

1 16d
D1D

BRITISH DENTAL
ASSOCIATION
INFORMATION CENTRE
22 JUN 1998
64 Wimpole Street
LONDON W1M 3AL
Telephone: 071 935 0875

**'TOUCH AND GOE':
TOOTHDRAWERS IN ENGLAND**

A.S.HARGREAVES

3rd Lilian Lindsay Memorial Lecture

**21 June 1997
British Dental Association Conference
Bournemouth**

LINDSAY SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY OF DENTISTRY

'TOUCH AND GOE': TOOTHDRAWERS IN ENGLAND

Toothdrawers, as a distinct occupational group, were first separated out from the heterogenous mass of providers of early dental care by Lilian Lindsay around 1920. History and historiography, however, are never static. New evidence comes to light, sometimes from the most unexpected sources. New interpretations develop, either as a result of the fresh material, or because scholars from other backgrounds perceive events from differing perspectives, or because generational attitudes and cultural environments have changed. There may no longer be any need to convince people that a newly emergent profession already had a substantial history behind it, as was the case after the 1921 Act, but since there is still a strong tendency in both the profession and laity to continue to regard toothdrawers as mountebanks and charlatans, their further exploration in contemporary context can enhance perspective not only about their particular activities but also about the early provision of dental care in this country.

Problems of title

Before medicine become institutionalised and medical licensing was introduced, any individual could practise medicine or surgery. Once the universities conferred the right to practise physic, and craft-guilds were set up in the twelfth-fourteenth centuries, attempts at regulation began to establish the hierarchical and frequently restrictive structures that can still be seen in present-day professions. Many of those outside the traditional tripartite model of physicians, barber-surgeons and apothecaries were not to become regulated in a professional context until later centuries, so patients' willingness to seek their help challenged the desired exclusivity and increasing rigidity of the developing 'Establishment'. The more restrictive a particular medical group became, the more the empirics' undertakings were seen as a threat to its livelihood; any encroachment from available and affordable (if not always efficacious) rivals was therefore to be repulsed.

Not only did the book-learned physicians sneer at the manual surgeons, but the latter similarly snubbed the empirics, particularly when many of these adopted the title 'surgeon' in self-aggrandisement (though their numbers usually fell away sharply when the army and navy demanded their services). Not all toothdrawers were presumptuous, though, so it can be difficult to determine

A.S.Hargreaves
was presented with the third Lilian Lindsay Memorial Medal
on the occasion of her lecture

whether the epithet 'toothdrawer', when applied to one regarded as professionally inferior, was pejorative or occupationally accurate. This creates difficulty in assessing the prevalence of toothdrawers at any one time, since there are more unnamed 'toothdrawers' encountered in contemporary texts than specifically identifiable individuals.

The picture is further complicated by authoritative bodies refusing to acknowledge credentials granted by other or opposing factions. The bishops' right to license physicians and surgeons, using machinery set up in 1511, brought them into conflict for many years with the barber-surgeons who wished to retain control over authorisation. In vain did Leonard Smith protest to the London Company in January 1630 that he had been approved by his bishop; he was firmly recorded in the Court's minutes as 'toothdrawer' and ordered to forbear his surgical practice.¹

As the seventeenth century progressed, the occupational term of 'toothdrawer' lost any faint precision still further. Emergence of the new group of 'operators for the teeth' (who extracted, cleaned, and provided artificial teeth) suggested an alternative title for self-promotion, or a means to enhance professional credibility, so there may well be toothdrawers concealed within the ranks of the 'operators'. As late as 1764, the *London Chronicle* was claiming, though without substantiation and with a townie's sneer:²

Every tooth-drawer who pretends to draw with a touch, is an Operator for the Teeth at least; But Oculists and Dentists abound in every country town; and I cannot help smiling at the rustic Barber-Surgeon, who joined both together and stiled himself on his shop-board, Oculist for the Teeth.

Conversely, since the contemporary public and press regarded dentistry with an even more jaundiced eye than today, they frequently degraded a quite respectable or competent operator or surgeon-dentist by refusing to regard him as anything other than a mere toothdrawer. Even the distinguished Samuel Rutter suffered at the hands of the *Edinburgh Chronicle*, though this was in a complaint about imported French words, so was less derogatory than might seem if taken out of context:³

Dentist figures it now in our news papers, and may do well enough for a French puffer; but we fancy Rutter is content with being called a *Touth drawer*.

1 Guildhall Library, London. Guildhall MS 5257/5, pp. 104, 107.

2 *London Chronicle*, 12-14 Apr 1764. Cited in B.W.Weinberger, *An Introduction to the History of Dentistry*, 2 vols (St Louis: Mosby, 1948), I, p. 230.

3 *Edinburgh Chronicle*, 15-18 Sept 1759.

Similarly, Horace Walpole regarded the fashionable London West End M. Lodimier as a 'French toothdrawer'.⁴

Popular detraction was exacerbated by casualness. Someone referred to as a 'toothdrawer' because he had just extracted or was about to do so, may easily have been surgeon, barber-surgeon, barber, apothecary, phlebotomist, toothdrawer proper, blacksmith, farrier, casual extractor, mountebank or charlatan. These problems of title bedevil the historian, whose analysis of prevalence and activities must thereby proceed with caution.

Emergence of toothdrawers

The vocabulary of Old English contained words for 'toothache', 'toothless', 'toothworm' and even 'toothsalve' and 'toothpick', but the absence of a word for some form of extraction technique suggests that this practice was not yet widespread. Toothdrawing as an activity distinct from barbary has yet to be proven in England before the beginning of the fourteenth century, but the occupational name would suggest that it had begun to develop earlier. William le Tothdrawer, for example, was committed to prison at York in 1301, as a result of asserting without right that he was a messenger of the Exchequer and assaulting some men of the vill of Wentbridge (near Pontefract):⁵

venerunt coram eodem Petro [de Leycestr'], diuersi homines eiusdem ville [Wentebrigg'] querimoniam facientes de quodam Willelmo Le Tothdrawer, quod idem Willelmus asserens se esse nunciam de scaccario, sub colore huiusmodi officii sui homines dicte ville insultauit, et ipsos uerberauit, et ipsos uerbis enormibus et contumeliosis deturpauit et victualia et alias res in eadem villa contra voluntatem dictorum hominum cepisse uoluit et asportasse

[there came before the same Peter [of Leicester] diuers men of the same vill [Wentbridge] making complaint of one William le Tothdrawer, that the same William, asserting that he was a messenger of the Exchequer, under cover of such his office assaulted the men of the said vill and beat them and with enormous and contumelious words vilified them and would take and carry off their victuals and other things in the same vill against the will of the said men]

Although locative names (such as those borne by the historians William of Malmesbury and Geoffrey of Monmouth) were a commoner form of surname than occupational descriptions at this period, the latter were fairly uniformly

4 Letter from Walpole to Henry Seymour Conway, 5 May 1753, in *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, ed. by W.S.Lewis et al, Yale edn., 48 vols (London: Oxford University Press, 1937-83), XXXVII (1974), pp. 354-55.

5 *Select Cases in the Exchequer of Pleas*, ed. by H.Jenkinson and B.E.R.Fermoy, *Selden Society*, 48(1931), 213.

distributed, though the use of *le* was less common in the north than the south. It has been suggested that as many miscreants were often rovers, without a permanent place of abode or of no known or admitted parentage, the scrivener for the Assize Rolls could only indicate them by their apparent or supposed occupation.⁶ William le Tothdrawer thus becomes the earliest recorded individual in this trade-group to have been so far identified.

Linguistic analysis of surnames is also useful in confirming the occupations of two later men. Roger Tothdrawer (of London) had been killed by John Spordaunce of Eslyng (Norfolk), but Spordaunce was pardoned by Edward III in 1368, on learning that the act had been in self-defence.⁷ David Tothdrawer, also of London, was brought to the attention of the Wardmote in 1422 because of 'fornication with divers unknown women'.⁸ However, unlike his companion-sinner (one Thomas Bridd, poulterer), David had no designated trade in the roll entry, which would suggest that the clerk regarded his trade as self-evident. Analyses of fifteenth-century rolls have revealed a remarkably high percentage of occupational names duplicating the trade,⁹ so the likelihood is that both Roger and David were indeed toothdrawers.

The ruffian-like image of these men may also be seen outside early fifteenth-century London. John Page of 'New Wyndesore' felt impelled in November 1409 to seek protection from John White 'tothdrawer', lest any impeachment, action or plea by him result in Page's arrest or imprisonment in Windsor gaol or elsewhere.¹⁰

All these men were disturbers of the peace: two were guilty of assault, one seems to have had no social inhibitions, another was aggressive. Nevertheless, it is only by activities or threats which brought them into contact with the courts, where records have survived, that their existence is known today. Those who led a more temperate life have remained in obscurity, though occasionally someone like Johannes Clerk, 'treacler and tuthdrager' of York in 1422, appears in a register of freemen.¹¹ Some early commentators,

6 C.L'Estrange Ewen, *A History of Surnames of the British Isles* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1931), p. 114.

7 *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Edw.III 1367-1370, p. 110.

8 *Cal.Plea & Memoranda Rolls, 1413-1437*, ed. by A.H.Thomas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), p. 122.

9 Ewen, pp. 193, 195.

10 *Cal.Close Rolls*, Hen.IV 1409-1413, p. 64.

11 *Register of the Freemen of the City of York. I: 1272-1558*, ed. by F.Collins, *Surtees Soc.*,

however, have not always appreciated the danger of making assumptions about clinical skills or community status based on the nature of surviving evidence. If a particular toothdrawer is known today only because of unruly behaviour, this should not lead to assumptions of incompetence or brutality. Nor should this be extended to encompass all other toothdrawers: the specific is not necessarily indicative of the whole. Samuel Robbes of Hadley, who (with others) assaulted 'one of His Majesty's officers within His Highnes' Chase at Enfield' in 1610,¹² may be strongly reminiscent of some of his mediaeval forebears, yet it must be remembered that Matthew Flynt, in 1400, was not only belligerent but sufficiently capable to be awarded a salary from the royal coffers.

Flynt is first encountered in 1396 in directions to the sheriffs of London:¹³

Writ of *supersedeas* and order by mainprise of John Henkesworth 'peautrer', Thomas Derlynge 'goldsmith', William Legeard 'botelmaker' and John Coke 'botelmaker' of the city of London to set free Richard Brigge of London 'botelmaker', if, taken at suit of Mathew Flynt of London 'tothdrawer' averring threats.

Brigge undoubtedly had supportive friends, but there seems little justification for the later assertion concerning Flynt that 'certain tradesmen ... went in bodily fear of him'¹⁴ — the writ merely indicates some aggression between the two men.

Flynt has become almost as well known to mediaeval as to dental historians, since the former seem to find much amusement in the subsequent grant for life made to him 'of 6d daily at the Exchequer, to the effect that he should do what pertains to his art to any poor lieges of the king who may need it in future without receiving anything from them'.¹⁵ What prompted this grant has continued to remain obscure. Henry IV had only recently usurped the throne, so supporters needed to be rewarded and any wavering allegiances secured. Had Flynt been more than a toothdrawer, or was the grant merely a

96(1896), 133. Clerk was an early apothecary.

12 W.J.Hardy and W.Le Hardy, *Middlesex County Records: Reports 1902-28* (London: Miller, 1928), p. 169.

13 *Cal.Close Rolls*, Ric.II 1396-1399, pp. 70-71.

14 L.Lindsay, *A Short History of Dentistry* (London: John Bale, Sons and Danielsson, 1933), p. 31.

15 *Cal.Patent Rolls*, Hen.IV 1399-1401, p. 255.

gesture of munificence that meant nothing more, a suggestion that Lindsay cited? It is unlikely that Flynt benefitted from the grant for more than two or three years — Henry's bankruptcy soon became all too apparent — but nevertheless it would seem that this was the first instance of the trade being salaried, and may even be the only one. If the Matthew Flynt of St Bride's parish, for whose will probate was granted in 1409,¹⁶ is the same man, then the questions continue: whence had he gained sufficient to justify making a will? was he a political activist? had he other occupations?

Decimation of the population from plague in the fourteenth century, noticeably in 1348-49, may partly explain the scarcity of named individuals between William le Tothdrawer and Flynt, David Tothdrawer and White. Recovery was patchy, but the reference to toothdrawers in *Piers Plowman* (in the C text, so c.1393) suggests that by then they had become part of community life. In the discourse on the Seven Deadly Sins, Glotoun (Gluttony) is on his way to church but is tempted into an ale-house, where he stays until evensong. In this vivid if disreputable scene, the company includes:¹⁷

Claryce of Cockeslane • the clerk of the churche 366
 Syre Peeres of Prydie • and Purnel of Flanders,
 An haywarde and an heremyte • the hangman of Tyborne,
 Dauwe the dykere • with a dosen harlotes
 Of portours and of pykeporses • and pylede toth-drawers, 370
 A rybibour and a ratoner • a rakere and hus knaue,
 A ropere and a redyngkyng • and Rose the disshere ...

By 1416, toothdrawers were sufficiently established in Beverley as to gain specific, respectable mention in the Order of the Barbers:¹⁸

Statutum est et concessum, prout perantea ordinatum fuerat, quod omnes

16 [in margin] 'Brigide Matheus fflynt
 Memorandum quod iij^o Idus Januarii Anno domini Millesimo CCC^{mo} Octavo probatum fuit
 testamentum Mathei fflynt Et commissa fuit administratio omnium bonorum &c. Alicie
 relicte dicti Mathei Executrici in dicto testamento Et per eandem admissa in forma iuris
 &c.' (Guildhall MS 9171/2 fol.140).

17 William Langland, *The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman*, Passus VII. In
 William Skeat's edition (1886), where the A, B and C texts have been printed simultaneous-
 ly, it can be seen that the relevant line (370) is absent from the A text, and lines 368 and
 370 are absent from the B text. For further treatment of this passage, see A.S.Hargreaves,
 'Toothdrawers in English popular literature prior to 1700', *Bulletin of the History of
 Dentistry*, 41(1993), 51-57.

18 *Beverley Town Documents*, ed. by A.F.Leach, *Selden Soc.*, 14(1900), 111.

*medici, sirurgici, fisici et extractores dentium, et quilibet eorundem, qui per annum
 integrum expectant comorandum infra villam Beverlaci, contribuant et contribuat
 expensis et costagiis artis predictae ut confratur*

[It was also decreed and granted, as it had been formerly decreed, that all medical
 men, surgeons, physicians and drawers of teeth, and every one of them who intend
 to live in the town of Beverley for a whole year, shall contribute to the common
 expenses and costs of the craft aforesaid as a brother]

By mid-century, toothdrawers were so numerous in East Anglia as to be included in the first English/Latin dictionary, the manuscript *Promptorium Parvulorum* (1440), compiled by the Dominican friar Galfridus in Bishop's Lynn; furthermore, distinction was made between 'Toothlesse for age' (= *edentatus*) and 'Toothlesse for yozghe [youth]' (= *edentulus*).¹⁹ In the companion English/Latin word-book, the *Catholicon Anglicum* (1483), there is no toothdrawer, but there are entries for 'Tuthe yren' (= *dentaria, dentariola*) and 'to draw oute Tethe' (= *edentare*).²⁰

Although de Chauillac had recommended in 1363 that 'operaciouns or wirchynges' on the teeth were 'moste approprede to barboures and to tothe drawers' (albeit under the governance of physicians),²¹ rather than being concentrated in the hands of the surgeons, it is unlikely that the majority of early toothdrawers had developed the responsibility or appropriate skills that he advocated. Crude instruments, with loose joints and irrelevant beak contours, and relative lack of anaesthesia would scarcely have resulted in clean extractions, even where there had been loss of periodontal attachment: tissue damage, haemorrhage, fracture, dislocation, infection and perhaps death were all possible sequelae.

Even those who had supposedly received some training in technique could encounter clinical difficulties. On 20 February 1427 the Court Rolls of Colchester recorded an action for damages brought against Richard Feryer by Richard Juell and his wife Joan, who claimed for the enormous sum of £40. Lindsay has variously viewed Feryer as both toothdrawer and barber, but the original text makes it clear that he was a barber.

It was alleged that Feryer had made an assault on Joan with his forceps:²²

19 *Promptorium Parvulorum*, ed. by A.L.Mayhew, *Early English Text Society*, e.s. 102(1908), col. 487.

20 *Catholicon Anglicum*, ed. by S.J.H.Herrtage, *E.E.T.S.*, o.s. 75(1881), pp. 380, 398.

21 *The Cyrurgie of Guy de Chauillac*, ed. by M.S.Ogden, *E.E.T.S.*, o.s. 265(1971), p. 485.

22 Essex Record Office, ERO D/B5 Cr47, m.18^f, 18^r and 20^f. The parchment rolls were

incaute et improvide trahens ipsum dentem cum maxilla eiusdem Johanne fregit et linguam eius laceravit et sanguinem ab ea nequiter traxit et alia enormia ei intulit

[incautiously and improvidently on drawing, broke the tooth itself with the jaw of the same Joan and lacerated her tongue and vilely drew blood from her and occasioned other outrages to her]

Feryer thereupon defended himself vigorously, claiming that he had treated Joan 'according to his art'. Presumably the Court was inclined in his favour since the March rolls note that the Juells were no longer pursuing their charge.

As the numbers of mobile poor increased, toothdrawing was one way to earn a meagre living when men were forced off the land or disbanded from a private army. Such skills as they had would be most needed by those in scattered rural communities too small to have their own 'rasyr-hows' and hence no convenient barber to hand, or by the very poor in emerging towns, though it would have been near desperation that led them to seek such services. It is unsurprising that toothdrawers were generally regarded with considerable apprehension and distaste, and this was mirrored in contemporary popular literature by their association with rat-catchers and the hang-man — a social but necessary evil.²³

They may have been too few, too independent by nature, or lacking in organisation to form any sort of craft-guild, but the popular image of an itinerant roaming the countryside, in flamboyant attire at markets and fairs, with a zany or merry-andrew at hand to drum up trade and amuse the gawping crowd, is an extravagant picture which draws heavily on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European illustrations: it ignores non-English cultures, disregards any element of satire or caricature, and is unable or unwilling to distinguish between those attempting to earn a reasonably honest living and the nostrum-mongers with a practical side-line, or the charlatans. The latter could certainly threaten the livelihood of the more responsible toothdrawers, many of whom were acquiring fairly settled bases in either the towns or the more populated rural areas, and who could with some justification feel aggrieved by their feckless counterparts lacking any fixed abode. Significantly, there is no

examined in the early 1930s by Sir William Gurney Benham; his translations, in manuscript, are currently held in the same office (ERO Acc.C8 Vol.11, pp. 59 and 67 for Feryer's case). It is probable that Lindsay's references to Feryer have been derived from personal communication with Benham since she uses his wording, though without acknowledgement.

23 e.g. *Cocke Lorelles Bote* (London, [1518?]); J.Hall, *The Courte of Vertue* (London, 1565), repr. as *The Court of Virtue*, ed. by R.A.Fraser (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 301; W.Cornwallis, *A Second Part of Essayes* (1601): Ess.43 'Of Vanitie', repr. in *Essayes by Sir William Cornwallis the Younger*, ed. by D.C.Allen (Baltimore: Hopkins, 1946), p. 174.

mention of toothdrawers in the rogue literature of the Tudor and early Jacobean period, despite its mixture of fact and fiction. They may have been rough, tough, partially itinerant and probably illiterate, but they were neither vagabonds nor malefactors, even though a few vagrants are known to have pretended to be toothdrawers or surgeons. Indeed, they were sufficiently part of the community to be included in the list of trades in the children's horn-book *Dives Pragmaticus*:²⁴

Al Barbours, Toothdrawers, and Fetherbed dryuers,
Al Collyers, Woodmasters, and good Billit clyvers.
Al Mylners, Maultsters, and Founders of belles,
Al Braziers, Potters, and makers of Welles...

By the Tudor period, despite the increase of 'masterless men' which prompted streams of legislation in attempted control, there is evidence that some toothdrawers were becoming respected for their craft skills and growing professional responsibility, in spite of all the technique handicaps previously mentioned. Kindheart, active in mid-Elizabethan London, was almost certainly a specific and well-regarded individual even though most surviving references to him are literary.²⁵ He has also been immortalised by Richard Deering, in his Fancy drawing on the cries of London, 'What D'Ye Lacke?':²⁶

Touch and goe! Touch and goe!
Ha'ye work for Kind Heart, the tooth-drawer?
Touch and goe!

John Brycket, on the other hand, is known today through his association with the London Company of Barber Surgeons, who not only were happy to admit him to the brethren in 1551, but whose Master was prepared to pay the initial dues for him if necessary:²⁷

24 *A Booke in Englysh metre, of the great Marchaunt man called Dives Pragmaticus, very preaty for children to rede* (London, 1563).

25 H.Chettle, *Kind-Harts Dreame* (London, 1592, repr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966). For full treatment of Kindheart see A.S.Hargreaves, 'Kindheart the toothdrawer: individual or type?', *Bull.Hist.Dent.*, 40(1992), 13-18.

26 F.Bridge, *Twelve Good Musicians* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1920), p. 61; *idem*, 'The musical cries of London in Shakespeare's time', *Proc.Musical Association*, 46(1919-20), 13-17; *idem*, *The Old Cryes of London* (London: Novello, 1921), pp. 50-51.

27 Guildhall MS 5257/1, fol.3^d.

Also the sayd M[aste]r and wardens hathe admytted John Brycket toothe drawer for a brother into this house, and he to paye thre wekes after Crystemas & xxs for hys admytance, besyde quartrage, orelles M[aste]r Holland to paye the same for him.

Brycket's fellow parishioner, William Tomlyn, was also admitted to the Company later in 1557, albeit at the second attempt and with the proviso that he had licence 'to Draw teethe, and to make Cleane teethe, and no more' and was 'not to sett oute no sygne'.²⁸ Later, in 1622 Cambridge, Henry Prest's skill was acknowledged when dealing with the oral damage left by some horse-mountebanks, and when Lord William Howard had a tooth removed in 1634, the account book recorded courteous payment to 'Mr Clark, a toothdrawer'.²⁹

This improved acceptance is mirrored in two literary extracts. According to an anonymous seventeenth-century commentator:³⁰

A Quack Doctor is one of the Epidemical Diseases of this age ... for his skill is not so much as a Tooth-drawers and a Corn-cutter is an Aesculapius to him.

The second passage occurs in one of the lesser-known Court masques of the early Stuart period, *Pan's Anniversary*, where the antimasquers were 'boys of Boetia' (i.e. country hicks) who had 'come to challenge the Arcadians at their own sports'. But as the Fencer proudly announced:³¹

A Tooth-drawer is our Foreman, that if there be but a bitter tooth in the company, it may bee called out at a twitch; he doth command any mans teeth out of his head upon the point of his Poynard; or tickles them forth with his ryding rod: Hee drawes teeth a horse-backe in full speed, yet hee will daunce a foot, he hath given his word: He is yeoman of the mouth to the whole Brotherhood, and is charged to see their gummes bee cleane, and their breath sweet, at a minutes warning.

Although there is some literary merging here of toothdrawers proper and fairground showmen, the foreman's status is reflected in Inigo Jones's design for his costume which, apart from costing far more than those of the other menials, was not fanciful furbelows and flourishes but typical dress for the

28 *Ibid.*, fol.35r.

29 *Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle*, ed. by G.Ormsby, *Surtees Soc.*, 68(1878), p. 314.

30 Cited in C.J.S.Thompson, *The Quacks of Old London* (London: Bretano's, 1928), p. 78.

31 I.Jones and B.Jonson, *Pans Anniversary; or the Shepherds Holy-Day*, in *The Workes of Benjamin Jonson: The second Volume* (London, 1640). First produced 19 June 1620 for the birthday of King James.

period: baggy calf-length breeches, and a high-crowned hat (like a copotain).³² The hat would have conferred additional importance, as also would the hobby-horse slung around his waist. These would further imply that his occupation was now perceived as superior to those of the other street-traders, such as tinker, juggler, corn-cutter, tinderbox man, clock-keeper, 'maker of mouse-traps, and bellows-mender. The dagger clutched firmly in one hand may say more about Inigo Jones's recent Italian trips than current English practice, though it was not unknown in this country.

Economic aspects

Evidence for dental pathology and pain from a range of sources suggests some need for extraction services, but these were not readily sought. Furthermore, toothdrawers were in competition with barbers and, to a lesser extent, those surgeons who were prepared to extract. Their skills were generally only called upon when all else had failed and continuing pain had finally overcome dread of the operation. This fear cannot be over-estimated. Kindheart had apparently lost three of his former patients to a charmer who 'promised to ease them onely with writing and after burning a word or two'.³³ Determined self-reliance, a necessity when there were few around with medical skills, also underlaid reluctance to seek professional (or semi-professional) services, and cost had to be borne in mind as well.

The apprehension in which toothdrawers were held had an inevitable effect on their livelihood. At no time did toothdrawing as a sole occupation carry with it any financial security. William le Tothdrawer had had to resort to deception and assault in 1301 to obtain food, and he was subsequently delivered from prison by the grace of the Court because he was poor — no money to pay any fine.

Dietary inadequacy (and consequent ill-health) was thus likely, and could not have been unique to William, for in the later seventeenth century John Ray included amongst his Jocular, Nugatory and Rustick Proverbs: 'He looks like a *Tooth-drawer*. i.e. very thin and meager'.³⁴ The essayist Steele was also familiar with the phrase.³⁵

32 Design reproduced in J.R.Planché, 'Remarks on the costume, etc., of some of the sketches by Inigo Jones', in *Inigo Jones and Ben Jonson*, ed. by P.Cunningham, *Shakespeare Soc.*, 14(1853), illustration between pp. 62 and 63.

33 Chettle, p. 32.

34 J.Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1678), p. 83.

35 *The Tatler*, no. 34, 28 June 1709. The reference is to James Salter ('Don Saltero').

When my first Astonishment was over, comes to me a Sage of a thin and meagre countenance; which Aspect made me doubt whether Reading or Fretting had made it so Philosophick: But I very soon perceiv'd him to be of that Sect which the Ancients called *Gingivistae*; in our language, Tooth-Drawers.

On the same lines, Beaumont and Fletcher had earlier made the lord Dion describe Pharamond, the Spanish prince, as looking like a toothdrawer (i.e. weak, if not wimpish).³⁶

Disappointingly few of the prices that were charged by toothdrawers (or by anyone else, for that matter) for extractions before the mid-eighteenth century have survived. Entries in personal journals or household account books provide some indication of charges, though many have been so cryptic that the number of teeth extracted, or by whom, remain unknown (Table 1 opposite).

Clearly, there was no standardisation of payment by either toothdrawers or barber-surgeons, and the social status of the patient was almost certainly the controlling factor behind any particular fee. Since much surviving evidence comes from documentation relating to the educated and upper classes, it can thus only partially indicate the range of charges for dental treatment and hence the income derived. Toothdrawers attending poorer patients, probably their main clientèle, would have received far less than the more established or organised barber-surgeons, and in a far less regular manner.

Because of the erratic nature of payments, it is unsurprising to find that many men had a secondary occupation. This may have been related work such as phlebotomy, bonesetting, or corn-cutting, or may have taken an entirely different direction such as that adopted by David Cornwell, who, around 1700, exhibited the 'Bold Grimace Spaniard' (as a freak) at the Ram's Head in Fenchurch Street, but was nevertheless prepared to draw 'stumps for ten shillings and teeth for five'.³⁷ More intriguing is Thomas Sherlocke of Kentishetowne, a recusant priest, whose clinical activities were sufficient for his nickname of 'Thomas Towthdrawer' to be used in the Middlesex Sessions Rolls, after he had illegally celebrated mass in December 1585.³⁸

formerly a servant to Sir Hans Sloane, who opened a barber's shop (in Chelsea) which developed into a coffee-house, noted for his collection of curiosities. According to the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* he was famous for his punch, could play a little on the fiddle, and shaved, bled, and drew teeth for nothing. The word '*Gingivistae*' is contrived.

³⁶ F. Beaumont and J. Fletcher, *Phylaster, Or, Love lyes a Bleeding* (London, 1620), p. 5.

³⁷ H. Morley, *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair* (London: Warne, 1874), p. 250.

³⁸ *Middlesex County Records. 3 Ed. VI to end Eliz.*, ed. by J. C. Jeaffreson, *Mddx. County Records Soc.*, (1886), I, p. 155, and II, pp. 191-92.

Extractor	payment	patient/source
Nicholas Sympson (Henry VIII's barber)	6 angels (45s.)	Princess Mary (1537) ³⁹
—	17s. 2d.	'Barbing Lord Percy [Earl of Northumberland], and pulling forth his teeth' (1608/9) ⁴⁰
'To Mr. Clark, a toothdrawer'	10s.	Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle (1634) ⁴¹
—	5-10s. 1s.	5th Earl of Bedford household page (1676) ⁴²
—	5s.	'George's teeth drawn' (c. 1693-4) ⁴³
Mr Guildus (apothecary, near Crosby, Lancashire)	5s.	Frances, wife of Squire Blundell (1704) ⁴⁴
Cuthbert Corney (Great Whitchingham, Norfolk)	6d.	[advert.] <i>Norwich Gazette</i> , 2 October 1708
—	4d. (1724) 6d. (1736) 3d. (1743)	Nancy, wife of Richard Latham ⁴⁵
John Reeves (farrier)	2s. 6d.	Rev J. Woodforde (4 June 1776) ⁴⁶

Table 1: record of charges for tooth extraction in personal papers

- ³⁹ *Privy Purse Expenses of the Princess Mary*, ed. by F. Madden (London: Pickering, 1831), p. 44.
- ⁴⁰ *Sixth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*, 5, Appendix (1877), p. 229.
- ⁴¹ As note 29.
- ⁴² G. S. Thomson, *Life in a Noble Household* (London: Cape, 1940), pp. 302, 308.
- ⁴³ Note in the Earl of Huntingdon's pocket-book, Hist. Manuscripts Commission, 78, *Hastings MSS*, 4 vols., I, p. 412.
- ⁴⁴ *The Great Diurnal of Nicholas Blundell*, ed. by J. J. Bagley, 3 vols., *Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 110, 112, 114 (1968-72), I, p. 70. The *Diurnal* states for 3 November 1704, 'Mr Guildus came to draw out a Tooth for my Wife', but an editorial footnote cites the *Disbursement Book*, 'November 1704 — drawing two teeth for my Wife ... 5s 0d.' As Guildus had declined to return to Crosby Hall on 6 November, Frances Blundell had had to resort to Dr Shaw in Liverpool on 8 November for the removal of 'a Stump of a Tooth', so the disbursement entry may therefore have covered both extractions since they were only 5 days apart.
- ⁴⁵ *The Account Book of Richard Latham 1724-1767*, ed. by L. Weatherill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 4, 32, 54.
- ⁴⁶ *The Diary of a Country Parson: The Reverend John Woodforde, 1758-1781*, ed. by J. Beresford, 5 vols (London: Milford, 1924-31), I, p. 183.

The most prevalent secondary occupation was phlebotomy, whether arteriotomy, venesection or cupping. The demand for this, particularly while the humoral doctrine prevailed, would have been far more regular than for *ad hoc* toothdrawing, so would have brought in a steadier, more reliable income. Indeed, it may well have been the mainstay of many toothdrawers' revenue, so that extractions might have become subsidiary to phlebotomy in some cases. Toothdrawers were as thoroughly used to the sight of blood as barbers, for whom the two activities had long been combined.

The association of phlebotomy with dental treatment persisted well into the nineteenth century. Amongst others in the provinces then, identified by Hillam, was William Allen of Birmingham, described as bleeder & toothdrawer in 1821, while Thomas Hutchinson of Nottingham was dentist, cupper and bleeder in 1840. William Joseph Dicker and John Crewer Bellamy, both of Plymouth, and John Pointing of Bristol were each still described as dentist and cupper as late as 1852, though the term 'cupper' had become much rarer since 1840.⁴⁷

The second most frequent parallel activity was corn-cutting, which combination also persisted well into the nineteenth century. As has been noted elsewhere, both fields of operation involved hard tissues of the body that were of reasonably easy access, if equally odiferous. Shoe design, then as now, only rarely allowed for the natural contours of the feet or permitted easy walking. With the introduction of the heel at the beginning of the seventeenth century came the innovation of 'straights', i.e. shoes that would fit either foot; only when high heels were abandoned c.1800 did right and left shoes return. As a result, the demand for corn-cutting services from an individual combining both occupations in the seventeenth century could well have exceeded that for dental attention.

The combined trades in Stuart England have been typified by a character called Gumb, one of the lesser mortals in *The London Chaunticleers*, which may have been written as early as 1636, though not published until 1659. His introductory street-cry is relatively prosaic — 'Have you any corns upon your feet or toes? any teeth to draw?' — but his lines carry a suggestion that even two trades were still not adequate for a reasonable livelihood:⁴⁸

O, for a flood now or a whole year of rain, that every step may be up to the ankles

47 C.Hillam, *Brass Plate and Brazen Impudence* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991), pp. 156 [Allen], 159 [Bellamy], 175 [Dicker], 197 [Hutchinson], 233 [Pointing].

48 *The London Chaunticleers* (London, 1659), repr. in *A Select Collection of Old English Plays*, 4th edn, rev. by W.C.Hazlitt, 15 vols (London: Reeves and Turner, 1874-76), XII, pp. 336-37.

in water, and cover every toe with a corn! May the shoemakers make all their shoes too strait, that they may pinch the sore-toed miser, and at every tread put him in mind of work for the corn-cutter! May the toothache be an hereditary disease, and prove infectious, or so many aldermen be turned into marble that the whole city may get rotten teeth with eating of sugar-plums and sweetmeats at their funerals.

Balance between the several activities was variable. John Goldstone, in Bath in 1744, 'Bleeds, Draws Teeth and Cuts Corns in the easiest and best Manner',⁴⁹ and later sold Greenough's tinctures for preserving the teeth and gums, and for curing toothache. Thomas Smith of King Street, Westminster, on the other hand, the self-styled 'first Master Corn-cutter of England', with an extensive daily round of some 21 coffee-houses in the early eighteenth century, was less concerned with teeth: he limited himself merely to selling 'the famourest ware in all England, which never fails curing the toothache in half an hour', in addition to 'killing the scurvy in the gums'.⁵⁰

Nineteenth-century dual practitioners included Dr Wolff (London, 1797-1811), Isaac Simmons (Manchester, 1813), and Fletcher (Brighton, 1818). The trades may have been similarly combined in Europe, though perhaps to a lesser extent: Braham and Davidson, both apparently from Germany, offered dual services in 1790s England, while Alex, from Amsterdam, described himself as 'Surgeon-Dentist and Corn-operator', and Durlacher (born in Germany) was corn-cutter and dentist in Bath from 1812 and Cheltenham from 1830-39.⁵¹

The third most associated activity was bonesetting, a craft which stood high amongst empirical skills, though it does not seem to have been sufficiently lucrative to become a fully-fledged independent trade. The respect in which it was held is reflected in the 1614 York ordinance which fined freemen who used unlicensed practitioners but specifically exempted bonesetters; the Elizabethan bonesetter Richard Durrant was so highly regarded in Norwich that the city

49 *Bath Journal*, 9 Apr 1744.

50 J.Lawood and J.C.Hotten, *The History of Signboards*, 3rd edn (London: Hotten, 1866), p. 108; *The Tatler*, ed. by D.F.Bond, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), II, p. 132 n.6, citing from Harleian MSS 5931.

51 D.W.Wright, 'London dentists in the 18th century', *Dent.Hist.*, 12(1986), 8-16; *idem*, 'London dentists 1800-1811', *Dent.Hist.*, 16(1989), 17-29; Hillam, pp. 177-78 [Durlacher], 183 [Fletcher], 234 [Simmons]; [Braham] *Chester Chronicle*, 15 Mar 1793, 11 May 1798; [Davidson] *Aris's Birmingham Gazette*, 24 Jul 1797, *Hereford Journal*, 28 Mar 1798; [Alex] *Glasgow Mercury*, 18 Aug 1795, *Edinburgh Evening Courant*, 16 Jul 1796. I am grateful to Dr Hillam for indicating the paucity of references to this combination of trades in contemporary European newspapers.

granted him a salary of £4 p.a., and his house rent was waived.⁵² Some men had the gift for it, while others gained their knowledge through apprenticeship; in some instances the skills were handed down from father to son through several generations.

Although it was frequently carpenters and blacksmiths who supplemented their income this way — they had both the physical strength and material for splints readily to hand — a few individuals have been identified who combined bonesetting with toothdrawing. In all instances the dentistry seems to have preceded the orthopaedics. William Lee of Newport Pagnell, Bucks., was licensed by Canterbury in July 1623 not only for 'curing pain in the teeth, extracting them', but also for dealing with fractured bones and dislocations.⁵³ Nearly a century later, the versatile William Bolton of Norwich was licensed in May 1708 for phlebotomy, toothdrawing, bonesetting and curing green wounds.⁵⁴ Another man was John Rushforth in Barnsley, described in 1828 as dentist and bonesetter.⁵⁵ However, the reforms and increasing regulation in the medical profession meant that it was not long before doctors risked disciplinary action for sending patients to such a 'quack', however skilled he might have been. Bonesetting was then to concentrate more on manipulation than on setting fractures, thereby developing into the disciplines of osteopathy and chiropractic.

The image of the penniless, destitute toothdrawer remains a stereotype even though it can be challenged by several men. Matthew Flynt's 6d./day grant was equivalent to £9 2s.6d. per annum, and even if he drew this for only a very short period, he still had sufficient estate to draw up a will, although only its probate has survived. John Brycket, admitted to the Barber-Surgeons' Company in 1551, must have been at the élite end of the spectrum since he had two houses and a gatehouse of which to dispose.⁵⁶

The really contentious individual is Peter de London, known today through the transcription and translation of a document found relatively recently

52 M.Pelling and C.Webster, 'Medical practitioners', in *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by C.Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 217; *The Records of the City of Norwich*, ed. by W.Hudson and J.C.Tingey, 2 vols (Norwich: Jarrold, 1906-10), II, p. 144.

53 Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, Wellcome MS 5342 (Haggis licences).

54 Norwich Record Office, NRO DN Sub4/3 Bk.12.

55 Hillam, p. 228.

56 Guildhall MS 9171/13, fol.56.

in the Verney papers, purporting to relate to a transfer of property in Staines, Middlesex, in July 1320.⁵⁷ This immediately prompts the question as to how a 'touzedrawere' of this period had the wherewithal to acquire substantial real estate comprising 'houses, lands, rents and tenements with courtyards and all and singular their appurtenances'.

When Donaldson, as editor of the *BDJ*, published the transcription in 1965, he very carefully and deliberately declined any sort of gloss or comment. His caution was justified. There is no trace of Peter de London in the surviving *Pedes Finum* for London and Middlesex; he is absent from the record index held by the abbey of Westminster, who then owned much of the manor of Staines; there is no mention of either Peter de London or Richard Dorreye (from whom the property was transferred) in the abbey's account rolls from 1322-1349, nor in the rentals and costumals that have been preserved. Absence from these records does not necessarily mean that Peter did not live at Staines, or hold land there, as the abbey did not own the entire parish, but the lack of further corroboration for something on this scale is nevertheless disturbing. There are some possible explanations which may be proposed: Peter might have transferred the property again fairly promptly, and the records have disappeared; his main residence could have been elsewhere, as yet undetermined; or, the document was a later forgery in an effort to establish claim to the land — not as uncommon a practice as might be thought.

There is one other possibility, which should receive serious consideration: that Peter de London was not really a toothdrawer but the victim of scribal humour or satire, to lighten the monotony of routine. There are frequent examples of this in early records: an attorney called 'Susprium et Fletus' ('a sighing and a weeping'); Willemus de Sancta Fide in 1205 being entered as 'Willemus de Sine Fide' in the same court the following year; Stephanus Bon Christien being later designated 'Stephanum Nequam Christianum' and (worse still) 'Stephanum Mal Christien'.⁵⁸

The Close Rolls for 1345 contain one instance of a Peter de London of co. Middlesex. Whether or not this is the same man, the context again implies a moneyed background and some status, since he was one of six men prepared to stand bail to the sheriff of London for a Devon man who may have been the victim of a miscarriage of justice.⁵⁹ Any questions about the 1320 Peter de London's wealth and occupation must therefore remain unanswered until further

57 J.A.Donaldson, 'Peter de London', *Brit.dent.J.*, 119(1965), 147-48.

58 Ewen, p. 349.

59 *Cal.Close Rolls*, Edw.III 1343-1346, pp. 575-76.

information is elicited, but until these are confirmed, extreme caution should be exercised about his classification in a dental context.

Licensing of toothdrawers

Evidence for toothdrawers proper is clearly episodic, patchy chronologically, and idiosyncratic, which inevitably blurs the picture of dental treatment in early modern England. There is, however, one small window at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The last of Henry VIII's three medical statutes, the so-called 'Quacks' Charter' of 1542-43, sharply criticised the surgeons before permitting some aspects of surgical treatment to be carried out by unqualified persons; the only restrictions to practice by any subject of the king who had knowledge of herbs, roots and waters were that they must not use cautery or incision, nor prescribe internal medicines. An interesting response to this statute is shown by the Norwich Subscription Books of the early eighteenth century. Other dioceses licensed people mainly as physicians, surgeons or midwives (in case of the need for urgent baptism), but Norwich was somewhat unusual in that it also licensed for the cure of specific maladies (such as the green sickness), for bonesetting and the curing of green wounds, sore eyes, sore breasts or distracted persons. In these same records there occur a number of licences for drawing teeth, possibly as a result of the administrative zeal of the then archdeacon of Norfolk, Charles Trimnell, subsequently Bishop of Norwich (1708-21). Such licences were not in fact unique to this diocese, but erratic recording as well as patchy survival of documentation means that, so far, only three other men outside East Anglia have been confirmed in this way. (Leonard Smith, caught between the Bishop of London and the London Company of Barber-Surgeons in 1630,⁶⁰ claimed to have been licensed as a surgeon, not as a toothdrawer, and so is excluded here).

The first of these was William Lee of Newport Pagnell, also a bonesetter, who was approved in 1623 for 'curing pain in the teeth, extracting them, *in facultate ossium fractorum conningendorum [sic] artum laxatorum in locum eorum reponendorum*'.⁶¹ His licence was valid over the whole province of Canterbury, which would have permitted considerable itineracy had he so chosen. The other seventeenth-century man was John Anthony of Beaconsfield, licensed in 1625 merely for 'extracting teeth and relieving pain in the same';⁶² his permitted area was defined specifically as the dioceses of Lincoln, Oxford,

Norwich, and Bath & Wells, but these bounds should have been sufficiently extensive for him to have experienced few real constraints. The third man, whose name has long been known, is Charles Hawker of Alcester, permitted to 'let Blood and to draw Teeth' by the diocese of Worcester in September 1722;⁶³ in his case, a Letter Testimonial (signed by four surgeons) has survived. Not all surgeons felt threatened by toothdrawers, so voluble detractors should not be taken as totally representative of contemporary attitudes.

Only a few aspects of the 24 men licensed by Norwich between 1701 and 1721 (detailed in the Appendix) can be touched on here. As with the other licensed medics, the toothdrawers' locations within the diocese were very diverse, and do not seem to have been related to the size of local population: four men were from Norwich itself and one from King's Lynn, but the rest came from rural areas, quite widely scattered, though predominantly in Norfolk. Carter has suggested that 'the probability is that most [medics] were natives of the place in which they practised',⁶⁴ so these licensed toothdrawers would probably have been well known locally in addition to serving their area from a known domicile; they would thus have been the more easily contactable as need arose, rather than sufferers having to wait until the next market day. Their wide distribution around Norfolk would then have provided the beginnings of a local network for basic dental treatment — there is no evidence yet of them providing artificial teeth — rather than it being random or town-based.

All licensed for toothdrawing combined this with phlebotomy, but a few had wider clinical skills: William Bolton of Norwich was also a bonesetter, additionally permitted to cure 'green wounds', as also were William Breeze at Pulham St Mary, Nathaniel Batho at Yoxford, Anthony Roper at Long Stratton, and John Stanton at Woodbastwick.

The two earliest licences, in 1701, were for 'Chirurgery and ptticular for drawing of teeth and bleeding', which phrasing emphasises the fluid boundaries between clinical activities at that period, and the close relationship between surgery and aspects of early practical dentistry. William Breeze, Thomas Cushing and Robert Gray were in fact barber-surgeons — the latter two taking known apprentices — so it may be wondered why they sought or were encouraged to take out licences when they were already legally permitted to clean and extract teeth. Perhaps they had been entered originally on the

60 As note 1.

61 Wellcome MS 5342.

62 *Ibid.*

63 R.A.Cohen, 'Warwickshire doctors and dentists', *Dent. Hist.*, 10(1984), 8-11; Wellcome MS 5348.

64 E.H.Carter, *The Norwich Subscription Books* (London: Nelson, 1937), p. 146.

barbers' side, but wished to emphasise their 'surgical' credentials, or had been affected by zealous officialdom? Competition could hardly have been a factor, since Calvin Wells's figures for caries prevalence in an eighteenth-century Norwich population suggest that there would have been plenty of work for barbers and toothdrawers alike.⁶⁵

The signatures in the Subscription Books offer a brief reflection of the education of the various licensees. Barber-surgeons were trained by apprenticeship, so were generally able to sign fluently and confidently. Less secure were the phlebotomists and midwives (some of whom had their hands guided or resorted to drawing their initials with much care), but there were relatively few who could do no more than make their mark. The 24 licensed for toothdrawing were far from being an illiterate group: Henry Raynor's signature was rather childish in its formation, but only one man was forced to sign by mark — Edward Minns.⁶⁶ Even if the formal schooling of these men had fallen short of that for the physicians, or even the barber-surgeons, it should be remembered that their technical competence had been vouched for (or should have been vouched for) by their peers or clinical seniors beforehand, following the original Henrician ruling. So even though treatment was basic rather than sophisticated, with varying levels of clinical skill, they were regarded by contemporaries as reasonably responsible, far in advance of casual extractors or itinerant charlatans.

The question then arises as to whether the Norfolk situation was replicated elsewhere. Was it, in fact, a mirror of southern England at that period? There remains an attitude that provincial and especially rural dentistry then was scant if not nearly non-existent, confined mainly to urgent extractions carried out by local blacksmiths or farriers, or mountebanks at fairs. Yet the evidence of these licences points strongly to there having been an extensive body of individuals serving their local communities in their various needs. Despite the fact that relevant data have survived for only one diocese, over a relatively short period, it would be very strange if this particular aspect of provision of health-care was a purely short-term, highly localised development.

* * *

There is no pure line of descent from toothdrawers to today's general dental practitioners. Such evidence as is presently available suggests that although a few were absorbed into the ranks of the late seventeenth and

65 C. Wells, 'Dental pathology from a Norwich, Norfolk, burial ground', *Journal of the History of Medicine & Allied Sciences*, 23(1968), 372-79.

66 Reproduced in Carter, *opp.* p. 146.

eighteenth-century operators for the teeth (who also repaired or restored), most became swamped in the competitive medical arena and were overtaken by evolution; in consequence their numbers lessened sharply, seemingly content to offer limited services to their local community. With the growth of scientific medicine in the early nineteenth century, increasing exclusivity and associated power for the medical men, regulation and hardening of professional boundaries, it is perhaps little wonder that the trade-group finally faded away.

If this present account appears overgenerous to toothdrawers, Richard Wiseman's remarks include a telling reminder of reality. Despite his advice that 'When the Teeth are dislocated, or to be dislocated, a Tooth-drawer is consulted', and despite his punctiliousness in bringing in Peter de la Roche or George Gosling for dental work, extracting remained a hazardous undertaking.⁶⁷

An Officer of the King's Regiment of Foot ... sent for a Toothdrawer, who pulling out the Tooth brake the *Alveoli* off from the jaw according to the length of it. The pain made great Fluxion, and required Evacuation and Revulsion by Bleeding and the like. But this being omitted, and the Part affected not treated as it ought, the pain increased, the neighbouring Parts swelled and apostemated, and all his Teeth and part of the *Alveoli* cast off.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful thanks are due to the respective Chief Librarians and their staff at the Guildhall Library (London), the Robinson Library (University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne), the Institute of Historical Research (University of London), the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, Durham University Library, Edinburgh Public Library; to the County Archivists at the Essex and Norfolk County Record Offices; and to the Keeper of the Muniments at Westminster Abbey. The help of Dr Anders Winroth (Sir James Knott Research Fellow in the History Department, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne) in checking the transcription of the probate entry for Matthew Flynt is much appreciated, as also are the comments by Emeritus Professor J.A. Cannon, of the same department.

67 R. Wiseman, *Severall Chirurgicall Treatises* (London, 1676), Bk. II, Ch. VII, p. 188.

APPENDIX

Identifiable toothdrawers

(with primary sources only)

William ALLEN

8 Philip Street, Birmingham, 1821. 'Bleeder, toothdrawer'.

Triennial Directory of Birmingham.——— **ALLAT**

'At Lin with a Garland of teeth about his necke', c.1622. Brother of a doctor [probably Robert Allott, MD 1608, Linacre lecturer, d. Cambridge 1642].

R.Bannister, *A treatise of One Hundred and Thirteen Diseases of the Eyes, and Eye-Liddes* (London, 1622), breviary.**John AMES**

Brunstead, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 16 Jun 1711, for 'the arts of Phlebotomy and drawing teeth'.

Norfolk Record Office [NRO] DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Edmond ANDREWS

Halesworth, Suffolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 13 Jun 1706, for 'the Art of blood letting and Tooth drawing'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

John ANTHONY

Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire. Licensed by province of Canterbury, 26 Feb 1624/5, for 'extracting teeth and relieving pain in the same' in dioceses of Lincoln, Oxford, Norwich, Bath & Wells.

Wellcome MS 5342.

Nathaniel BATHO

Yoxford, Suffolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 10 Apr 1711, for 'the art of Letting of Blood Drawing of Teeth and Curing green wounds'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Nathaniel BELL

Cantley, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 15 Mar 1700/1, for 'Chirurgery and ptticulary for drawing of teeth and bleeding'.

NRO DN Sub 1/1 Bk.1.

William BOLTON

Norwich. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 19 May 1708, for 'the Arts of Phlebotomy, Teeth drawing bone setting and curing green wounds'. Described as 'Chirurgion Instrument Maker' on admission to freedom 24 Feb 1696/7.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

William BREEZE

Pulham St Mary, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 28 Jun 1709, for 'the art of letting blood drawing teeth and curing green wounds'. Will proved 1726, when described as 'barber-surgeon'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

John BRYCKET

St Botolph without Bishopsgate, London. Admitted into London Company of Barber-Surgeons, 10 Sept 1551. Will dated 11 Feb 1554/5, leaving 2 houses and a gatehouse.

[Court minutes, London Company of Barber-Surgeons] Guildhall MS 5257/1 fol.3^d; [will] Guildhall MS 9171/13 fol.56.**Peter BURRELL**

Ranworth, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 20 Jan 1706/7, for 'the art of blood letting and drawing of teeth'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Robert CANN

Fundenhall, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 30 May 1706, for 'the Arts of bleeding and Tooth drawing'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Mr CLARK

Summoned to Naworth Castle (near Carlisle), 1 Feb 1633/4.

The Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle, ed. by G.Ornsby, *Surtees Soc.*, 68(1878), 314.**Thomas CLARKE**

Birmingham

'Drawer of teeth'. c.1790 (*PHIBB Index*, 2nd.ed., 1988), but 'dentist' in 1785-93 Birmingham trade directories.**Johannes CLERK**

Registered as 'treacler and tuthdragher' on admission to freedom of the City of

York, 1422.

Register of the Freemen of the City of York. I: 1272-1558, ed. by F. Collins, *Surtees Soc.*, 96(1897), 133.

Edward COMPORT

Shoe-lane, London, late 17th century.

C.J.S. Thompson, *The Quacks of Old London* (London: Bretano's, 1928), p. 196.

James COOKE

Halifax, c.1740-post 1772. Toothdrawer & bleeder, working from his own home, but prepared to serve as an 'apoteaker'. Single.

Reply 26 Dec 1772 to an advertisement in an unidentified Leeds weekly newspaper. Reported in *Dent.Hist.*, 20(1991), 50.

Cuthbert CORNEY

Great Whitchingham, Norfolk. Toothdrawer/phlebotomist and ague-curer.

Norwich Gazette, 2 Oct 1708.

Thomas CUSHING

Swanton Novers, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 22 Apr 1705, for 'the Art of Bleeding and drawing teeth'. Apprentice: Benjamin Daniell (May 1714).

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Giles DAVY

Lyng, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 23 Mar 1707/8, for 'the Art of Phlebotomy and drawing of teeth'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Katheryn DAWSON

London. Widow of John Brycket (*q.v.*), but forbidden by the London Company of Barber-Surgeons to continue her toothdrawing practice 5 Oct 1557, possibly because of her re-marriage to Hew Dawson, but more probably because of poor skill.

Guildhall MS 5257/1 fol.33v.

——— DELAROCK

French, but in England from 1619. In London, near Fleet bridge, Oct 1635. Probably the father of Peter de la Roche, Operator for the Teeth to Charles II, and possibly the same man as Gideon Delarocke, d.1655, Clerkenwell.

Return of Strangers in the Metropolis 1593, 1627, 1635, 1639, ed. by I.Scouloudi, *Pub.Hug.Soc. Lond.*, 57(1985), 269.

Thomas FAULKNER

Turner Street, Manchester, 'Fustian cutter, toothdrawer' 1788; 12, Oldham Street, Manchester, 'Dentist' 1794-1817. Died 1819.

Manchester & Salford directories, *et al.*

Matthew FLYNT

London. Writ of *supersedeas* and order by mainprise against him Nov 1396. Grant for life of 6d. daily at the Exchequer to 'do what pertains to his art', Apr 1400. ?Probate Jan 1409.

Cal. Close Rolls, Ric.II, 1396-1399, pp. 70-71; *Cal.Pat.Rolls*, Hen.IV, 1399-1401, p. 255; Guildhall MS 9171/2 fol.140v.

John GOLDSTONE

London. In Bath 1744, lodging at Mr Lambe's, Grocer in Stall Street. 'Bleeds, Draws Teeth and Cuts Corns in the easiest and best Manner'.

Bath Journal, 9 Apr 1744.

Benjamin GOULSON

1, Lomal's Buildings, Manchester, 1804. 'Bleeder, toothdrawer'.

Manchester & Salford Directory.

Robert GRAY

Trowse Newton, nr Norwich. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 29 Dec 1716, for 'Phlebotomy and drawing of teeth'. Apprentice: John Thurtell (July 1721).

NRO DN Sub 4/6 Bk.15.

William HARRISON

11, Crown Street, Manchester, 1804. 'Toothdrawer'.

Manchester & Salford Directory.

John HARVEY

Bawdeswell, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 3 Apr 1704, for 'the Art of Bleeding and Drawing Teeth'.

NRO DN Sub 1/1 Bk.1.

Charles HAWKER

Alcester, Warwickshire. Licensed by diocese of Worcester, 7 Sept 1722, 'to let Blood and to draw teeth'.

Wellcome MS 5348.

'KINDHEART'

Nickname of an Elizabethan toothdrawer in London. Probably a real person, although most references to him are literary.

H.Chettle, *Kindharts Dreame* (London, 1592); J.F. Bridge, *The Old Cryes of London* (London: Novello, 1921), p. 51.

William LEE

Newport Pagnell, Buckinghamshire. Bonesetter and toothdrawer. Licensed by province of Canterbury, 30 Jul 1623, for 'curing pain in teeth, extracting them, in facultate ossium fractorum conningendorum artum laxatorum in locum eorum reponendorum'.
Wellcome MS 5342.

Angell MARCK

Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 5 Jul 1706, for 'the Arts of Phlebotomy and drawing of Teeth'. No location given, but probably in Norfolk.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Mathewe

London, c.1518. Probably a real person, though known only through his inclusion on the pardoner's list in *Cocke Lorelles Bote*, pr. W.de Worde (c.1518).
Repr. in *Early English Poetry, Ballads and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages*, ed. by E.F.Rimbault, *Percy Soc.*, 6(1843), 5.

Edward MINNS

Norwich. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 10 May 1708, for 'ye Art of blood letting & drawing Teeth'. Signed by mark.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Nathaniel MOLDEN

Norwich, dec. by Mar 1723. According to son (Agabus Molden), practised toothdrawing for near 40 years, but register of freemen at Norwich lists him as barber-surgeon, admitted 21 Oct 1685.
Norwich Gazette, 2 Mar 1723.

William MOORE

Castle Ditches, Norwich, 1761. Bleeder & toothdrawer, at shop of the widow of the recently-deceased Benjamin Payne, barber, son of Benjamin Payne (q.v.). Claimed a London apprenticeship.
Norwich Mercury, 7 & 14 Feb 1761.

William NAILER

84, Dudley Street, Birmingham. 'Bleeder & toothdrawer' 1770; 'toothdrawer' 1774-5.
Birmingham trade directories.

George NAYLOR

King's Lynn, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 10 Jun 1706, for 'ye Arts of Bloodletting & Toothdrawing'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Absolom NEUTH

Harly-Wood, parish of Horsley (Surrey), 1787. Bleeder & toothdrawer, 'successor to his late father and grandfather'.
General Intelligencer, 28 May 1787.

NEUTH

Father of Absolom Neuth (q.v.). Deceased *ante* May 1787.

NEUTH

Grandfather of Absolom Neuth (q.v.).

William ORREY

Coltishall, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 25 Mar 1701, for 'Chirurgery and pticularly Letting blood and drawing of teeth'.
NRO DN Sub 1/1 Bk.1.

Robert PALMER

Nottingham, d.Nov 1794.
The Diary of Abigail Gawthorn of Nottingham 1751-1810, ed. by A.Henstock, *Thoroton Rec.Soc.Series*, 32(1980), 61.

Benjamin PAYNE

St Peter Mancroft, Norwich. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 1 Feb 1720/1 for 'the Art of Blood letting & drawing of Teeth'. Barber, who with John Paley moved from Castle Hill into the Dikes, Norwich, Feb 1721.
NRO DN Sub 4/6 Bk.15; *Norwich Gazette*, 11 & 18 Feb 1721.

Peter de LONDON

Purchaser of real estate in Staines, Middlesex, Jul 1320. Yet to be authenticated as a genuine toothdrawer.
Deed reproduced in *Brit.dent.J.*, 119(1965), 147-48.

Henry PREST

Cambridge, c. 1622.
R.Bannister, *A Treatise of One Hundred and Thirteen Diseases of the Eyes, and Eye-Liddes*, breviary.

Henry RAYNOR

Blofield, Norfolk. Licensed by the diocese of Norwich, 27 Apr 1706, for 'the Art of Bleeding and drawing of teeth'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Samuel ROBBES

Hadley. With others, assaulted one of the King's Officers, Enfield, 1610.
Middlesex County Records, Reports 1902-1928, ed. by W.J.Hardy & W. Le Hardy (London: Miller, 1928), p. 169.

Anthony ROPER

Long Stratton, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 15 Jul 1712, for 'the Arts of Phlebotomy Raseing gums drawing teeth and curing green wounds'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

William SCOTT

Old Buckenham, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 10 Dec 1703, for 'bleeding and drawing of teeth'.
NRO DN Sub 1/1 Bk.1.

Philip SHERMAN

Feltwell St Mary, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 9 May 1707, for 'the art of Bleeding & drawing teeth'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Leonard SMITH

London. Claimed to have been approved by his bishop, but not included amongst Haggis licenses in Wellcome Institute. Ordered by London Company of Barber-Surgeons (who referred to him as 'Tooth drawer') to forbear his practice, Jan 1629/30; forbidden by them to practise surgery, Apr 1630.
Guildhall MS 5257/5, pp. 104, 107.

John STANTON

Woodbastwick, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 19 Jul 1712, for 'the Art of Phlebotomy Rawing gums drawing teeth and curing Green wounds'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

Robert SYMONDS

Norwich. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 2 Dec 1709, for 'the Art of Phlebotomy drawing teeth and Rawing Gums'.
NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

William TOMLYN

St Botolph without Bishopsgate, London. Forbidden by London Company of

Barber-Surgeons to continue his practice 5 Oct 1557, but admitted to the Company 23 Nov 1557, licensed only to draw and clean teeth 'and no more'.
Guildhall MS 5257/1 fols.33^r, 35^r.

David TOTHEDRAWER

Parish of St Peter, London. Brought before the wardmote in Jan 1422 because 'on 20 Aug and at many other times committed fornication with divers unknown women'.

Cal.Plea & Memor.Rolls, 1413-1437, p. 122.

Roger TOUTHDRAWER

London, *ante* 1368. Killed in self-defence by John Spordaunce of Eslyng, Norfolk, who was pardoned by the king in May 1368.

Cal.Pat.Rolls, Edw.III, 1367-1370, p. 110.

Jeremiah WALLACH

German, but *fl.* 1741-9 in Church-Lane, nr Whitechapel Church, London. 'Bleeder & toothdrawer' 1741; 'Bleeder & Operator of the Teeth' 1749.

Daily Advertiser, 5 Nov 1741, 17 Jan 1749.

——— WALLACH

Son of Jeremiah Wallach (*q.v.*). Same 'Art and house' as his father, 1741.

Edward WELLS

North Elmham, Norfolk. Licensed by diocese of Norwich, 14 Apr 1705, for 'the Art of Drawing Teeth and bleeding'.

NRO DN Sub 4/3 Bk.12.

John WHITE

Protection against him sought by John Page of New Wyndesore, 1409.

Cal.Close Rolls, Hen.IV, 1409-1413, p. 64.

William le TOTHEDRAWER

Assault and deception in the vill of Wentbridge (Yorkshire), Easter week 1301. Committed to prison at York, but later released because of his poverty.

Select Cases in the Exchequer of Pleas, ed. by H.Jenkinson & B.E.R.Fermoy, *Selden Soc.*, 48(1932), p. 213.

Edward WITHANALL

16, Lower Priory, Birmingham, *fl.* 1757-70. 'Bleeder with leeches and tooth drawer'.

Universal Directory for Towns of Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Walsall, Dudley.

Unnamed toothdrawers

One alien toothdrawer in London, Oct 1616.

Lists of Foreign Protestants, and Aliens, Resident in England 1618-1688, ed. by W.D.Cooper, *Camden Soc.*, 82(1862), vi; *Returns of Aliens in this City and Suburbs of London 1598-1625*, ed. by R.E.G.Kirk & E.F.Kirk, *Pub.Hug.Soc.Lond.*, 10(Pt.III)(1907), 140.

One who extracted 4 teeth from a wife of Sir John Hotham (parliamentarian, executed 1645), prob. between 1607 and 1636.

Diary of Rev John Ward, ed. by C.Severn (London: Colburn, 1839), pp. 122-23.

'A female of great eminence in the art', Wapping, Jun 1754.

H. Fielding, *The Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon* (London: Dent, 1932), p. 209.

A man on Castle-hill, Norwich, 1709. Teeth drawn (3d. a piece) or trimmed (1d. a man).

Norwich Gazette, 16 Apr 1709.