/4999, p.17, no 1021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1759 - 29/10/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Royal Ann</strong></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>723</td>
<td><strong>Batsford, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Ramines</strong></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2164; ADM 36/6466, p 222, no.1091 (lant in between); ADM 36 6467, p.251, no 1091.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 25/02/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ramines</strong></td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6467, p.260, no no. &amp; p.290, no.1410, ADM 36/6468, p.289, no.1410; ADM 36/6469, p 266, no.502; ADM 36/6470, p.229, no.399 (not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5.</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>Batten, William</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.5, 212, no.95; ADM 36/4927, p.201, no.95; ADM 36/4928, p.207, no.95, ADM 36/4929, p.199, no 95 (captain leaves as well).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foudroyant</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5635, p.196, no.25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>Belwin, Joseph</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no 2213; ADM 36/6466, p.224, no 1140 (lent in between), ADM 36/6467, p 285, no.1140.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4.</td>
<td>3598</td>
<td>Benson, Ben</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp.21, 134, no.1474, MS-no 3958, also Ben Benson, seems to suggest that Ben reappears in July in the MS registers, now serving on the Pelican. However, the Pelican's muster lists show that this second Ben Benson had already been on board that ship since 14/02/1760 (ADM 36 6337, p 88, no 101), hence it is unlikely that the two are identical.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS.1)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Berwick, Thomas</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 58, no.60; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no.22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no.737; ADM 36/6219, p.150, no 737, ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5014 (lent to Royal Sovereign)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>Betts, William (24/01/1758) - 17/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>(In Marine Society's registers as going to the Princess Amelia, where he never appeared - see ADM 36/4867); ADM 36/6231, p.223, no.1108, ADM 36/6230, p 23, no 1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4129</td>
<td>Bird, William 20/10/1760 - 08/09/1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp 13, 214, no.201; ADM 36/6914, p 193, no.201; ADM 36/6915, p 11, no 201 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/05/1763</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p 312, no.771; ADM 51/243, 13/05/1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>Bird, Richard (19 03/1757) - 25/09/1759</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 104, no 2176; ADM 36/6466, p 222, no 1103 (lent); ADM 36/6457, p 251, no 1103; ADM 36/6468, p 277, no.1103; ADM 36/6469, p 259, no.349, ADM 36/6470, p.143, no.294 (lent before left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4760</td>
<td>Blake, Robert (01/04/1762) - 17/11/1762</td>
<td>bs</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 172, no 618.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Brewer, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS1)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Brian / O'Brien, Nicholas</td>
<td>29/10/1756 - 05/08/1757 cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.3, 58, no 48, ADM 36/6944, p.213, no 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/03/1758 cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.100, no 728.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/12/1758 ab</td>
<td>Zephyr</td>
<td>Run (North Carolina)</td>
<td>ADM 36/7099, pp.10, 30, no 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>Brian(t), T John / Thomas</td>
<td>(28/05/1757) - 27/04/1758 bs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.6, 154, no.111; ADM 36/6684, p 58, no 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>Brown, William</td>
<td>27/02/1758 - 12/09/1758 ss</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p.225, no.1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>Bull, Jos</td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 25/02/1758 cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.103, no 2154; ADM 36/6466, p 221, no 1081 (sick in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no.1081.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in</td>
<td>Name &amp;</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.7</td>
<td>4144</td>
<td>20/11/1760 - 27/03/1761 chs</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5470, p.279, no.466.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 09/06/1762 cs</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5470, p.284, no 583; ADM 36/5471, p 278, no.583; ADM 36/5472, p.301, no 583.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/06/1762 ordy(SN)</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5472, p.115, no 95.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 25/01/1763 ab</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6389, p.221, no 1511; ADM 36/6390, p 130, no 1511 (lent at the end, but ship not named); ADM 33/618, p.49, no.1511, ADM 51/722, 25/01/1763 .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td>14/06/1762 - 25/08/1762 cs</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.180, no.843 (wrongly recorded as having left with master).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26/08/1762) - 19/07/1763 cos</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.181, no.867, ADM 36/6185, p.155, no.867, ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>(24/06/1757) - 29/10/1757 ls(1st)</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.17, no.151 &amp; p 89, no no (sick for some time, servant to a wounded lieutenant).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2753</td>
<td>(11/08/1758) - 28/04/1759 gs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.5, 169, no 96; ADM 33/545 (06/1759), p 4, no.97.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td>(06/08/1759) - 12/08/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.252, no 1005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 26/08/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Foudroyant</td>
<td>Haslar Hospital</td>
<td>ADM 36/5635, p.196, no 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 28 02/1761 cs</td>
<td>Magnanime</td>
<td>Death (at Haslar)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6108, p.333, no.1177, ADM 36/6109, p 284, no 1177; ADM 36/6110, p.199, no.1177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/02/1761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 102/374, no. 1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>Campbell, Samuel</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.3, 146, no.38; ADM 36 6684, p 164, no 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29/04/1757) - 13/09/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17/09/1759) - 26/10/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p 216, no 219.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- date uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6109, p.284, no 1187.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 01/02/1760</td>
<td>Magnanime</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22/10/1759) - 20/01/1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Returned to Marine Society, which sponsored an apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with a Watch Spring Maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Carpenter, John</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2173, ADM 36/6466, p 222, no 1100 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no.1100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19/03/1757) - 25/02/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6467, p.260, no no.; ADM 36 6468, p 56, no 1412.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26/03/1758 - 14/06/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6468, pp.63, 296, no.1590; ADM 36/6469, p 212, no 1590.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haslar Hospital</td>
<td>ADM 36/6469, p.217, no.1705; p.278, no.783; ADM 36/6470, p.234, no.609 (not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/06/1758 - 09/01/1759</td>
<td>cks</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 15/02/1760</td>
<td>cks</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H 1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>Champ(s), Thomas (12/03/1757) - 25 02/1758 cs Ramilies</td>
<td>With master (presumably)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 103, no 2160; ADM 36/6465, p 221, no 1087 (lent in between); ADM 36 6467, p 251, no 1087. ADM 36/6536, p 185, no.1047; ADM 36/6537, p.231, no 1047; ADM 33/559, p.31, no.1047. ADM 36/6809, p.249, no 570; ADM 36/6810, p.224, no 560 (in between discharged due to sickness); ADM 36 6811, p 52, no 560. ADM 36/6903, p.245, no 409; ADM 36/6904, p 226, no 409. ADM 36/6905, p 222, no 409; ADM 36/6906, p 188, no 409; ADM 51/991, 04/03/1763.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>Chapman, John (06/08/1759) - 08/11/1759 boy Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6469, p 252, no 1011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(as&amp;SN) Norwich</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6202, p 282, no.12; ADM 36/6203, p 241, no.12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3467</td>
<td>Chapman, Thomas</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.252, no.1010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6202, p.282, no.11, ADM 36/6203, p.241, no.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Clark, Thomas</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Rambles</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no 2214; ADM 36/6466 (lent in between), p.224, no.1141; ADM 36/6467, p 285, no.1141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.6.</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>Clark, Thomas</td>
<td>boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.250, no.967 (entry-date uncertain) Note: Clark presumably only held here for Danae. ADM 36/5451, pp. 2, 239, no.23; ADM 36/5452, p. 209, no 23; ADM 36/5453, p.245, no.23. ADM 36/5453, p.297, no.530; ADM 51/226, 29/09/1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July Aug 1759-13/09/1759</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>Danae</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/5453, p.297, no.530; ADM 51/226, 29/09/1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5.</td>
<td>4130</td>
<td>Clarke, Abraham</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp 15, 55, no 249; ADM 33/689 (08/1759), p 12, no.249.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27/10/1760) - 30/01/1761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5.</td>
<td>4135</td>
<td>Clarke, John</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36 6913, pp.3, 205, no.9; ADM 36/6914, p 184, no 9; ADM 36/6915, p.107, no.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17/10/1760) - 17/11/1762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5.</td>
<td>4132</td>
<td>Clarke, Joseph</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Sickness Haslar Hospital</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, p.15, 216, no 251; ADM 33/689 (08/1763), p.12, no 251. ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(27/10/1760) - 11/04/1761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in Code</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1759 - 15/09/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.31, no.1033; ADM 36/4997, p 11, no no.; ADM 36/4999, p 18, no.1033; ADM 36/4998, p 111, no 1033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 27/06/1760 cs</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Cobby, Thomas (SS 1)</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 5, 60, no.80, ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(06/11/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6940, p.20, no no..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no 744; ADM 36/6219, p.151, no 744; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no 5020 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758 cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p.120, no 1185.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/11/1759 cs</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>Colborn, Ben</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 105, no.2183; ADM 36/6465, p 103, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/03/1757 - 03/07/1757 as</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.108, no no. (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.254, no 1234.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/07/1757 - 25/02/1758 cs</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5536, p 185, no.1044.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/07/1758 cs</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5536, p.192, no 1209; ADM 36/5537, p 238, no 1209; ADM 33/559, p.38, no 1209.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/08/1758 - 24/01/1759 ordy</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/8809, p 248, no 549, ADM 36/6810, p.215, no 394, ADM 36/8811, p.44, no 394 (sick since 03/03/1760), ADM 33/591, p.23, no 549.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 02/04/1760 ordy</td>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/05/1760 - 31/03/1761 ordy</td>
<td>Thunderer</td>
<td>Rochester Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/04/1761 - 04/03/1763 ab</td>
<td>Thunderer</td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6904, p.20, no.457 &amp; p 228, no 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Coleman, Joseph (SS 1)</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Death (drowned)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.5, 60, no 81; ADM 36/6945, p.44, no 81; ADM 36/6946, p.5, no 81.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS.1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Collins, John (SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29/10/1756 - 05/08/1757)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp. 4, 58, no.52; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 (SN)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no.730; ADM 36/6219, p 150, no.730, ADM 36/6791, p.445, no.5007 (lent to Royal Sovereign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/03/1760 - 20/06/1760 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4946, p.12, no 240 (a very late return, hence unsure if identical boy, but captain appears keen to hold on to his group of servants, he also waited for George Norris to return from Harwich).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 02/12/1762 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>Ship laid up &amp; crew turned over to Terrible, but not John. Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/5157, p.124, no.817; ADM 36/5159, p.299, no.821, ADM 36/6184, p.193, no.71; ADM 1/1835, 22/10 1762 (in between lent to Nightingale while captain on leave).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>Collins, Michael (20/10/1760)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.13, 214, no 205; ADM 36/6914, p 193, no 205; ADM 36/6915, p.313, no 780 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/05/1763 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.312, no.773, ADM 51/243, 13/05 1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3452</td>
<td>Collier, Thomas (31/07/1759) boy(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.250, no.975.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 12/03/1761 cps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repulse</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6526, p.230, no.68, ADM 36/6527, p 210, no 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Nov 1762 cps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Falkland</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5579, p.299, no.746; ADM 36/5580, pp 283, 328, no 746 (no captain's log).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4455</td>
<td>Conway, James (02/01/1762)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp 272, 304, no.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 12/03/1762 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/6388 (captain arrived without James)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4451</td>
<td>Cook, John (02/01/1762) - 12/03/1762 cs Minerva</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp.272, 304, no.549.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6388 (captain arrived without John).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Cook, Richard (29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.3, 58, no.49; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 1) 06 08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN) Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6218 (captain arrived without Richard).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4756</td>
<td>Cooper, Edward (06 09/1762) - 19/07/1763 cs Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 182, no 890; ADM 36/6185, p 156, no.890.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Connerton, William Southamton</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp 21, 134, no 1476 (in 1757, the Preston had a captain's servant with the same name, who left in March with no destination recorded, see ADM 36 6365, p 224, no 87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS. 4</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>Cowderoy / Gordrey / Goddrey / Cowdrey, William (08/10/1759) - 29/02/1760 cs Swiftnsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5026, p.185, no.469, ADM 36/5028, p.180, no 516.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reappears in Manne Society's registers: 18/04/1760 - 22/08/1761 cs Bedford Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Cox, William (06/11/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 59, no.74; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no 27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 1) 06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN) Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p 20, no no (sick since 26/08/1757).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>Coxhill, John, ab Southampton 10/05/1757 - 17/07/1757</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.5, 51, no.70 (no pay book).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5.</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>Crampton, James cs Temeraire 20/10/1760 - 08/09/1762</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.13, 214, no.209; ADM 36/6914, p.193, no.209; ADM 36/6915, p.11, no.209 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/05/1763 cs Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.313, no.779; ADM 51/243, 13/05 1763.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3.</td>
<td>2859</td>
<td>Crewley, Jacob cps Hawke 16/10/1758 - 27/10/1759</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p.10, no.202, p 204, no.56 (carpenter sick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3796 Reappears in Marine Society's registers: Sutherland</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6726.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3932 Reappears again in Marine Society's registers: Centaur</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/5226, p.41, no 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>Dallen / Doublan, Richard cs Families 12/03/1757 - 03/06/1757</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2169; ADM 36/6466, p 102, no no..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/06/1757 as Families</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.107, no no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/06/1757</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6.</td>
<td>4453</td>
<td>Davis, Edward cs Minerva 02/01/1762 - 12/03/1762</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp 272, 304, no.551. ADM 36/6388, p. 219, no. 1017; ADM 36 6389, p 200, no 1017; ADM 36/6390, p. 111, no. 1017; ADM 51/722, 25/01/1763.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 25/01/1763 cs Prince</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4128</td>
<td>Davis, Joseph (20/10/1760) - 08/09/1762 cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.12, 213, no.198; ADM 36 6914, p.192, no.198; ADM 36/6915, p.10, no.198 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/05/1763 cs Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.312, no 770; ADM 51/243, 13/05/1763.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>Davis, William 02/06/1757 - 22/02/1758 bs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p 7, no.119 &amp; p 126, no no. (sick since 08/1757).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>4027</td>
<td>Dent, Zebulon 07/08/1760 - 26/08/1760 cs</td>
<td>Seahorse</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5515, p 8, no.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4200</td>
<td>Reappears in Marine Society's registers: 01/01/1761 - 18/04/1762 cs</td>
<td>Superbe</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6776, p 237, no.376, ADM 36/6777, p.257, no 376, ADM 36/6778, p.106, no.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Dicey, John (20/04/1757) - 04/03/1759 cps</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Carpenter died</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p 2, no.18 &amp; p 144, no.18, ADM 36 6684, p 205, no.18; ADM 36/6685, p.68, no 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>Dore, Ed (03/06/1757) - 17/07/1759 gs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.7, 54, no.125; ADM 36 6684, p 211, no 125, ADM 36/6685, p 69, no.125 &amp; p 241, no.27 (sick in between) ADM 36 6685, p 249, no.81; ADM 36/6686, p 193, no.126, ADM 36/6687, p 174, no.126; ADM 36/6688, p.120, no 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/07/1759 - 26/11/1762 ab</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Run (at Plymouth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix III cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4118</td>
<td>Dowles, James (20/10/1760) - 08/09/1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp 13, 214, no.202; ADM 36 6914, p 193, no.202; ADM 36/6915, p 11, no 202 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign, meant to go to the Devonshire with captain). ADM 36/5433.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>Downe / Downs, Thomas 10/10/1758 - Nov. 1759 Is(1st)</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td>Ship captured</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, pp 9, 48, no.195.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>Doyle, Dennis (29/08/1762) - 19/07/1763</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 181, no 872; ADM 36/6185, p 155, no 872, ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>Drake, William (15 04/1757) - 31/07/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramines</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 107, no 2227; ADM 36/6466, p 105, no no. &amp; p 225, no 1154 (lent for last musters). ADM 36/6466, p.109, no no. &amp; p 230, no.1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/08/1757 - 14/09/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramines</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>Death (killed by a fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/09 1757 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2853</td>
<td>Drew, James (16 10/1758) - 25/05/1759</td>
<td>bs</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, pp 10, 131, no 204 (already absent since 03/1759).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2852</td>
<td>Drew, John (16/10/1758) - 18/07/1759</td>
<td>bs</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p.10, no 203 &amp; p 114, no.88 &amp; p 205, no 57 (already absent since 03/1759))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in Code</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Ease / Hayes, Nath'</td>
<td>(29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 58, no.59; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no.21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05 09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758 cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no 736; ADM 36/6219, p.150, no.736, ADM 36/6791, p.446, no 5013 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 08/06/1759 cs</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p 120, no 1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Elwin(s), Thomas</td>
<td>29 10/1756 - 17/12/1756 cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p.4, no.51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Evans, William</td>
<td>(12/05/1757) - 11/04/1760 cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.5, 150, no.79; ADM 36 6684, p.208, no.79; ADM 36 6685, p.69, no.79 &amp; p.240, no 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Eversen, John</td>
<td>(28 04/1757) - 05 07 1757 ms</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp 3, 22, no 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Fegus, Josiah / Flgey, Joseph</td>
<td>29/10/1756 - 05 08/1757 cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 59, no 61; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05 09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/09/1757 - 31/10/1758 cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no 738; ADM 36/6219, p.150, no 738; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no 5015 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/11/1758 - 20/01/1759 cs</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Death (sea)</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p.120, no 1182.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>Flink/Flinch, William</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilias</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19/03/1757) - 31/07/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilias</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4/125</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Florence, Richard</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Florence, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20/10/1760) - 09/09/1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>28/69</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Flowers, George</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>Flowers, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10/10/1760) - 23/01/1759</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>Flowers, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ss(SW)</td>
<td>Flowers, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4/122</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Foot &amp; Samuel George</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Foot &amp; Samuel George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20/10/1760) - 09/04/1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/L &amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>Furrow, Sam</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2167; ADM 36/6466, p.222, no.1094 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no clear no. ADM 36/5536, p.184, no.1041. ADM 36/5536, p.192, no.1208; ADM 36/5537, p.238, no 1208, ADM 33/559, p.38, no 1208.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13/03/1757) - 25/02/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/07/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 03/12/1758</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(at sea &amp; killed by a fail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.4</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>Garrett, John / Garrath, James</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Death (Spithead)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p 223, no 1105; ADM 36/6230, p 109, no 1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(24.01/1758) - 28.02/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 14/09/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/08/1757</td>
<td>boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 22/10/1758</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>Infernal Bomb</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>08/10/1762 - 19/07/1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>Gishner alias Guichenon / Gishnow, James</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.103, no.2157; ADM 36/6466, p 101, no no. ADM 36/6466, p 107, no no &amp; p 227, no 1207 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 254, no 1207; ADM 36/6468, p 281, no.1207; ADM 36/6469, p 281, no.389, ADM 36/6470, p 226, no.324 (not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 03/05/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 15/02/1760</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>710</td>
<td><strong>Glover, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Ramiel</strong></td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.103, no.2156, ADM 36/6466, p 101, no no. ADM 36/6466, p.227, no.1199 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.253, no.1199 (sick since 22/12/1757).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 03/06/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/06/1757 - 20/01/1758</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/02/1758 - 31/12/1758</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6467, pp.259, 290, no.1397; ADM 36/6468, p 288, no 1397; ADM 36/6469, p.204, no 1397, ADM 33/585 (01/05/1758-31/10/1758), no p., no. 490. ADM 36/6469, p.204, no 1397 &amp; p.266, no.490, ADM 36/6470, p.228, no.389; ADM 33/585 (01/11/1758-01/05/1759), no p., no.389 (in between lent to Colchester; not on list of saved men, but wages paid on 15/03/1760 to party).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/01/1759 - 15/02/1760</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.5</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td><strong>Goodsell / Goodsworth / Goodall, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>ps</td>
<td><strong>Adventure</strong></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.5, 170, no 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 08/1758 - 28/04/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1.</td>
<td>213</td>
<td><strong>Goodman, John</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Union</strong></td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 59, no.75; ADM 36/6944, p.214, no.28. ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(05/11/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Norwich</strong></td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/03/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Neptune</strong></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.100, no 742.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/12/1758</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td><strong>Zephyr</strong></td>
<td>Run</td>
<td>ADM 36/7099, pp 10, 30, no 41. (North Carolina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>725</td>
<td><strong>Gore, Richard</strong></td>
<td>as</td>
<td><strong>Ramiel</strong></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 28/03/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>Go(wh)ding, John</td>
<td>(15/04/1757) - 12/03/1758 as Families</td>
<td>Sickness Haslar Hospital</td>
<td>01/03/1758 Death (at Haslar)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no 2215; ADM 36/6466, p 224, no 1142 (lent in between), ADM 36/6467, p 252, no 1142, ADM 36/6468, p.45, no.1142. ADM 102/374, no.1173 (wrong date, but name &amp; ship match).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Grey, James</td>
<td>(19/03/1757) - 31/07/1757 as Families</td>
<td>Change of officer</td>
<td>- 14/08/1757 cs Families Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2193, ADM 36/6466, p 103, no no &amp; p.223, no 1120 (lent in between) ADM 36/6466, p.109, no no. &amp; p.229, no 1258. ADM 36/4988, p.184, no.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>Grey, Francis</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Haines, Robert (12/03/1757) - 28/01/1758 cs Ramilies Sickness Haslar Hospital ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2165; ADM 36/6466, p 222, no 1092 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 251, no 1092; ADM 36/6468, p.43, no.1092 (sick since 24/12/1757); ADM 33/580, p.46, no 1092 (reason: Sickness &amp; Request). ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>Hele, Will 27/10/1760 - 08/09/1762 cs Temeraire With master ADM 36/6913, pp 15, 216, no.248, ADM 36/6914, p 195, no.248; ADM 36/6915, p.13, no.248 (in between lent to Royal Soverign). ADM 36/5433, p.312, no.775; ADM 51/243, 13/05/1763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4131</td>
<td>Hall, John (27/10/1760) - 08/09/1762 cs Temeraire With master ADM 36/6913, pp 15, 216, no 250; ADM 36/6914, p 195, no 250; ADM 36/6915, p.13, no.250. ADM 36/5433, pp 100, 258, no 797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>Hallagan / Halligan, William 28/05/1757 - 19 06/1758 cks Southampton Without master Destination unknown ADM 36/6683, pp.6, 154, no.110; ADM 36/6684, p 58, no 110.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03/03/1758 - 22/07/1758 cs Ramilies</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4767, p. 175, no. 401 &amp; p. 242, no. 401, ADM 36/4768, p.242, no. 401; ADM 36/4769, p.188, no. 401; ADM 36/4770, p.231, no. 401.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/09/1762 - 28/03/1763 ab Anson</td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4770, p.231, no. 401 &amp; p.301, no.401 &amp; p.331, no. 401; ADM 33/627 (Jan 1760-Mar 1763), no. 401, ADM 51/47, 28/03/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03/06/1757 cs Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p. 103, no.2155, ADM 36/6466, p. 101, no. &amp; p. 221, no.182.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31/07/1757 as Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p. 107, no. &amp; p. 227, no. 1204 (lent in between).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24/11/1757 boy(SN) Royal Ann</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>Haslar Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Harwood, Thomas 08/09/1757 - 17/02/1758 Is Gibraltar</td>
<td>Death (at sea)</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p. 126, no 125 &amp; p.154, no 8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td><strong>Hatton, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Hawke</strong></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, pp.9, 49, no.198. William had already been sent to the <strong>William &amp; Ann</strong> by the Marine Society on 12/01/1758 (see MS-no.2067), but had returned for some reason ADM 36/5803, p.79, no.86 &amp; p.192, no.60 (occasionally mustered as cs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16/10/1758 - 29/12/1758</td>
<td>cs(cos)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hawke</strong></td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5311, p.2, no no. &amp; p.27, no.15 (initially meant to go with captain to <strong>Success</strong>). ADM 36/5311, p.48, no.128 &amp; p 86, no.140, ADM 36 5312, p.25, 229, no.140; ADM 33/633 (1763), no p., no 140, ADM 51/188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 08/09/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 19/12/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cygnet</strong></td>
<td>No more books. Crew perhaps paid off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feb 1763</td>
<td>ps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td><strong>Hemming, James</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>805</td>
<td><strong>Higgins, Ed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Norwich</strong></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>803</td>
<td><strong>Higgins, John</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Norwich</strong></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>804</td>
<td><strong>Higgins, William</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Norwich</strong></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 7</td>
<td>4159</td>
<td><strong>Hill, George</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Essex</strong></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>721</td>
<td><strong>Hills, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td><strong>Ramilies</strong></td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 103, no 2161; ADM 36/6466, p 221, no 1088 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no 1088.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in Group</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>Reference Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 2082</td>
<td>Hoffman, Martin</td>
<td>ss Surprise</td>
<td>14/11/1757 - 08/03/1758</td>
<td>With master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6748, p.220, no 282 (surgeon Corfield is superseded). ADM 6/18; ADM 6/34; ADM 25/55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rediscovered Martin by chance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/04/1760 - 28/02/1762 ss Southampton</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6586, p.12, no no.; ADM 36/6587, p.174, no.51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1. 199</td>
<td>Homeslead / Holmste(a)d, Thomas</td>
<td>cs Union</td>
<td>(29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p.4, 56, no.56; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no.18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN) Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758 cs Neptune</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no.733; ADM 36/6219, p.150, no 733; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5010 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 08/06/1759 cs Essex</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36 5469, p 120, no 1179.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7 4758</td>
<td>Hornbuckle, William</td>
<td>cs Nightingale</td>
<td>23/09/1762 - 19/07/1763</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 182, no 894; ADM 36/6185, p.156, no 894, ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763 (ticked at the end).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6. 3470</td>
<td>Horns, George</td>
<td>boy Royal Ann</td>
<td>(06/08/1759) - 08/11/1759</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4389, p 252, no 1014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as Norwich</td>
<td>27/04/1760 as(SN)</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6202, p 282, no 14; ADM 36/6203, p 241, no 14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as Royal Ann</td>
<td>05/06/1760 as(SN)</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4997, p 152, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as Deptford</td>
<td>10/10/1760 as</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5336, p.186, no 659.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as Nottingham</td>
<td>01 01/1761 as</td>
<td>Without master Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6212, p 280, no 1195; ADM 36/6213, p 101, no.1195.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4</td>
<td>3597</td>
<td>Howard, Sam (08/10/1759) - 22/02/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Sickness Absent</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp.20, 134, no.1470 (sick since 24/01/1760).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, p.138, no no. &amp; p 271, no 1566; ADM 36/6703, p.147, no.1566.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>Hubbert, Jere</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>Hudgel, Richard (19/03/1757) - 03/07/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no 2184; ADM 36/6466, p 103, no no. &amp; p 222, no 1111 (discharge-month vanees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/07/1757 - 30/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.108, no no. &amp; p 229, no 1235 (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.111, no no. &amp; p 231, no 1289, ADM 36 6467, p.287, no.1289; ADM 36/6468, p 284, no 1289.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6468, p.297, no.1610; ADM 36/6469, p 274, no.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6470, p.232, no.523ADM 33/585 (01/11/1758-01/05/1759), no p., no.523 (twice lent in between; not on list of saved men, not paid).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>Humphrys, John (12/03/1757) - 03/06/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 103, no 2152; ADM 36/6466, p 101, no no. &amp; p.221, no.1079.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/03/1757 - 03/06/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36 6466, p 107, no no. &amp; p 227, no 1202 (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sickness Haslar Hospital</td>
<td>ADM 36/4988, p 189, no.372.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death (at Haslar)</td>
<td>ADM 102/374, no.904.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge Details</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Jackson, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(06/11/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 5, 60, no 77; ADM 36/6945, p 44, no 77.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758 cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no.750; ADM 36/6219, p 151, no 750; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no 5023 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 06/04/1759 cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4944, p.14, no.29, ADM 36/4945, p 30, no 29 (sickness not mentioned); ADM 33/545 (1759), p.2, no 29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harwich Sick Quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3527</td>
<td>James, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(17/09/1759) - 26/10/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.260, no.1241; ADM 36/5803, p.216, no 218 (went via the Hawke).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 01/02/1760 cs</td>
<td>Magnanime</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6109, p.284, no 1186.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>3525</td>
<td>Jeffreys / Jeffery(s), Act(e)ton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 09/1759 - 19/06/1762 cs</td>
<td>Royal Sovereign</td>
<td>Without captain</td>
<td>ADM 36/6794, p.16, no no. &amp; p 220, no 403, ADM 36/6795, p.255, no.403; ADM 36/6797, p.228, no.403, ADM 36/6798, p.9, no.403; ADM 36/6803, p 6, no 403.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- March 1763 cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6234, pp 194, 256, no.534.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Returned to Marine Society in 1763, which sponsored him an apprenticeship with a Japanner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>Jeffreys, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10/07/1758) - 02/04/1763 cks</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp 2, 208, no.22 (has later entry-date in MS registers, but here never ticked, therefore unlikely that he visited the Marine Society to pick up his clothing) ADM 36/4927, p.205, no 22; ADM 36/4928, p 205, no 22 ADM 36/4929, p.198, no.22, ADM 36/4930, p 213, no 22, ADM 36/4931, p.118, no 22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>808</td>
<td><strong>Jenkins, Richard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td><strong>Johnson, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>gs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4928, p.2, no.17 &amp; p.208, no 17 (has later entry-date in MS registers, but here never ticked, therefore unlikely that he visited the Manne Society to pick up his clothing); ADM 36/4927, p.205, no.17; ADM 36/4928, p.205, no.17; ADM 36/4929, p.198, no.17; ADM 6/19, 12/01/1762, p.379 (David Gaven, gunner). No muster or pay books. Roebuck was lent in 1763/4 to 'The Antigallican Private Ship of War' association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS.1 (SS 1)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td><strong>Johnson, William</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ordy/ab</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/4929, p.208, no.429, ADM 36/4930, p 217, no.429; ADM 36/4931, p 125, no 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 02/04/1763</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>932</td>
<td><strong>Jovner, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no.2216, ADM 36/6466, p.224, no.1143 (lent in between); ADM 36 6467, p 285, no.1143, ADM 36/6468, p.278, no.1143. ADM 36/6468, p 297, no.1607; ADM 36/6469, p.274, no 686, ADM 36/6470, p 232, no.519 (twice lent in between; not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in Line</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Kemp, Jeremy (19/03/1757) - 15/02/1760 as Ramilie Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2192; ADM 36/6466, p.223, no 1119 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no clear no ; ADM 36/6468, p.277, no 1119; ADM 36/6469, p.260, no 353; ADM 36/6470, p.226, no.298 (not on list of saved men)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS.3</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>Kerby / Kirby, John 16/10/1758 - 29/12/1758 cs Hawke Change of master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, pp.9, 49, no 197.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 18/07/1759 cs(cos) Hawke Without master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p 79, no.85 &amp; p.162, no 121 (occasionally mustered as commander's servant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4</td>
<td>3618</td>
<td>Key, Edmond (22/10/1759) - 03/11/1759 cs Swiftsure Without master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp.22, 65, no 1504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>King, Joseph (19/03/1757) - 14/08/1757 as Ramilie Without master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 104, no.2174; ADM 36/6466, p 102, no no. &amp; p.222, no.1901 (lent in between). ADM 36/4988, p.184, no.239.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 25/08/1757 boy(SN) Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4988, p.83, no 2077; ADM 36/4987, p.84, no 2077, ADM 36/4992, p.82, no 2077 &amp; p 131, no 455 (in between lent for five months to Royal Sovereign)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 15/03/1758 cs Royal Sovereign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 25/03/1758 boy(SN) Royal Sovereign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/12/1758 as Royal Ann Without master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4988, p.83, no 2077; ADM 36/4987, p.84, no 2077, ADM 36/4992, p.82, no 2077 &amp; p 131, no 455 (in between lent for five months to Royal Sovereign)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>King, Joseph (SS 1) 06 11 1756 - 05/08/1757 cs Union Without master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.5, 60, no.76.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Kitt, Mathew (SS 1)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.3, 58, no.50; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/06/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>With master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 27/09/1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>Lamming, John</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no.2217; ADM 36/6466, p.104, no no &amp; p 224, no.1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15/04/1757) - 29/08/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 17/09 1757</td>
<td>boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 07/06/1758</td>
<td>ms(SN)</td>
<td>Peregrine</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>Lauder, George</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.3, 146, no 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(04/05/1757 - 25/02/1758)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Letham, Richard</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p 3, no.47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(29/10/1756) - 05/01/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>Lively, Richard</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p 223, no.1104, ADM 36/6230, p.23, no 1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(06/08/1759) - 08/11/1759</td>
<td>(as&amp;SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 19/03/1760</td>
<td>as(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Loyall, John</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 59, no.73; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no.26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(06/11/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no.741; ADM 36/6219, p 151, no 741;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5018 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6219, p.261, no no.; ADM 36/6221, p 37, no.759.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 07/04/1760</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>Death (on board)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Luskin / Lovekin, William</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 58, no 57; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(29/10 1756) - 05 08/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no 734; ADM 36/6219, p 150, no 734;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6791, p.446, no 5011 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p.120, no 1180.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 08/06/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p.186, no 1243; ADM 33/557 (1760), p 20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no 1180 &amp; p.23, no 1243.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/11/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>Macway, James</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 105, no 2186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19 03/1757) - 27/03/1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4124</td>
<td>Magee / Mc Gee, Charles</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.12, 213, no.197; ADM 36/6914, p.192, no.197; ADM 36/6915, p.10, no.197 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS.1)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Mal(l)en, Robert</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.5, 60, no 79; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no.29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4119</td>
<td>Mannings, Benjamin</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.13, 214, no 206 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign); ADM 33/689 (08/1763), p.10, no 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haslar Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY H/1/2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>Martin, James (11/08/1758) - 21/09/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Sickness / Portsmouth / Gosport Hospital</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp 5, 212, no 94; ADM 36/4927, p.207, no 94; ADM 33/545 (12/1759), p 3, no 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>Mason, William (29/01/1758) - 19/01/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Death (Antigua?)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p.224, no.1113, ADM 36/6230, p 206, no 1113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Merritt, Robert (29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 4, 59, no 62; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p 20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 06/09/1757</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p 247, no 739, ADM 36/6219, p 150, no 739; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5016 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 07/12/1759</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4755</td>
<td>Merriman, John 14/06/1762 - 25/08/1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.180, no 844 (wrongly recorded as having left with master)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26/08/1762) - 19/07/1763</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 181, no 868, ADM 36/6185, p 155, no 868, ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSV/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Merritt, Daniel (19/03/1757) - 31/05/1759 as Ramilies</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2178, ADM 36/6466, p 222, no 1105 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 251, no.1105: ADM 36/6468, p.277, no.1105; ADM 36/6469, p.259, no 351, ADM 36/6470, p.184, no.275.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS 1)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Miles, William (29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 58, no.58; ADM 36/6944, p.213, no 20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 09/09/1757 cs(SN) Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>31/10/1757 cs Neptune</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p 247, no.735; ADM 36/6219, p 150, no 735; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5012 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 21/07/1759 cs Neptune</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6219, p 261, no no., ADM 36 6221, p 36, no 756.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10/11/1762 ab Neptune</td>
<td>Run (from Long Boat, at Portsmouth)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6221, p.46, no.951; ADM 36/6229, pp 15, 65A, no.315.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Mitchell, George 02/05/1757 - 09/09/1757 gs Southampton</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.7, 155, no.118 (sick since 12/08/1757; no pay book) Portfolio: ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4762</td>
<td>Mobbs, Joseph 02/06/1762 - 17/06/1762 gs Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 179, no. 631 (wrongly recorded as having left with old gunner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/07/1763 gs Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 179, no 835, ADM 36/6185, p.155, no 835, ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H182</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>Moore, William (19/03/1757) - 03/06/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilyes</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2175; ADM 36/6466, p 102, no no &amp; p 222, no.1102.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/07/1757 as Ramilyes</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 14/08/1757 cs Ramilyes</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/09/1757 boy(SN) Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>Moran, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>Munns, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>Munt, Isaac / Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp.21, 26, no 1475; ADM 36/6703, p.145, no.1474.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3474</td>
<td>Newman, William / James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p 251, no 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 06/08/1759 boy(SN) Royal Ann</td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 01/11/1759 cs Royal Ann</td>
<td>Crew paid off / turned over to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/02/1761 ab Royal Ann</td>
<td>marlborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix III cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foudroyant</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5.</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>Newton, Will (20/10/1760) - 08/09/1762 cs</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp.13, 214, no 203, ADM 36/6914, p 193, no 203; ADM 36/6915, p.11, no 203 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.312, no.772; ADM 51 243, 13/05/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS.4.</td>
<td>3596</td>
<td>Nightingale, Math 08/10/1759 - 21/01/1761 cs</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp.21, 267, no.1471; ADM 36/6703, p 145, no.1471. Math had already been sent to the Intrepide by the Marine Society on 18 01/1759 (see MS-no.3002), but had returned for some reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>Nixon, Thomas (15 04/1757) - 26/12/1757 as</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Death (at Hospital)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no.2224, ADM 36/6466, p.224, no.1151 (lent in between, sick since 22/12/1757).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1.</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Noble, William (SS 1) (29 10/1756) - 05/08/1757 cs</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 58, no 54; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.247, no 731; ADM 36/6219, p.150, no 731, ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5008 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4944, p 13, no 27; ADM 36/4945, p 30, no 27; ADM 33/545 (1759), p 2, no.27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>Harwich Sick Quarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix III cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Norris, George (29/10/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 58, no.53; ADM 36/6945, p.43, no.53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757 (SN)</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.20, no no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p.101, no.749; ADM 36/6219, p.151, no.749,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/01/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5022 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15/04/1759 - 20/06/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4944, p.13, no.28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24/11/1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5157, p.124, no.820; ADM 36/5158, p.265, no.820 (on leave for the last three weeks).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>Norton, Nath 22/12/1758 - 13/08/1760</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4814, p.55, no.172; ADM 36/4816, p.4, no.100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17/12/1760</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5696, pp.80, 100, no.560.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned to Marine Society in 1763 (last station recorded as lieutenant's servant on Adventure, but not found in Adventure's books), and was sent to his father. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4127</td>
<td>Nottingham, Phil(i) 20/10/1760 - 08 09 1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp 13, 214, no.207; ADM 36/6914, p.193, no.207; ADM 36/6915, p.11, no.207 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/05/1763</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.312, no.776; ADM 51/243, 13/05/1763.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned to Marine Society, but did not get a sponsored apprenticeship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4123</td>
<td>Ogilby / Oglevy, Thomas 20/10/1760 - 14/03/1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, p 12, 126, no.199, ADM 36/6796 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Appendix III cont. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY/H 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Quality</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>Ollon / Unlon, Richard</td>
<td>12/05/1757 - 19/06/1757 cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6883, p.5, no 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>Parnell / Barnett, Josias</td>
<td>(19/03/1757) - 31/07/1757 as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2188; ADM 36/6466, p 103, no no. &amp; p 223, no.1115 (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14/09/1757 cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.109, no no. &amp; p 229, no 1254.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>Pasman / Parsons, James</td>
<td>12/03/1757 - 26/12/1757 cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Death (Haslar Hospital)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.103, no.2159; ADM 36/6466, p 221, no 1086 (lent in between); ADM 102/374, no.949 (sick since 16/12/1757).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4134</td>
<td>Peacock, Joseph</td>
<td>17/10/1760 - 16/09/1762 Is(2nd)</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36 6913, pp.3, 205, no 5; ADM 36/6914, p 184, no 5; ADM 36/6915, p 2, no 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24/02/1763 Is(6th)</td>
<td>Namure</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6261, p.283, no.1407; ADM 51/621, 24/02/1760.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2186</td>
<td>Peat, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS.</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>Pickup, Lawrence</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>ADM 36/6167, pp.66, 208, no.382; ADM 36/6168, p.246, no.382.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6168, p.255, no.657; ADM 36/6169, pp.27, 261, no.657; ADM 36/6170, p.91, no.657.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4789, p.195, no.824; ADM 36/4790, p.68, no.824; ADM 36/6592, P.164, no.996, ADM 36/6048 (not found).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3720</td>
<td>Reappears in Marine Society's registers:</td>
<td>ps</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of crew turned over to Medway, but not Lawrence. Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2166; ADM 36/6466, p.222, no.1093 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no 1093. ADM 36/6467, p.290, no.1411; ADM 36/6468, p.289, no.1411; ADM 36/6469, p.266, no.503, ADM 36/6470, p.229, no 400 (not on list of saved men).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>Plumkin / Plampin, William</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, p.2, no.9 (has later entry-date in MS registers, and here ticked in August - perhaps he visited the Marine Society then to pick up his clothing). ADM 36/4926, p.5, no 103 &amp; p.212, no 103, ADM 36/4927, p.209, no.103, ADM 36/4928, p.207, no.103, ADM 36/4929, p.111, no 103 &amp; p 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>Pope, Harvey / Henry</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5913, pp.13, 214, no 204, ADM 36/5914, p.193, no.204, ADM 36/5915, p.11, no.204 (in between lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Run (Lisbon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS.5.</td>
<td>4117</td>
<td>Poulton / Powton, Robert</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5433, p.312, no.773, ADM 51/243, 13/05/1763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>Price, John (15/04/1757) - 31/08/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master, Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.107, no.2226, ADM 36/6466, p 224, no 1153 (first lent, then ticked).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Price, Zach (18/05/1757) - 07/07/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.5, 152, no 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.161, no 179; ADM 36/6684, p.213, no 178; ADM 36/6685, p 70, no 178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6685, p.242, no 44; ADM 36/6686, p.187, no 31; ADM 36/6687, p 171, no 31; ADM 36 6688, p 190, no 31, ADM 51/913, 14/02/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>4621</td>
<td>Prett, Manuel (31 05 1762) - 28/03/1763</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/5918, p.140, no 90; ADM 36/5919, p.241, no.90, ADM 33/653 (1763), no.90; ADM 51/502; ADM 36/5920 (not found).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>Quelch, Robert 08/04/1757 - 30/04/1757</td>
<td>as/cs</td>
<td>Invincible</td>
<td>With masters</td>
<td>ADM 36/5855, p.200, no.585 (quality uncertain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barfleur</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5137, p.253, no no.; ADM 36/5139, p.204, no 546.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barfleur</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5139, p.221, no 978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Sickness (query) Absent</td>
<td>ADM 36/5318, p.264, no.655 (sick since 14/11/1759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin / Experiment</td>
<td>Lent earlier to Experiment (Armed Tender) &amp; captured there</td>
<td>ADM 36/5319, p 258, no.625 ADM 36/5320, p 279, no 625; ADM 36/5322, p 228, no 625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>Rawlings, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>Read, James / Reed, Joshua</td>
<td>(31/07/1759) - 07/09/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.250, no 973 (the name Joshua Reed in the muster lists differs grossly from James Read, yet he arrives together with the other Marine-Society boys, some of them also featuring minor name variations). ADM 36/4989, p.31, no.1031 (supernumerary for a few days). ADM 36/4989, p.32, no.1048, ADM 36/4999, p.18, no 1048; ADM 36/4998, p.112, no.1048; ADM 33/543 (Royal Ann's pay book lost or falsely catalogued) ADM 36/5749, p 229, no.1182; ADM 36/5750, p.196, no 1182; ADM 36/5751, p.230, no.1182; ADM 36/5752, p 220, no 1182; ADM 36/5753, p.202, no.1182 (lent to Royal Sovereign since 12th April, while lent he is mustered as a midshipman on the Royal George, upon his actual return to the Royal George he is mustered as able seaman, no pay book of R. G. for the period). ADM 36/5753, p. 202, no 1182, ADM 36 6226 (he was meant to go to Neptune, but did not appear there). MSY/H/V, no.96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4441</td>
<td>16/10/1761 - 12/03/1762</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp.219, 303, no.534.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/6388 (captain arrived without William).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>15/01/1762 - 13/07/1762</td>
<td>cps</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp.272, 305, no.561; ADM 36/6128, p.105, no.561 (very late appearance on board compared to date in Marine Society's registers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.4, 211, no.71, ADM 36/4927, p.207, no.71; ADM 36/4928, p.148, no.71 (lieutenant promoted in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>19/07/1758 - 30/10/1760</td>
<td>Is (2nd, then 1st)</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.4, 211, no.71, ADM 36/4927, p.207, no.71; ADM 36/4928, p.148, no.71 (lieutenant promoted in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.4, 211, no.71, ADM 36/4927, p.207, no.71; ADM 36/4928, p.148, no.71 (lieutenant promoted in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS.2</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>19/03/1757 - 15/02/1760</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2177; ADM 36/6466, p.222, no.1104 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no.1104; ADM 36/6468, p.277, no.1104; ADM 36/6469, p.259, no.350; ADM 36/6470, p.225, no.295 (not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2177; ADM 36/6466, p.222, no.1104 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.251, no.1104; ADM 36/6468, p.277, no.1104; ADM 36/6469, p.259, no.350; ADM 36/6470, p.225, no.295 (not on list of saved men).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>19/03/1757 - 31/07/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no 2194; ADM 36/6466, p.103, no no. (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/08/1757 - 25/02/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no 2194; ADM 36/6466, p.103, no no. (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 15/02/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no 2194; ADM 36/6466, p.103, no no. (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Number in Code</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>Roberts / Robbins, William (15/04/1757) - 15/02/1760 as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no.2220; ADM 36/6466, p.224, no 1147 (lent in between); ADM 36 6467, p 252, no 1147; ADM 36/6468, p.278, no 1147; ADM 36/6469, p 260, no.364; ADM 36/6470, p.226, no.305 (not on list of saved men). Note: W. Roberts and William Robbins (no.935) are indistinguishable in muster books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2.</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Robinson, Thomas 23/09/1757 - 26/10/1757 bs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p.127, no.139 (wrongly recorded as having left with master).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10/12/1759 cs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p.159, no 137, ADM 36/5668, p 4, no 58, ADM 36/5669, p 117, no 137.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 26/03/1760 cs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5669, p.164, no.119 &amp; p 185, no 167.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>Robinson, William 19/03/1757 - 27/03/1757 as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2185.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destination unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in Code</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Rogan, Andrew (06/11/1756) - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp 5, 60, no 78; ADM 36/6944, p 214, no.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p 20, no.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/10/1758</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p 101, no.747; ADM 36/6219, p.151, no.747, ADM 36/6791, p 446, no 5021 (lent to Royal Sovereign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/06/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4944, p.13, no.25; ADM 36/4945, p.80, no.25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10/08 1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/5157, p 123, no 815; ADM 36/5158, p 187, no.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 22/01/1763</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 33/690 (1763), p 12, no 245; ADM 51/978, 22/01/1763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Rogers, Ben (13/04/1758) - 21/09/1758</td>
<td>ps</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p 226, no.1162.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4454</td>
<td>Rogerson, Samuel cs</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp 272, 304, no.552.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/6388 (captain arrived without Samuel).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>Roll / Holt, Thomas (19/03/1757) - 12/03/1758</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no 2191; ADM 36/6466, p 223, no 1118 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 251, no 1118, ADM 36/6468, p.44, no.1118 (sick since 06/03/1758).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(05/05 1758) 15/02/1760</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6468, pp 61, 294, no 1531, ADM 36/6469, p 271, no.810; ADM 36/6470, p 230, no 463, ADM 33/585 (01/11/1758-01/05/1759), no p., no.463 (twice lent in between; not on list of saved men, never paid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Rose, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>(According to the MS registers William was only partly clothed and returned to his (sic) ship; however at no point does he appear in the Gibraltar's books)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>Round, Thomas (05/08/1758 - 23/11/1760) ls (2nd / 1st)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>Destination unknown ADM 36/4926, pp 4, 212, no 84; ADM 36/4927, p 207, no 84, ADM 36/4928, p.187, no.84 (lieutenant promoted in between)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4759</td>
<td>Ruggles, Thomas 14/06/1762 - 25 08/1762 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.180, no.845 (wrongly recorded as having left with old master)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(23/09/1762) - 28/08/1762 cos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.182, no.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/10/1762 - 19/07 1763 ms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p.182, no.896, ADM 36/6185, p.156, no.896; ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>Ryalls, Peter (19 03/1757) - 03/07 1757 as</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramlies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.104, no.2182; ADM 36/6466, p.103, no no &amp; p.222, no.1109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 14/08/1757 cs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramlies</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.108, no no &amp; p 228, no 1233 (lent in between).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 17/08/1757 boy(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>For being an apprentice</td>
<td>ADM 36/4988, p.184, no.241.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>Sampson, Sampson (06 08 1759) - 12/08/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p 252, no.1004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 26/08/1759 boy(SN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foudrayant</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5635, p 196, no.23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

344
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 4</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td><strong>Sanger, Charles</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6231, p.224, no.1112, ADM 36/6230, p 23, no.1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4</td>
<td>3617</td>
<td><strong>Seal, William</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6702, pp 22, 65, no 1505.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>934</td>
<td><strong>Saldom, Stephen</strong></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramiies</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no 2218; ADM 36/6466, p 224, no 1145 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 252, no.1145, ADM 36/6468, p.45, no 1145.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15/04/1757) - 04/06/1758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6468, pp 63, 296, no 1600, ADM 36/6469, p.212, no.1600; ADM 102/374, no 1436.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/06/1758 - 12/01/1759</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Ramiies</td>
<td>Death (Haslar Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>370</td>
<td><strong>Shaddows, William</strong></td>
<td>ls(6th)</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p 3, no 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25/10/1756) - 24/01 1757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.8, 66, no 172; ADM 36 6944, pp 7, 104, no.172 (twice before spells of sickness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 01/1757 - 29/10 1757</td>
<td>cps</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>ADM 36/6945, pp.26, 83, no 1065; ADM 36/6946, p.53, no 1065 (no pay books); ADM 36/6788, p.212, no.709 (during whole period William never returned to Union, and instead was a supernumerary on Royal Sovereign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/11/1757 - 05/02/1758</td>
<td>Im</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21 02/1758) - 30 07/1758</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6945, pp 84, 204, no 1099 (wrongly recorded as having left with old master).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 28 09/1758</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6945, p 208, no 1193.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Sharp, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Sheet / Street, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>Shoot / Shute, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(03/09/1757) - 13/10/1757</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 27/12/1757</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5807, p 21, no 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2770</td>
<td>Sibby / Sibley, Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10/07/1758) - 24/11/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.2, 212, no.5; ADM 36/4927, p 205, no 5 (has later entry-date in Marine Society's registers, and here ticked in between - during that time he perhaps went to the Marine Society to pick up his clothing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>Simpson, Ben</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12/03/1757) - 03/06/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p 103, no 2158; ADM 36/6466, p 221, no 1085.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 24/01/1758</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p 227, no 1200; ADM 36/6467, p 253, no 1200; ADM 36/6468, p 47, no 1200; ADM 33/580, no p., no 1200 (sick since 22/12/1757, wages paid in December 1751, though not to him in person).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4456</td>
<td>Singleton, William</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp.272, 305, no 560; ADM 36/6128, p.241, no.560; ADM 33/660 (1763), ADM 51/3911, 03/02/1763 (in between sick).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Smith, Christopher</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.4, 59, no 65; ADM 36/6944, p 213, no 25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p 20, no no.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218, p 247, no 740, ADM 36/6219, p.150, no 740; ADM 36/6791, p.446, no.5017 (lent to Royal Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5469, p 120, no 1183.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>Smith, Daniel</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36 4926, pp 2, 208, no 20, ADM 36 4927, p 205, no 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36 4928, p 205, no 20 (has later entry-date in Marine Society's registers, but here never ticked, therefore unlikely that he visited the Marine Society to pick up his clothing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>Smith, Thomas</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2190; ADM 36/6466, p.103, no no. &amp; p 229, no.1255 (lent in between).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6466, p.109, no no. &amp; p 229, no.1255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With captain</td>
<td>ADM 36/4988, p.184, no.244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speedwell</td>
<td>No change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6601, p.167, no.327.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hind</td>
<td>(not clear why discharged)</td>
<td>ADM 36/7602, p.509, no 244; ADM 36/7603, p.13, no 244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hind</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/7603, p.205, no.325 (ticked for the entire period, which might explain the prior discharge-record)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>780</td>
<td><strong>Smith, William</strong></td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1 (SS.1)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td><strong>Solomon, Francis</strong></td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p.4, no.63. Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 5</td>
<td>4116</td>
<td><strong>Soucher, John</strong></td>
<td>Temeraire</td>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>Haslar Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6913, pp 12, 214, no 200, ADM 33/689 (08/1763), p.10, no.200 (ticked from beginning, but master is paid until John's discharge). ADM 102/374 (not on Haslar's deaths list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td><strong>Steads, Samuel</strong></td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, pp.5, 149, no.71 &amp; p.218. (Wounded in action with three privates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td><strong>Stevenson, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, p 2, no 11 &amp; p 208, no 11 (has later entry-date in MS registers, but here never ticked, therefore unlikely that he visited the Marine Society to pick up his clothing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6665, p.155, no.466, ADM 33/587 (1759), no 466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>941</td>
<td><strong>Stockdale, Henry Thomas</strong></td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.107, no.2225; ADM 36/6466, p.224, no 1153 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p.252, no 1154, ADM 36/6468, p.279, no.1152; ADM 36/6469, p 260, no.367; ADM 36/6470, p.226, no.309 (not on list of saved men)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 3</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>Stubbers, John</td>
<td>(07/04/1757) - 12/09/1757 Is(2nd)</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Lieutenant died</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.21, no.10 &amp; p.142, no 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/09/1757 - 12/10/1757 SN</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.204, no.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 01/11/1757 Is(2nd)</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.169, no.249 (replaces other MS-boy as servant to wounded first lieutenant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/02/1758 Is(1st)</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.172, no.271 (leaves with master, but returns three weeks later).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26/02/1758 - 19/06/1758 cs</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6683, p.175, no.305; ADM 36/6684, p 67, no.305.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10/05/1758) - 04/12/1758 cps</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Absent (reason unknown)</td>
<td>Returned to old master.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p 199, no 91, p 227, no 178, ADM 36/5668, p.92, no.178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Swift / Sweet, William</td>
<td>14/09/1757 - 22/03/1758 cps</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p 127, no.133 &amp; p 175, no 16, ADM 33/561 (1759), p 1, no 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibraltar Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>Swindon, William</td>
<td>19/03/1757 - 15/02/1760 as</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.105, no.2189; ADM 36/6466, p 223, no 1116 (lent in between); ADM 36 6467, p 251, no 1116, ADM 36/6468, p.277, no.1116; ADM 36 6469, p 259, no 352; ADM 36/6470, p.225, no.295 (not on list of saved men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY H 1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Taibot(t), Francis</td>
<td>gs</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p.127, no.148 &amp; p 221, no.31; ADM 36/5669, p.112, no. 31. ADM 36/5595, p.147, no.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firedrake</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>The gunner deserted at Portsmouth &amp; never arrived on board the Firedrake. Destination unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31/07/1759) - 09/09/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repulse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 20/09/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>Taylor, Richard</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p 9, no 200 &amp; p 204, no 54 (already earlier lent to Duke Aquitain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(16/10/1758) - 02/04/1759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 22/03/1759</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Duke Aquitain</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4933, p 84, no 598.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 01/01/1761</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Duke Aquitain</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/4933, pp.87, 242, no 673.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Taylor, Sam</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p 4, no.72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td>(06/11/1756 - 05/08/1757)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5</td>
<td>2754</td>
<td>Thomas, William (10/07/1758) - 08/02/1759 bs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.2, 208, no.12 (has later entry-date in MS registers, but here never ticked, therefore unlikely that he visited the Marine Society to pick up his clothing). ADM 36/6665, p. 155, no 457, ADM 33/587 (April 1755 - April 1759), no.457 (in between lent together with boatswain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 6</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>Thompson, John 16/10/1761 - 08/12/1761 ps</td>
<td>Minerva</td>
<td>Without master, Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6127, pp.219, 303, no 530.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 7</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>Thorn, William Essex</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>Thrift, Peter (06/08/1759) - 08/11/1759 as(SN) boy</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.252, no.1007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27/04/1760 as(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6202, p.282, no.8, ADM 36/6203, p 241, no 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/06/1760 as(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4997, p 152, no no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/10/1760</td>
<td>Deptford</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5336, p 186, no 556.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16/02/1761</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6212, p.280, no 1192, ADM 36/6213, p 100, no 1192.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/03/1761</td>
<td>Royal Sovereign</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6795, pp.66, 146, nos.2769/1138.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30/04/1762</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6065, p 19, no 467.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/06/1762</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6450, p.248, no.483.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSY/H/3, no.273.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returned to Marine Society, which sponsored him an apprenticeship with a Peruke Maker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS.</th>
<th>807</th>
<th>Tomlin, William</th>
<th>Norwich</th>
<th>Never appeared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| YS 7 | 4761 | Tomlinson, John 06/10/1762 - 17/11/1762 bs | Nightingale | Change of master | ADM 36/6184, p.182, no.906 (wrongly recorded as having gone with old boatswain to hospital). |

| SS 7. | 4160 | Udall, John | Essex | Never appeared | MSY/H/3, no.274. |

Returned to Marine Society (last station recorded as boatswain's servant), and got an apprenticeship with a Water- and Lighterman sponsored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in Code</th>
<th>Name &amp; Code MSY/H/H182</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YS 7</td>
<td>4744</td>
<td>van Dona, Abraham</td>
<td>21/09/1762 - 19/07/1763</td>
<td>cps</td>
<td>Nightingale</td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6184, p 182, no 893; ADM 36/6185, p.156, no.893; ADM 51/4273, 19/07/1763.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Walker, Thomas</td>
<td>18/10/1757 - 14/05/1758</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5667, p.128, no.157 &amp; p.221, no.39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 10/10/1760</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Melampe</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6137, (list starting on p.229), no.471; ADM 36 6138, p 180, no.41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/05 1761</td>
<td>ordy</td>
<td>Melampe</td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6139, p 65, no.471.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/06/1761 - 17/12/1761</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>Melampe</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23/02/1762 - 03/04/1762</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>Melampe</td>
<td>Sickness (query)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Warren / Warring, Charles (29/10/1756) - 05/01/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, p 4, no.64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/N/182</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>697</td>
<td><strong>Warwick, Guy Earl of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/03/1757 - 22/04/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6367, p.69, no.1543.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26/08/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5862, p 193, no 456; ADM 36/5864, p.32, no 456.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28/03/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Culloden</td>
<td>Reason not clear</td>
<td>ADM 36/5206, p 218, no 2220, ADM 36/5208, p 26, no 467. (presumably sickness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13/05 1760) - 05/09/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Culloden</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>ADM 36/5208, pp.30, 183, no.541 (sick at the beginning).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>939</td>
<td><strong>Weatherfoot, John</strong></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no.2223, ADM 36/6466, p 224, no 1150 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 252, no 1150; ADM 36/6468, p.278, no.1150; ADM 36 6469, p 260, no 366, ADM 36/6470, p.226, no.307 (not on list of saved men).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15/04/1757) - 15/02/1760</td>
<td>as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24 01/1758) - 04/04/1759</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td><strong>Webb(e)y, Simon</strong></td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6943, pp.3, 58, no 46, ADM 36/6944, p 213, no.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SS 1)</td>
<td>29 10 1756 - 05/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6200, p.19, no no. (sick since 20/08/1757).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/08/1757 - 05/09/1757</td>
<td>cs(SN)</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td>ADM 36/6218 (captain arrived without Simon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY/H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>722</td>
<td><strong>Wells, James</strong></td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Ramilies</td>
<td>With master (presumably) ADM 36/6464, p.104, no 2162, ADM 36/6466, p.221, no 1089 (lent in between), ADM 36/6467, p.251, no. 1089.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Eagle</strong></td>
<td>Promotion   ADM 36/5536, p.185, no 1048, ADM 36/5537, p.231, no 1048; ADM 33/559, p.32, no.1048.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Terrible</strong></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>ADM 36/6809, p.249, no 569, ADM 36/6810, p 216, no 414, ADM 36 6811, p.45, no.414.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>Thunderer</strong></td>
<td>Promotion (no discharge)</td>
<td>ADM 36/6903, p.242, no.349, ADM 36/6904, p 223, no.349.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01/04/1761 - 04/03/1763</td>
<td><strong>Thunderer</strong></td>
<td>Crew paid off</td>
<td>ADM 36/6904, p.223, no.349, ADM 36/6905, p 219, no.349; ADM 36/6906, p.185, no 141; ADM 51 991, 04/03/1763.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 3</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td><strong>White, Christopher</strong></td>
<td>gs</td>
<td>Hawke</td>
<td>Ship captured</td>
<td>ADM 36/5803, p.10, no.201 &amp; p.204, no 55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 2</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td><strong>White, John</strong></td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 6</td>
<td>3465</td>
<td><strong>White, John</strong></td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4989, p.252, no 1008 (sick in between)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as(SN)</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6202, p.282, no.9, ADM 36/6203, p 241, no.9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/4997, p.152, no no..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Depford</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/5336, p.186, no.657.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6212, p.280, no.1193; ADM 36/6213, p 101, no 1193.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Royal Sovereign</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6795, pp.66, 146, nos.2770/1139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>ADM 36/6065, p.19, no.468.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix III cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Number in MSY H/1&amp;2</th>
<th>Name &amp; Length of Service</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Discharge</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 4.</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td><strong>Whitechett, James</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>810</td>
<td><strong>Whiteread, George</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>788</td>
<td><strong>Williams, Richard</strong></td>
<td>(19/03/1757) - 03/07/1757</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Rambles</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 31/08/1757</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Rambles</td>
<td>Change of master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 25/02/1758</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Rambles</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>809</td>
<td><strong>Williams, Stephen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YS 4.</td>
<td>3599</td>
<td><strong>William, Thomas</strong></td>
<td>(08/10/1759) - 06 03/1760</td>
<td>cs</td>
<td>Swiftsure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2</td>
<td>937</td>
<td><strong>Williams, William</strong></td>
<td>(15/04/1757) - 15/02/1760</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>Rambles</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Code</td>
<td>Number in MSY H/1&amp;2</td>
<td>Name &amp; Length of Service</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 5.</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>Wilson, George (10/07/1758) - 31/12/1761 cs</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Without master</td>
<td>Destination unknown</td>
<td>ADM 36/4926, pp.2, 208, no.3; ADM 36/4927, p.205, no 3 (wrongly recorded as having been discharged earlier); ADM 36/4928, p.205, no.3; ADM 36/4929, p.198, no.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 05/09/1757 boy(SN)</td>
<td>Royal Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 16/10/1757 ms</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>With master</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/5317, p.28, no.635.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 13/04/1758</td>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>Ship wrecked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 2.</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>Woolmore, William (15 04/1757) - 04/02/1758 as</td>
<td>Ramiies</td>
<td>Death (Haslar Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADM 36/6464, p.106, no 2222; ADM 36/6466, p.224, no 1149 (lent in between); ADM 36/6467, p 252, no.1149; ADM 36/6468, p.45, no 1149; ADM 102/374 (sick since 22/12/1757, note: not on Haslar's deaths list).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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