Dependency, Shame and Belonging
Badging the Deserving Poor, *c*.1550-1750*

In his 'Famylar and Frendly Discourse, Dialogue Wyse' of 1587, the chronicler of metropolitan hospital foundations John Howes envisaged two characters, *Dignitie* and *Dutie*, debating the ways in which the deserving might be distinguished from the undeserving poor on the streets of the city of London.[1] 'What badge or marcke', *Dignitie* asked, 'would you that the poore should beare about them?' *Dutie* replied that the worthy poor should wear a square of blue cloth upon which would be mounted a parchment inscribed with the arms of the city, the name and parish of the pauper, and the pension which he or she regularly received. If those seeking alms were found without a badge of this kind 'fastened to the upper garment upon the brest or backe', he insisted that they were not only to be 'sharpelye punnyshed', presumably with the apparatus of social discipline with which Ian Archer tells us the streets of the metropolis had become littered, but 'allsoe to loose their pencyons'.[2] *Dignitie* was affronted: surely this policy could not apply to 'honest men or women which have lyved in good state and [are] now decayed'? Indeed not, *Dutie* countered: the badge was to be worn only by those whom the parish officers suspected to be 'gadders and wanderers abroad'. Even this, however, did not placate *Dignitie*. Badging the poor was, he insisted, a radical change of policy which would prevent casual almsgiving and deter any beggars from coming 'to mens doores to receave the reversion of meate and porridge' as they were encouraged to do in the late Elizabethan campaigns for general hospitality.[3] By all means let begging from door to door continue, *Dutie* agreed, so long as mendicants seeking victuals 'allwaies [wore] theire badges on their backe or breaste'. *Dignitie* nonetheless recognised that badging implied public humiliation: 'the shame of the badge', he insisted, 'will make somme

kepe in and not to goe abroade'. The cultivation of a sense of shame among the poor, *Dutie* responded, was a price worth paying precisely because many pensioners earned more from begging than they received from the parish officers. 'I am perswaded', he argued, 'that a number had rather loose theire weekly pencyons then to be restrained of their libertie of begging'. Only through 'the carefullnes of theire governors, the dilligence of the beadells and the bearinge of their badges', *Dutie* concluded, could the streets be 'well cleansed of beggars, roges and ydell people'.

This 'Famylar and Frendly Discourse' encapsulates a number of themes concerning the identification, and indeed the self-identification, of various categories of poor people in early modern England, upon two of which this paper will elaborate by looking backwards from Howes to the sixteenth century precedents for badging and forward to the compulsory badging of all parish paupers under a statute of 1697. In the first instance, the argument in favour of badging the poor developed out of popular confusion about the uneasy conjunction of public and private charity. It was abundantly clear from *Dignitie*'s more conservative contributions to the 'Discourse' that parish paupers were expected, and in some respects even encouraged, to supplement their weekly pensions with casual, perhaps even with regular, begging and that some of them found mendicancy a highly profitable supplement to their parish pay. But, *Dutie* asked, how could householders be sure that those they relieved at their doors were the known neighbourhood poor whom overseers had so painstakingly identified as deserving? In the populous parishes of the metropolis, he feared, the charity of householders would be exploited by shiftless hordes of migrants and vagrants. The deserving, *Dignitie* implied, could easily be identified by their manifest reluctance to seek alms. Badges were therefore necessary not only to single out the undeserving (who would be prevented from wearing them) but also to help

restrict charity to the institutional relief provided by the parish. In the second place, moreover, in resorting to badging the authorities deliberately nurtured a sense of shame amongst the poor, seeking to exploit the reluctance of the indigent to be humiliated by the conspicuous receipt of public relief, to feel the chill of what the poor came to call the cold, often even the frozen, hand of charity. By the end of the sixteenth century, I want to suggest, badges were evolving from tokens of approval to become symbols of humiliation, and those who wore them were being transformed from the respectable to the dependant poor: the poor of the parish. Even in 1587, however, Howes' *Dutie* stopped short of insisting that the aged (or 'decayed') honest poor wear badges. By the end of the seventeenth century, the *shame* of poverty was inscribed in a physical emblem which was applied indiscriminately to all paupers. Even aged pensioners were to wear the parish badge, labelled in canvas with the initial letters of their place of settlement: KP—Kenilworth parish.

I: The 1697 Statute and its Antecedents

John Howes' dialogue anticipated by over a century the discourse of deterrence which gave rise to the infamous statute of 1697 under the terms of which the poor, even (perhaps even especially) those considered to be deserving, were made to wear badges indicating that they received pensions. By the closing decades of the seventeenth century, there was widespread concern among parish ratepayers about exponentially increasing relief costs.[4] Their desire to control the welfare machine was also shared by polemicists and policymakers among whom there was a developing sense that outdoor relief actually fostered a 'culture of dependency' in which the labouring poor preferred rather to live 'on the parish' than to take pains for their own maintenance. Although magistrates throughout England had consistently sought to

ensure that the award of parish pensions was a last resort, and almost invariably reduced, suspended or cancelled them where they suspected that poor households were able to support themselves by their labour, expenditure nonetheless continued to rise.[5] Even the 1692 statute by which overseers of the poor were prevented from adding new applicants for relief to the pension rolls without the permission of a magistrate (a measure deliberately designed to prevent the promiscuous granting of relief by parish officers) served only to intensify those protracted negotiations between prospective paupers, vestrymen and magistrates which had long characterised the administration of the Elizabethan relief statutes, and in turn to generate thousands of petitions for pensions to distant justices of the peace and subsequent appeals claiming that parish officers had stood in contempt of justices' relief orders.[6] Late seventeenth-century magistrates and legislators alike therefore recognised the need to deter potential applicants by making life on the parish as unattractive as possible.

The MP for Gloucestershire Sir Richard Cocks lamented in the 1690s that because the poor were confident that 'the parish is obliged in old age, extremities, and necessities to provide' for them, they would 'in plenty and cheap times' either 'work little, or live without saving'. The solution, he insisted, was the outright repeal of the poor laws and their replacement with harsher methods 'to affright [the poor] from their idle and negligent practices and behaviour, and force them to be as willing to work as we are to employ them'.[7] In *Bread for the Poor* (1698), the Devonshire clergyman Richard Dunning was similarly confident that the indigent had come to recognise 'parish pay' to be 'a work of less trouble and more profit than daily labour'.[8] Perhaps both men had heard paupers singing the popular ballad 'Hang Sorrow, cast away Care; the parish is bound to find us, &c', which critics of the poor

law such as Henry Fielding found such an offensive 'song of Triumph' well into the eighteenth century.[9] Although both Cocks and Dunning were to be frustrated in their desire for repeal, what piecemeal reform of the legislation there was ensured that deterrence, often enforced through shaming sanctions, became a leitmotif of poor law policy. From the 1690s onwards, the polemicists' intention that being 'on the parish' should be a humiliating experience began to find echoes in the parishes not only of the metropolis and the provincial towns but also across rural England.[10]

The shame of pauperisation received its ultimate symbolic representation in the badging of the poor under the statute of 1697. This was, potentially, not only a critical episode in the history of poverty and poor relief, but also arguably the single most decisive moment in the creation of social identity, in early modern England. The act ordered that all poor persons receiving parish relief must wear a badge in red or blue cloth on the shoulder of the right sleeve in an open and visible manner. Any parish officer who dispensed relief to a poor person not wearing a badge could be fined 20s. for each disbursement, and any pauper who refused the badge was either to have their relief withdrawn or to be whipped and committed to bridewell for three weeks' hard labour. In requiring that the wives and children of parish paupers also wear the badge, moreover, the act powerfully insisted upon the notion that idleness was an inherited condition, propagated by feckless parents who lacked the moral compass to inculcate habits of industry and discipline in their offspring.[11]

The full legislative history of the badging statute will probably never be written. There are no extant reports of parliamentary debates on the bill and any relevant literature on its passage in contemporary broadsheets or pamphlets is also conspicuous by its failure to survive.[12] The MP who was principally responsible for the act was Henry Blaake, a Whig who sat for the Wiltshire textile borough of

Calne.[13] Unfortunately Blaake is not well represented in the correspondence of the period and appears to have left no cache of private papers. Neither did Lord Stamford, who chaired the committee of the whole that considered the bill in the Lords. Blaake, however, had strong Bristol connections, and may have been influenced by the local networks of a city which saw the founding of one of the earliest Corporations of the Poor in 1696 and subsequently of a Society for the Reformation of Manners in 1700.[14] If Blaake's experience of Bristol politics is one possible context for the act, another is provided by the difficulties experienced by manufacturing regions generally, and clothing districts in particular, during the mid-1690s.[15]

The lack of evidence for the parliamentary context of the act is obviously frustrating, but is less damaging to the project of reconstructing the evolution of the policy than might be imagined. Badging had in fact been practiced in England, and indeed in most of Europe, for at least two centuries before the 1697 statute was passed. The demand that certain beggars 'wear a sign' can be traced as early as 1370 in European sources, and there is ample evidence that tokens were granted in earnest of alms to those who received relief from the monasteries and other charitable institutions of western Europe, including England, throughout the late medieval period.[16] By the early sixteenth century, the authorities in the reformed cities of central Europe were insisting that although the deserving poor should not go unrelieved, neither should they be invisible. In the 1520s and '30s, for example, the resident paupers of Nuremberg, Regensburg and Zurich were all made to wear symbols indicating that they were publicly relieved.[17] These initiatives were emulated, and in one or two cases actually anticipated, in the towns of early Tudor England.

In early sixteenth century English towns, badges were issued as a stamp of approval, a testimonial of the truth of the deserving or diseased status of those who wore them. Badges, 'tokens' or 'signs' were worn by those resident beggars who asked alms weekly in Gloucester from 1504, in York from 1515, in Leicester and London from 1517, in Shrewsbury from 1520, in Coventry from 1521, in Lincoln from 1543 (and again in 1545), in King's Lynn from 1547, and in Ipswich from 1557.[18] Local experiments of this kind were doubtless encouraged by the formal licensing of beggars stipulated in Tudor legislation, especially the statute of 1563, a measure prompted in part by the difficulties of identifying the resident poor at a time of rapid immigration into the towns of the south and the midlands.[19] In 1571, the corporation of Bristol spent over nine shillings on tin badges for twenty poor people who were 'to go into Somerset to seek relief'. The officers of the parishes in the boroughs of Leicester and Northampton took similar initiatives in 1577 and 1585 respectively, and those of Canterbury and Oxford had also complied by the end of the sixteenth century. The vestries of the metropolitan parishes of St Botolph Aldgate, St Michael Cornhill and St Stephen Walbrook, furthermore, all badged the poor both before and after begging licenses were once more explicitly authorised in 1598, and the policy was extended to all London parishes in 1600. In Salisbury, it was nostalgically observed in 1613, beggars had 'in times past had a certain badge sewed on their coats to the end they might be known of all people'.[20] In virtually all these cases, the badging of beggars predated the introduction, even though it was precocious in the urban environment, of formal welfare provision (financed by rates, distributed in pensions) for the deserving poor.[21]

Nor was it uncommon for the respectable recipients of endowed charities founded in the early seventeenth century to be required to wear badged coats, as in the

scores of parishes provided for under the bequest of Henry Smith; at Southwark (under that of Robert Buckland); or at Llangoed and Bedgelert (that of William Wynn). The gowns worn by the almsmen of the College of the Poor in Southwark, of Hugh Sexey's Hospital in Bruton (Somerset) and of Thomas Dutton's hospital in Northleach, and the coats worn by those of Anthony Bradshaw's almshouse in Duffield (Derbyshire), were similarly badged so that they could be easily identified. Even though the poor children lodged in the Salisbury workhouse were not permitted 'to resort home to their parents or else to wander up and down the streets', they were from 1638 to wear badges bearing the arms of the city and blue caps 'whereby they might be known the children of the workhouse and distinguished from all other children'.[22] Badged coats and gowns of this kind were much more elaborate than the badges worn by beggars or paupers, and effectively functioned as liveries, publicly representing the munificence of the benefactor and the gratitude of those who were proud to accept it.

Although they were far more primitive and functional than coats or gowns, however, it is arguable that even parish badges were marks of distinction, in the more positive sense of that word. By wearing badges, the known neighbourhood poor marked themselves out as deserving, publicising the fact that overseers not only thought them worthy of parish relief but had also authorised them to supplement their pensions through seeking alms from door to door. This sense that a badged pauper was *respectable* was even more developed in the case of the recipients of endowed charity who often had to satisfy very stringent criteria of eligibility; and more obvious still in the case of almsmen, the 'decayed Trollpian worthies' described by Paul Slack who had earned the right to a comfortable retirement in a generously endowed hospital by living lives of diligence, thrift and sobriety.[23] These, then, were badges of

honour and those who wore them were the deserving, perhaps even the honourable, in the case of the almsmen maybe even the *honorary*, poor.

II: From Shame to Stigma?

By the early years of the seventeenth century, however, the semiotics of badging had begun to shift, a process that culminated in the 1697 statute. As early as 1587, as we have seen, Howes' *Dignitie* had recognised that the badge might be less a sign of approval than one of odium.[24] One of the principal components of this shift was the changing significance of a sense of shame amongst the poor. Students of charity and welfare in medieval and early modern Europe have long emphasised the significance of, and the special treatment accorded to, the 'shame-faced poor': the *poveri vergognosi* of fifteenth-century Florence, Renaissance Venice and seventeenth-century Turin described by Richard Trexler, Brian Pullan and Sandra Cavallo, or the (*en*)*vergonzantes* of Habsburg Toledo, Salamanca and Zamora depicted by Linda Martz and Maureen Flynn. These were usually decayed householders of considerable social standing and respectability who sense of personal honour and pride made them reluctant to publicise their indigence by begging, and whose loss of wealth and status might present formidable problems for the stability of a 'society of orders'. The shame-faced poor of European cities were, therefore, most appropriately relieved covertly, beyond the sight of their neighbours.[25] Historians of sixteenth-century England are similarly coming to recognise that contemporaries thought that an elevated senses of honour was a positive attribute amongst the poor. The charitable response was paradoxical. On the one hand, feelings of shame were actively to be discouraged in the indigent, for it was argued that the deserving must always make their needs known in order that they could be fed, clothed and sheltered. On the other,

the shame-faced poor were admired, and sometimes even rewarded, for their humble reluctance to advertise their plight. In Coventry, for instance, the terms of early sixteenth-century bequests specifically singled out for aid those whose personal sense of humility prevented them from begging. Beneficiaries of charity were to be such poor householders 'as can be knowen have need and ben ashamed to aske or begge openly' or who 'be ashamed to begge and be no comen beggars'.[26] In England as elsewhere in Europe, the silence of the shame-faced poor found its reward in quiet relief.

Nor was this discourse associated exclusively with pre-reformation notions of what Lee Palmer Wandel has called 'works-righteousness'.[27] As late as 1596, the Tudor regime was reminding householders throughout the land that although the relief of the impotent poor was a 'proper work of charity', it was less urgent than hospitality to those who, their manifest need notwithstanding, were 'ashamed to begg and crave thy charity as others doe'.[28] Even in the early seventeenth century, clerical exponents of the 'commonwealth' tradition of voluntary almsgiving like the rector of Farway (Devon), Thomas Foster, were advocating 'silent and close beneficence' on the grounds that the fear of 'exprobation' experienced by the recipients of relief was at least as corrosive of the charitable imperative as the kind of ostentation sometimes displayed so conspicuously by donors.[29] Indeed, the idiom of shame was consistently rehearsed and played upon by applicants for both parish relief and endowed charity long into the seventeenth century as they explained to vestrymen and trustees alike that they had covertly borrowed and even pawned goods from their neighbours rather than publicly ask relief of their betters.[30]

By the 1630s, however, such views had begun to look old-fashioned. When, in 1631, the Hampshire JPs expressed their frustration that numerous poor householders

still refused, even in a year of chronic food shortage, to claim public relief, they blamed this reluctance not on a popular sense of shame but on fear, sloth and ignorance.[31] As institutional relief spread across the country in the middle decades of the seventeenth century, moreover, magistrates' astonishment that the poor did not seek to mobilise whatever rights they might have under the Elizabethan statutes gradually turned into resentment that the indigent were only too enthusiastic in claiming relief. Writing almost a century later in 1752, Thomas Alcock eloquently summarised the process by which, he sought to persuade his readers, the poor had come to believe not only that they might claim public relief, but that they had every right to do so. In the early years after the legislation of 1601, he argued, the burden of welfare expenditure was 'light and inconsiderable', for few men ever applied for relief. 'It was', Alcock thought, 'a shame and a scandal for a person to throw himself on a parish, and parents, children, relatives and friends commonly endeavoured all they could, as well as the party himself to prevent it'. But this spirit of independence evaporated as more and more of the indigent benefited from pensions: 'the sweets of parish pay being once felt, more and more persons soon put in for a share of it', and 'the shame grew less and less and numbers countenanced and encouraged one another'.[32] It was for this reason, wrote the political economist Robert Pashley in 1852, that badging had been 'calculated to embitter the bread of poverty.[33]

By the mid-eighteenth century, rhetoric of this kind was doubtless inherent to a polemic constructed to call the popular sense of a 'right' to parish relief into question. Magistracy and vestry alike were, nonetheless, actively encouraging feelings of shame among those who openly advertised their plight. Whereas the indigent had once been expected to publicise their need by holding out their hands to accept doles, and had identified themselves as poor by their very willingness to accept charity, now

they were deliberately deterred from seeking the alms of the parish. In John Howes'
'Discourse' we catch attitudes towards the shame-faced poor in transition, with *Dutie*
expressing horror at the merest implication by *Dignitie* that 'honest men or women
which have lyved in good state and [are] now decayed', like the other deserving poor,
should be made to wear a badge to distinguish them from 'idell beggars'.[34] By the
1690s, however, the distinction between the undeserving and the deserving had come
to seem less significant than that between the dependant and the labouring. As Alcock
retrospectively argued, 'badges seemed right ordered to be fix'd as some public marks
of shame, and to distinguish parish paupers from those industrious poor that live by
their own endeavours'.[35]

Although Richard Dunning argued that the wearing of the badge should make
the poor 'submissive and orderly', deterrence was probably only one of the strands of
thinking that fed into the 1697 statute.[36] As we have seen, there was a long pre-
history of using badges to distinguish the resident deserving poor from casual
beggars, and this was a tradition on which some late seventeenth-century polemicists
drew, even though the clause of the 1598 statute which had explicitly authorised
licensed begging had been quietly dropped from its sequel in 1601.[37] Thomas Firmin
argued as late as 1678 that paupers should be prevented from augmenting their parish
income except by labour, and suggested that those incapable of work should be
badged in recognition of their inability to do anything but beg.[38] He advocated the
general adoption of a policy already practised in the London parish of St Botolph
Aldgate where 'a badge with the three first letters of the parishes name upon it' was to
be made up 'of blew and yellow bayes' and pinned upon 'the sleeve or breast' of all
those persons who were permitted to seek alms from their neighbours. Householders,
in turn, were to promise to give casual relief exclusively to those who wore badges.

Firmin could not understand either 'why anybody should be offended' that 'the parishioners should invite their poor neighbours once a day to come to their houses to receive such bread and meat as they are willing to bestow' nor why those wearing badges should 'go under so dishonourable a name as beggars' when they were to all intents and purposes '*invited guests*'.[39] In turn, he argued, common beggars would either soon learn that casual alms were not to be had, or if they did not, then 'those very poor who wear the badge and are appointed to take relief' would 'soon hunt them out of the parish or provoke the beadles to do it'.[40] These ideas were taken up by John Locke in 1697 who argued not only that badges should be a means of licensing beggars but also that parish pensioners wear them in order that they might 'have liberty to declare their wants, and receive broken bread and meat, or other charity, from well-disposed people'. In this respect, Locke, like Firmin before him, was echoing the views of *Dutie* in Howes' 'Famylar and Frendly Discourse' of over a century before.[41]

Despite these compassionate apologies for badging, harking back as they did to the kind of thinking that had underpinned the late Elizabethan campaign for general hospitality, there is very little evidence that badges were generally used as licenses to beg by the late seventeenth century. A very few examples in support of this tendency originate, as might be expected, in Scotland, Wales and Ireland where (because the assessment of rates and the distribution of pensions was less common), the badging of the poor seems to have retained a much closer relationship with licensed begging, but also, more surprisingly, in the far north-west of England. The case of the 'decrepit' Eskdale widow who explained in 1732 that she had 'sought her bread up and down the parish these twentie yeares, having a badge upon her shoulder and [being] allowed by [the parish officers] to seek' suggests that in Cumberland badges were worn both

to indicate dependency and as a recognition of the right to beg long into the eighteenth century.[42]

That Firmin's rather traditional views were not widely shared is, furthermore, made abundantly clear in a satirical critique of benevolent thinking about the badging of the poor which survives in the mid-eighteenth-century papers of the vestry of Wimbledon (Surrey). In a searing attack on those who misguidedly regarded badging as an act of victimisation under the terms of a tyrannical statute, its anonymous author mocked the case for repeal by postulating five putative 'reasons why the poor who are maintained by the parish should *not* wear a badge'. Wearing a badge would be a 'very unreasonable humiliation' of the poor and 'much beneath their dignity'. Badging would 'interrupt the poor' in their 'very agreeable method of passing the time' in 'idling begging or abusing their neighbours or benefactors'. The badge symbolised social obligation, a principle despised by the poor who would 'scorn to wear such a deception' leaving the parish 'to lose the honour of maintaining them and only support such as are really humble and pitiful'. In order to avoid the badge, the poor would be forced to 'exert themselves to gain maintenance by their own industry' which 'would be a great hardship upon such as are not fond of working and can easily throw themselves in the poorhouse'. Finally, badging should be disregarded because it was established by act of parliament, and the common people knew that all such injunctions were 'great infringements of their liberties'.[43] Satire of this kind clearly bespoke the case in favour of badging as it was understood by parish officers and ratepayers alike: that it shamed and deterred; that it prevented casual begging and idleness; that it encouraged gratitude and humility; that it stimulated independence and industry; and that it was underpinned by statutory authority. The Wimbledon vestrymen had self-evidently repudiated the commonwealth rhetoric through which

badging had originally been justified as part of a programme of licensed begging.[44] To a twenty-first century audience, this polemic amounts to an apologia for 'stigmatising' the poor, in the modern sense of ensuring that the state of dependency was one of disgrace and dishonour. To an early modern public, however, stigmata had a rather different meaning: the marks identifying a branded felon. In this sense, badging the poor was a modification of the sixteenth century practice of branding or whipping the idle, a way of inscribing an external physical sign on the clothes, rather than on the bodies, of the dependent poor.[45]

III: The Practice of Badging

In their monumental study of the old poor law of 1927, Sidney and Beatrice Webbs famously argued that the badging of the poor under the 1697 statute never became general and that it proved short-lived even in those parishes where it was initially enforced. Their assessment that 'nothing could secure compliance with the law on this point' was, however, swayed by their reading of the complaint literature of the early 1750s which argued that the policy was 'almost universally disused'. Alcock, indeed, argued in 1752 that 'these marks of distinction have had but little effect and for that reason have been almost everywhere neglected'.[46] Some polemicists, moreover, were sceptical that the law could ever be effectively enforced. Although Dunning argued that 'the wearing of the badge or the threat of it would make the poor thrifty and industrious', he nonetheless thought that 'some [ratepayers] will be positively against it and oppose it to the utmost, and will join with the insolence of the poor and rather than hinder will lead and encourage them in their aspersions of it and otherwise oppose it'.[47] Although Dunning refused to elaborate on the motivation for such recalcitrance, it is probable that he had in mind those lesser

ratepayers who might well become dependant on parish relief in old age and were therefore reluctant to encourage a disgrace to which they would themselves eventually become subject.[48]

More recent work on parish archives suggests that the marking out of the dependent poor was in fact practiced far more widely than the Webbs' scepticism, Alcock's regret or Dunning's pessimism allowed. The following discussion is based on a systematic search of all extant poor law parochial material in the 1690s for two counties (Somerset and Warwickshire) supplemented by other evidence amassed as part of larger project on the politics of poor relief in rural England. The survival rate of overseers' accounts before the mid-eighteenth century is not, it should be emphasised, impressive: only sixteen Warwickshire parishes have extant accounts for the period before 1760. Even those vestries whose efficient bureaucracies have resulted in the survival of plentiful parish papers have not, moreover, ensured continuous runs of records. Whereas overseers' lists of expenditure might frequently indicate payments for making badges, the decisions to enforce the wearing of them are generally less common, usually surviving only in vestry minute books, the survival rate of which is not high for this period.

These evidential problems notwithstanding, it is particularly striking that the badging of those who received parish relief, rather than merely of those who were licensed to beg, was being practised in some areas for some two decades before the 1697 statute was passed. In the 1670s and '80s, in an echo of the local experimentation which had a century earlier preceded the initial statutory requirement to collect poor rates, badges were issued in numerous parishes of the city of London and in the towns of Cambridge, Colchester, Exeter, Norwich and Wisbech.[49] Badging was also precociously practiced in such rural parishes as Petworth (Sussex) from

1677; Romsey (Hampshire) from 1678; Tonbridge (Kent) from 1682; Pattingham (Staffordshire) from 1685; and Brighton (Sussex) and Cowden (Kent) from 1696. In Wem (Shropshire), 'the parishioners' had also 'caused every one of their poore to weare a P. made of tin' long before the 1697 statute.[50] Their motives for pre-empting the legislation can only be guessed at. The enthusiasm of some parish officers for badging might in part, for instance, be explained by the fact that they were also providing coats for the poor and by their concomitant fear that paupers might engage in pawning, pledging for credit even the rough hempen clothing provided by the parish.[51]

County magistrates also apparently anticipated the 1697 statute in Hampshire where badges of both cloth and metal were stipulated in 1685; in Middlesex, where 'pensioners refusing to wear the badge' were 'to have their pensions stopped until they conform to the order' in October 1694; and in Warwickshire in October 1695, where parish officers were to forbear further relief until 'such a poor person reform himself'. In the Middlesex case, the order was motivated by the oppression of inhabitants 'by the poor begging at their doors and shops' and by the 'inconvenience' of being unable to distinguish among 'the great number of poor and the parishes to which they belong'.[52] Other county benches, for example those of Cumberland in 1700, of the West Riding in 1716, and of West Kent in 1717 followed suit by issuing general orders insisting on pauper badges.[53]

These county-wide initiatives were taken very seriously in the parishes, even in small communities where they might be thought unnecessary because the dependant poor were well known and easily recognised. Early eighteenth-century overseers accounts are replete with payments for the making of badges. Indeed, the expenditure incurred by parishes could be substantial, especially where vestries opted,

in the interests of durability, for metal badges. While badges made of cloth might cost a penny or two each, those stamped on tin or brass involved far greater outlay. Although the most common pattern for a badge was a pair of cloth letters, more elaborate designs were occasionally attempted. Those made in Petworth (Sussex) in 1677 were discs of brass, three inches in diameter, punched through with four eyelets for sewing onto clothing, and had the date scratched on the rim. Even more remarkable were the paupers' badges made in Romsey (Hampshire) in 1678, which were elaborate leaden plaques four inches by three inches, inscribed with the arms of the town and the inscription: 'I receves allemes of the town of Rumsey' [insert figure 1, facing page]. The vestry of Harefield (Middlesex) experimented with both brass and cloth badges during the 1690s. Even where parish officers settled on cloth, expenditure might be significant: 13s10d was spent on the making of badges in Gnossal between 1730 and 1740 and 12s6d in Puddletown (Dorset) as late as 1778.[54] Some parish officers evidently bought badges in bulk. The overseers of Eaton Socon had some 92 badges made at a total cost of £1-2s-6d in the years 1706-19, and their colleagues at Wisbech ordered 180 badges and a stamp to manufacture them in 1680. The parish officers of Stogumber (Somerset) paid £2-10 for *two hundred* badges in 1698.[55]

Recorded alongside expenditure on badges were parish orders warning the poor that they would forfeit pensions if they failed to wear them: at Aylesbury (Buckinghamshire), Gnosall (Staffordshire), Terling (Essex) and Whickham (County Durham) from 1697; at Little Crosby, Manchester and Warton (all Lancashire) in 1698; at Roxton (Bedfordshire) and Grimsargh and Urmston (both Lancashire) from 1699; at Ashwell (Hertfordshire) from 1701 and again in 1718 and 1721; at Burton-on-Trent (Staffordshire) and Atherton and Prescot (both Lancashire) from 1702; at

Gnossal and at Linton (Cambridgeshire) from 1703; at Great Horwood (Buckinghamshire) and at Lapworth (Warwickshire) from 1704; at Eaton Socon (Bedfordshire) and Bow Brickill (Buckinghamshire) from 1706; at Meldreth (Cambridgeshire) five times between 1708 and 1723; at Trull (Somerset) from 1709 and again in 1728; at Kirkoswald (Cumberland) from 1710; at Edlesborough (Buckinghamshire) from 1711; at St Botolph's Cambridge from 1712; at Liverpool from 1713 (and again in 1718); at St Martins-in-the-Fields (Westminster) and Chalfont St Peter (Buckinghamshire) from 1722; at Bottisham (Cambridgeshire) from 1727 and again in 1730; at Lapworth (Warwickshire) and Warrington (Lancashire) from 1729; at Hackney (Middlesex) in the 1730s; at Sutton Bennington (Nottinghamshire) in 1731; at Frieston (Lincolnshire) and Winscale (Westmoreland) from 1737; at Shipston-on-Stour (Worcestershire) from 1742; in both Puddletown and Wimborne Minster (Dorset) from 1745; at Highley (Shropshire) from 1761; Poulton (Lancashire) from 1767; and in the Durham parishes of Symondburn (1733), Morpeth (1747), Long Newton (1775), and Houghton le Spring (1790).[56] In Stone (Staffordshire), it seems that the poor were consistently made to wear badges between 1697 and 1784.[57] Whether and for how long other parishes sustained these initiatives is unclear, and where vestries had paid for large numbers of badges at outset, it is unlikely that even the payments recorded in overseers' accounts would disclose the pattern of enforcement.

This barrage of examples is intended to convey both the geographical spread and the chronological perdurance of orders to badge the poor, and especially to demonstrate that badging initiatives were made even in relatively small rural parishes where population turnover was far less significant and recognition of the deserving was far less of an issue. Taken together, the array of examples of implementation

makes a powerful case for the early impact of the 1697 statute and is, moreover, suggestive of the level of badging which predated it, and which perhaps even inspired the parliamentary initiative itself. Whether this evidence quite undermines the Webbs' impression of the situation in the 1750s is, however, far from clear. It certainly seems likely that the repeal of badging in 1810 was preceded by a waning in badging initiatives which would fit comfortably with the Webbs reading of mid-eighteenth-century attitudes.

The problem with this distribution of examples, of course, is that these instances are dispersed and sporadic, making it difficult to draw more general conclusions. Even so, it should be emphasised that extant expenditure lists which do not refer to the badging of the poor in the 1690s are far less common than those that do. All four Warwickshire parishes with extant accounts for the year 1695-96 recorded outlay for cloth, thread and craftsmanship to make and sew lettered badges on the clothes of the poor. Six of eight Somerset parishes with surviving records of expenditure for the 1690s paid for badges, two of them also providing the coats on which they were to be stitched.[58] Essex parish papers, moreover, convey a more localised sense of the nature, scale and extent of the enterprise to badge the poor. In some of the larger parishes—St Mary's Chelmsford from 1684, Braintree from 1688, Wivenhoe from 1692—badging predated the 1697 statute.[59] In at least one, Thaxted, compliance with the act was almost immediate.[60] In a series of others, vestries passed resolutions to badge the poor as the eighteenth century progressed: Writtle (1708), Upminster (1723), Stanford Rivers (1724), Lambourne (1737). The vestrymen of Birchanger subscribed to a badging order in 1765 with the promise that they would 'contribute to the utmost of [their] powers in all respects to see the same carried into execution'.[61] In only one case was the bitter pill sweetened: the pensioners of St

Mary's Chelmsford were not only badged but clothed in blue kersey in 1705.[62] The Somerset justices also seem to have had a keen interest in badging, repeatedly insisted on the enforcement of the policy in 1731, 1755, 1757, 1769 and 1787.[63] In all probability, the policy was most rigorously enforced when ratepayers felt particularly over-burdened. After all, the efflorescence of badging orders in years of high prices, such as 1727-30 or 1741, was probably not coincidental.[64]

As the examples cited above suggest, justices' and vestrymen's badging orders often had to be repeated. The vestrymen of Pattingham, for instance, made twelve separate badging orders between 1685 and 1731.[65] As in other aspects of early modern social policy, the interpretation of repetition of this kind is problematic. On the one hand, repetition might imply initial (perhaps even subsequent) failure to comply with badging orders, a failure which might be the product of any number of factors, including the negligence or passive resistance of parish officers, and perhaps even of their sensitivity to the likely or actual responses of paupers.[66] Overseers may in fact have made special dispensations for those paupers who had unchallenged reputations for honesty and propriety. Among the late eighteenth-century parish papers of Cruwys Morland (Devon), for instance, is the form of a justice's order to exempt paupers of good character from wearing the badge. This precedent was justified by the provisions of a statute of 1782, the preamble of which referred to the 'very grievous' 'sufferings and distresses of the poor' occasioned by the 'incapacity, negligence or misconduct of overseers'. As early as 1698, Dunning had argued that those of 'civil demeanour', the sick, children and the aged should be exempted from wearing the badge. Henry Fielding suggested in 1753 that those labourers who were 'entirely guiltless' should be distinguished from those 'guilty of some crime (idleness at least)' by the absence of badges.[67] On the other hand, it is striking that some

vestrymen simply kept trying, their continual orders and payments for the provision of badges testifying both to their frustration with, and their enthusiasm for, the policy. They might also have pragmatic motives. In some parishes, such as Wem, it was argued that 'the wearinge of the badge was onely to save the Officers harmlesse from the [financial] penalty in the Act'.[68]

Perhaps repeated orders were also provoked by the hostility, reluctance or complaints of the poor themselves. At least one magistrate enforced the punishment and then thought better of it. When the Kent JP Paul D'Aranda came across two goodwives near Sevenoaks who were not wearing the badge in 1708, he sanctioned the reduction of their pensions, only to rescind his order on appeal. He nonetheless noticed that they were not wearing badges when he saw them again the following day.[69] The case of Anne Bowman of Kirkoswald (Cumberland), whose pension of sixpence a week was made conditional on her wearing the badge in 1710, nevertheless suggests that although magistrates might be encouraged, perhaps even tempted, to spare the very elderly the humiliation, they were perfectly prepared to insist that a 78-year old widow wear the badge.[70] Indeed, only very rarely do vestries seem to have granted any latitude in this matter, although the officers of Wimborne Minster (Dorset) did concede in 1745 that forfeitures for not wearing the badge might be waived on occasions of 'the utmost necessity, as in cases of sickness or other accidental misfortune'.[71] The power to badge the poor was finally repealed in 1810, though the corporation of Bury St Edmunds attempted to enforce it as late as 1800, and the vestries of Gnossal (1810), Lacock (1817) and Toddington (Bedfordshire) (1819) sought to deploy its sanctions even after they had lost the legal authority to do so.[72]

As befitted a policy of deterrence, moreover, the logic of exemplary punishment was selectively applied to those who did not conform. Pensions were actually withheld from a widow from Brighton and from a single mother from Solihull (Warwickshire) in 1696; from another widow from Cowden (Kent) in 1698; from four women of Burton-on-Trent in 1703; from a widow of St Andrew's Holborn in 1705; from three women of Chalfont St Peter in 1729; and from a single mother and her bastard child in Whinfell (Cumberland) in 1738. One of the poor pensioners of East Barnet (Hertfordshire) was actually committed to prison in 1732 'for insulting the churchwarden and not wearing his badge as the act of parliament directs'.[73] The laconic but resonant formula used to deprive the collectioners in the Chalfont St Peter case is, moreover, a powerful reminder that badging orders were not merely symbolic: 'no bodge this month no pay'.[74] The preponderance of women in this sample suggests that there was a conspicuous lack of identity between, on the one hand, the targets of the discourse which condemned the culture of dependency, primarily young labouring men with families who preferred collection to labour; and, on the other, the recipients of relief as it was actually practiced across thousands of parishes, who were primarily widows, the majority of them elderly.[75] Overwhelmingly female pensioner populations, it seems, gradually became 'masculinised' only during the course of the eighteenth century.[76] This gulf between discourse and reality may go some way to explaining the negotiations in which paupers, parish officers and magistrates perforce participated as they actively debated if, when and by whom badges should be worn.

IV: Conclusion: The Semiotics of Badging

In 1698, the poor of Warton (Lancashire) were 'called together and badges given to them that owned themselves such that it might be known thereby who was

poor and who was not'. One Bridget Winder, the parish officers recounted, 'would not own herself such but scorned the badge'.[77] Winder's reaction is suggestive that overseers might even have anticipated resistance. At Easter 1697, the vestry of the Warwickshire parish of Fillongley audited the overseers' accounts for the preceding twelve months. Among the payments were 10d 'for red cloth for the poor' and 10d 'for setting the letters on the poor'. Unlike other parishes, however, Fillongley had not provided coats, which meant that the badges had to be stitched to the paupers' own clothing and, in turn, that the poor had to be present in person while the tailor did his work, a situation which brings an entirely new resonance to the phrase 'red letter day'. It does not require much imaginative sympathy to visualise half a dozen elderly paupers gathered in the workshop. At least the parish officers were sensitive to the potential volatility of this encounter and sought to mollify the paupers by providing them with ale, at a charge of fourpence, while they waited.[78]

It is tempting to speculate whether the Fillongley paupers felt embittered and truculemt, bewildered and indignant, or weary and resigned, perhaps even proud and (literally) relieved. Exercises of empathy of this kind, however, almost invariably raise the fundamental question of precisely whose attitudes are under consideration. Some commentary on this issue has undoubtedly been influenced by shared historical knowledge of the devastation caused in the twentieth century, and indeed earlier, by similar acts of stigmatisation. Indeed, the badging of the poor continues to arouse feelings of distaste, abhorrence and even of moral outrage among historians of social relations. Noting that badges were issued both to workhouse inmates and to the outdoor poor in mid-eighteenth-century Virginia, John Nelson remarks that the episode points towards 'future dark chapters in history'. Valerie Pearl regards 'badging the poor with tin armlets' as one of the 'inhumanities of the time'. For Keith

Wrightson and David Levine, the badged coat, like the pauper funeral, was among those symbols of the age that caused 'a shudder of pain' to vibrate across the centuries.[79] Observations of this kind raise in particularly acute form the enormous difficulty of arriving at a real understanding of what 'taking the patch' *meant* at the time, especially to the poor of the parish and their families.[80] The most plausible answer is that wearing the parish badge meant many things and that the semiotics of badging were ambiguous.

Some paupers may have seen the strategic advantages of wearing the badge, for it publicly advertised the official recognition of their respectability. The badged pauper had satisfied the overseers, and the ratepayers they represented, that they were deserving of the alms of the parish and that they had passed the stringent tests of eligibility on which magistrates and parish officers generally insisted. To be sure, badges symbolised paupers' inability to work, but they also publicised their sobriety, their fear of God, and their past careers of thrift and industry on behalf of themselves and their families. They were, furthermore, evidence that the poor accepted their lot with equanimity, that they deferred to, and accepted the charity of, their betters. In this sense, badges were marks of inclusion, indicative both of a pauper's conformity to the standards of conduct on which the moral community of the neighbourhood insisted and of his or her right to settled residence. Although notions of deservingness were becoming far more begrudging, badging served an invaluable function in helping separate the deserving from the undeserving. It is, indeed, arguable that the authorities were less interested in the meaning of badges, than in the responses of those who were made to wear them. Despite the rhetoric of some contemporary polemicists, it seems unlikely that, even by the late seventeenth century, the more positive implications of earlier experiments with badges or signs—as marks of

identification, of patronage and of belonging—had been entirely eclipsed. Those who wore them with equanimity, perhaps even with enthusiasm, therefore subscribed to a world-view in which they were expected to be grateful for the charity of the ratepayers and eager for the sponsorship of the overseers. The parish badge was, therefore, a form of *livery* (of the kind worn by male household servants into the eighteenth century and beyond) that functioned as a symbol not only of subordination but also of patronage.

In some respects, therefore, the parish badge was a testimonial of good behaviour and many paupers evidently thought it worthwhile pleading for a pension, even though (possibly even because) it meant wearing one. That so many petitions (and, indeed, appeals), even in the years after the 1697 statute, were sent to magistrates by poor householders claiming that overseers had denied them relief is striking testimony to popular acceptance of the inevitability, possibly in some cases of the desirability, of badging, for without the badge there would be no collection. To this extent badging was one aspect of a welfare process in which, as recent commentators have suggested, the poor had at least some degree of agency.[81]

The badge might, furthermore, even be an asset in future negotiations with overseers and magistrates. In persuading the Cumberland bench to increase her parish allowance in 1745, for example, a seventy-year-old widow from Brampton emphasised the justice of her cause by reminding them that she 'always wears the badge'. A willingness to wear the badge similarly secured an increase in the level of the pension allocated to the Jeffrey family of Edlesborough (Buckinghamshire) in 1711.[82] Badging was also probably responsible for encouraging the development of a collective identity among those on relief, reaffirming as it did the social solidarity of the poor of the parish. Badges therefore symbolised the emergence not only of

poverty as an inherited condition but also of the poor as a permanent class, though doubtless one segmented by highly localised senses of place and belonging.[83]

As we have seen, however, it was not uncommon for paupers to spurn the parish badge, for all the respectability, inclusion and solidarity it might have implied. Paupers themselves remain stubbornly silent in the available sources about their grounds for refusal. Some observers thought it a matter of affronted personal dignity. By the early 1720s, social commentators were lamenting the touchy sensibility of the labouring poor. It was reported from Romford (Essex) in 1724, for example, that 'pride, though it does ill become poor folk, won't suffer some to wear the badge'.[84] Jonathan Swift wrote in 1737 that although the beggars of Dublin were 'neither afraid to steal nor ashamed to beg' they were nonetheless too proud to be seen with a badge, as many of them have confessed to me, and not a few in very injurious terms, particularly the females'. This 'absurd insolence', he argued, was a product of their sense that wearing the badge was 'a high indignity to their office'. 'If beggary be not able to beat out pride', he insisted, 'it cannot deserve charity'.[85]

But perhaps there was more at stake than the pride so condescendingly condemned in this critique. As we have seen, the children of those on relief were also made to wear the badge, and a pauper's acceptance of it symbolised his or her inability to support their own offspring by their own labour and therefore rendered the household vulnerable to the intervention of parish officers keen to reduce relief expenditure by apprenticing boys and girls as young as seven years old to years of drudgery under distant masters.[86] Refusal to wear the badge was therefore analogous to resistance to having ones children sent away under the apprenticeship clauses of the Elizabethan poor law statute, provisions which were themselves bolstered by legislation of 1697. Since overseers were empowered to reconstitute pauper

households by removing the children of those who were regarded as unable or unsuitable to bring them up properly, it is hardly surprising that the badge should occasionally be refused, for to wear it was to admit that a pauper could not rear her children 'painfully' or 'carefully'. Perhaps, in turn, this explains why so many of those who did refuse the badge (along with the majority of those who would rather do without parish relief than see their children bound out by the overseers) were women.[87] The prominence of women amongst those who refused to wear the livery of the parish might also be explained by the fact that it was unusual for women to be liveried in any context.[88] Perhaps women were simply less familiar with the predicament of having to reconcile personal feelings of belonging, with public acknowledgement of being beholden, to institutions of any kind.

Indeed, labouring families seem to have been acutely sensitive to the symbolic recognition of their dependency and its implications, and women in particular used their detailed knowledge of the law to avoid the badge wherever possible. Two female inhabitants of Aylesbury successfully appealed against badging orders in 1697 on the grounds that although their widowed mothers were partly dependant on the parish and wore the badge, they personally contributed to their support without a subsidy from the ratepayers and were therefore exempt under the terms of the statute. Although a child of the London parish of St Andrew's Holborn (London) had her pension stopped in 1705, it was restored to her on appeal, despite the fact that her mother still refused to wear the badge.[89] The fact that badges should be refused is, moreover, particularly striking in that they might become currency in the inter-parochial exchange of settlement rights. Plates of tin or brass stamped with the parish initials might even be produced in court, as one was at Shropshire quarter sessions in 1701, as evidence of overseers' recognition of a settlement and of the obligations that went with it.[90]

In refusing to accept the public identity of dependency ascribed to them by the parish officers, recalcitrant paupers forfeited whatever 'rights' they believed were conferred by the Elizabethan poor law. Perhaps they felt that entitlements of this kind were hardly worth the irrevocable public sacrifice of their independence. Either way, they were in no position to negotiate the terms, let alone the fact, of their subordination.[91] The pensioner's badge, like the workhouse test and the requirement that paupers' property be inventoried and conveyed to the parish before they be admitted to the relief rolls, is a signal reminder that the extent to which the poor were free to exercise agency in the politics of poor relief, which has become such a prominent theme in the recent historiography of welfare, should not be exaggerated. Notions of moral, of customary, perhaps even of legal, 'entitlement' to relief do not sit comfortably alongside the conditions which were attached to claiming a parish pension.[92] In the early sixteenth century, after all, the deserving poor had been encouraged to overcome their shame, to stretch out their hands and to raise their voices in the gestures and cries of importunacy; and they had been readily rewarded with gifts of alms. Their late seventeenth-century descendants enjoyed no such luxury. Their choice was a stark one: to accept the badge of dependency, or to go without.

Appendix

The following lists summarise the evidence presented in this article for the badging of the poor both before and after the 1697 statute. Listing the parishes by date of implementation potentially exaggerates the consistency with which the policy was enforced. Even in those parishes where repeated orders were made, it is unclear whether the parish officers continuously insisted that badges be worn.

County-Wide Initiatives to Badge the Poor (in chronological order)
Hampshire 1685
Middlesex 1694
Warwickshire 1695
Cumberland 1700
Yorkshire (West Riding) 1716
West Kent 1717
Somerset 1731, 1755, 1769, 1787

Parochial Initiatives to Badge the Poor (in chronological order, by decade)
Petworth (Sussex) 1677
St Martins-in-the-Fields (Westminster) 1677, 1722
Colchester (Essex) c.1677-84
Norwich (Norfolk) c.1677-95
Romsey (Hampshire) 1678

St Botolph Aldgate (London) 1680
Wisbech (Cambridgeshire) 1680
Geeat St Mary's (Cambridge) 1682
Tonbridge (Kent) 1682
St Mary's Chelmsford (Essex) 1684, 1705
Pattingham (Staffordshire) 1685, 1697, 1700, 1704, 1707, 1711, 1715, 1719, 1723, 1727, 1728, 1730
Braintree (Essex) 1688
Exeter (Devon) c.1688-1709

Wivenhoe (Essex) 1692
St Martins Ludgate (London) 1693, 1694
Wick St Lawrence (Somerset) 1694
Kenilworth (Warwickshire) 1695
Brighton (Sussex) 1696
Cowden (Kent) 1696, 1698
Fillongley (Warwickshire) 1696
Napton (Warwickshire) 1696
Solihull (Warwickshire) 1696
Sowe (Warwickshire) 1696

Wem (Shropshire) [before 1697]
Aylesbury (Buckinghamshire) 1697
East Pennard (Somerset) 1697
Gnosall (Staffordshire) 1697
St Katherine Coleman (London) 1697
Terling (Essex) 1697
Thaxted (Essex) 1697
Whickham (County Durham) 1697
Butleigh (Somerset) 1698
Ditcheat (Somerset) 1698
Stogumber (Somerset) 1698
Little Crosby (Lancashire) 1698
Manchester (Lancashire) 1698
Warton in Lonsdale (Lancashire) 1698
Grimsargh (Lancashire) 1699
Urmston (Lancashire) 1699
Roxton (Bedfordshire) 1699

Westbury (Somerset) 1700
Ashwell (Hertfordshire) 1701, 1718, 1721
Burton-on-Trent (Staffordshire) 1702
Atherton (Lancashire) 1702, 1743
Prescot (Lancashire) 1702
Gnossal (Staffordshire) 1703, 1720, 1740
Linton (Cambridgeshire) 1703
Great Horwood (Buckinghamshire) 1704
Lapworth (Warwickshire) 1704
St Andrew's Holborn (London) 1705
Bow Brickill (Buckinghamshire) 1706
Eaton Socon (Bedfordshire) 1706
Meldreth (Cambridgeshire) 1708, 1714, 1717, 1720, 1723
Sevenoaks (Kent) 1708
Writtle (Essex) 1708
Trull (Somerset) 1709, 1728

Kirkoswald (Cumberland) 1710
Edlesborough (Buckinghamshire) 1711
St Botolph's Cambridge (Cambridgeshire) 1712
Liverpool (Lancashire) 1713, 1718

Chalfont St Peter (Buckinghamshire) 1722, 1729
Upminster (Essex) 1723
Stanford Rivers (Essex) 1724
Bottisham (Cambridgeshire) 1727, 1730
Lapworth (Warwickshire) 1729
Warrington (Lancashire) 1729

Hackney (Middlesex) 1730s
Drayton (Somerset) 1731
Sutton Bennington (Nottinghamshire) 1731

East Barnet (Hertfordshire) 1732
Symondburn (Durham) 1733
Frieston (Lincolnshire) 1737
Lambourne (Essex) 1737
Winscale (Westmoreland) 1737
Whinfell (Cumberland) 1738

Shipston-on-Stour (Worcestershire) 1742
Puddletown (Dorset) 1745
Wimborne Minster (Dorset) 1745
Morpeth (Durham) 1747

Loxton (Somerset) 1755
Marston Bagot (Somerset) 1757

Highley (Shropshire) 1761
Birchanger (Essex) 1765
Fitzhead (Somerset) 1766
Poulton-with-Fernhead (Lancashire) 1767
Blagdon (Somerset) 1769

Long Newton (Durham) 1775

Stone (Staffordshire) [until 1784]

Ditcheat (Somerset) 1787

Houghton le Spring (Durham) 1790

HINDLE: 'Dependency, Shame and Belonging'/Endnotes

[1] John Howes, 'A Second "Famylar and Frendly Discourse, Dialogue Wyse"', printed in *Tudor Economic Documents*, eds. R.H. Tawney and Eileen Power (3 vols, Longman, Green and Co., London, 1924), III, pp.426-27. All the quotations in this paragraph are drawn from this source. For Howes, see Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991), p.156; Paul Slack, 'Hospitals, Workhouses and the Relief of the Poor in Early Modern London', in Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham (eds), *Health Care and Poor Relief in Protestant Europe* (Routledge, London, 1997), p.238.

[2] Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability*, p.219

[3] Steve Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms: The Campaign for General Hospitality in Late Elizabethan England', *Past and Present*, 172 (2001), pp.44-86.

[4] On the growth of relief expenditure in late seventeenth-century towns, see Paul Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (Longman, London and New York, 1988), pp.173-82. For rural parishes in the same period, see A.L. Beier, 'Poverty and Progress in Early Modern England', in A.L. Beier *et al* (eds), *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989), pp.223-4; Steve Hindle, 'Power, Poor Relief and

Social Relations in Holland Fen, c.1600-1800', *Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), pp.80-3; John Broad, 'Parish Economies of Welfare, 1650-1834', *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999), p.1002.

[5] Steve Hindle, *On the Parish? The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England, c.1550-1730* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, forthcoming 2004), ch.6.2 ('The Discretionary Calculus of Eligibility').

[6] Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.6.4.1 ('The Magistracy and the Poor').

[7] Bodleian Library, Oxford,. MS Eng. Hist. b209, fols.90-89, 81. Cocks' views are developed and contextualised in David Hayton, 'Sir Richard Cocks: The Political Anatomy of a Country Whig', *Albion*, 20 (1988), esp. p.241; Hayton, 'Moral Reform and Country Politics in the Late Seventeenth-Century House of Commons', *Past and Present*, 128 (1990), pp.67-8; *The Parliamentary Diary of Sir Richard Cocks, 1698-1702*, ed. D.W. Hayton (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996), pp.xxxi-xxxii, xl, 25-6, 324; and, more generally, in Stephen Macfarlane, 'Social Policy and the Poor in the Later Seventeenth Century', in A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay (eds), *The Making of the Metropolis: London, 1500-1700* (Longman, London and New York, 1986), pp.252-77.

[8] Richard Dunning, *Bread for the Poor* (Exeter, 1698), p.2.

[9] 'Song 267', in *The New Academy of Complements . . . With an Exact Collection of the Newest and Choicest Songs a la Mode* (London, 1671), pp.271-72; Henry Fielding, 'I Hate the Mob', *The Covent Garden Journal*, 49 (20 June 1752), in Fielding, *The Covent Garden Journal and A Plan of the Universal Register-Office*, ed. Bertrand A. Goldgar (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1988), p.270.

[10] Macfarlane, 'Social Policy and the Poor', esp. pp.253-54; Paul Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999), pp.102-25.

[11] 8 & 9 William III c.30 (1697), cl.II.

[12] I am grateful to Drs. David Hayton and Richard Connors for exploring these issues with me and upon whose comments the following discussion draws heavily.

[13] *The House of Commons 1690-1715*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks *et al*, 5 vols (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002), III, pp.220-21.

[14] Cf. Mary E. Fissel, 'Charity Universal? Institutions and Moral Reform in Eighteenth-Century Bristol', in Lee Davison *et al* (eds), *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750* (Alan Sutton, Gloucester, 1992), pp.121-44; Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement*, esp. pp.106-7, 109-14.

[15] J. De L. Mann, *The Cloth Industry in the West of England From 1640 to 1880* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1971), pp.37-62; David Rollison, *The Local Origins of Modern Society: Gloucestershire, 1500-1800* (Routledge,, London, 1992), pp.21-63.

[16] William J. Courtenay, 'Token Coinage and the Administration of Poor Relief During the Late Middle Ages', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 3 (1972), pp.284-90; Neil S. Rushton, 'Monastic Charitable Provision in Tudor England: Quantifying and Qualifying Poor Relief in the Early Sixteenth Century', *Continuity and Change*, 16 (2001), pp.21, 30.

[17] Lee Palmer Wandel, *Always Among Us? Images of the Poor in Zwingli's Zurich* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990), p.153.

[18] J.H. Thomas, *Town Government in the Sixteenth Century* (Allen and Unwin, London, 1933), p.115; *York Civic Records*, ed. Angelo Raine, 8 vols (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1939-53), III, p.46; 'London Orders for Restraining Vagabonds and Beggars, 1517', printed in Frank Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1913), pp.140-41; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *14th Report, Appendix VIII: The Manuscripts of Lincoln, Bury St Edmund's and Great Grimsby Corporations; and of the Deans and Chapters of Worcester and Lichfield &c* (HMSO, London, 1895), pp.38, 40; King's Lynn Record Office, KL/C/7/6, fo. 69r.

[19] 5 Elizabeth I, c.3 (1563); A.L. Beier, *Masterless Men: The Vagrancy Problem in England, 1560-1640* (Methuen, London, 1985), pp.154-55. Badges had also been authorised under the terms of 4 & 5 Philip & Mary, c.9 (1557). For sixteenth-century urbanisation, see E.A. Wrigley, 'Urban Growth and Agricultural Change: England and the Continent in the Early Modern Period', reprinted in Wrigley, *People, Cities and Wealth: The Transformation of Traditional Society* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1987), pp.157-93; Paul Griffiths *et al*, 'Population and Disease, Estrangement and Belonging, 1540-1700', in Peter Clark (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, Volume II: 1540-1840* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000), pp.195-233.

[20] 39 Elizabeth c.3 (1598), cl.10; [Ulster Museum, Belfast: G.Ewing?], 'Book of Information About Badges Worn By the Poor', p.3; *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, ed. Mary Bateson, 3 vols (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1899-1905), III, pp.xlv, 8; Thomas, *Town Government*, p.133; Claire S. Schen, *Charity and Lay Piety in Reformation London, 1500-1620* (Ashgate, Aldershot, 2002), p.178;

Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, ed. Paul Slack (Wiltshire Record Society, 31, 1975), p.83.

[21] Paul Slack, 'Great and Good Towns, 1540-1700', in Peter Clark (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain, Volume II: 1540-1840* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000), p.367.

[22] Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995), pp.179, 222-23; Jeremy Boulton, N*eighbourhood and Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987), pp.144, 148; *Calendar of Wynn—-of Gwydir—Papers, 1515-1690: in the National Library of Wales and Elsewhere*, ed. J. Ballinger (National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1926), no.2625; Somerset Archives and Research Service, Taunton (hereafter SARS), DD/SE/43/5, p.14; Ewing, 'Badges Worn by the Poor', p.4; Charles Kerry, 'Anthony Bradshaw of Duffield and the Almshouses Founded by Him at that Place', *The Reliquary*, 23 (1882-3), 137-40; Paul Slack, 'Poverty and Politics in Salisbury, 1597-1666', in Peter Clark and Paul Slack (eds) *Crisis and Order in English Towns, 1500-1700: Essays in Urban History* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1972), p.192.

[23] Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.2.5.3 ('Eligibility for Charity'); Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement*, p.25.

[24] Howes, 'A Second "Famylar and Frendly Discourse, Dialogue Wyse", pp.426-7.

[25] Brian Pullan, *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice: The Social Institutions of a Catholic State to 1620* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1971), p.128, 267-8, 373-4; Richard C. Trexler, '*Shamed Poor*: Charity and the Defence of Urban Elites in the Italian Communes', reprinted in Trexler, *Dependence in Context In Renaissance Florence* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 111, Binghampton, 1993), pp.61-112;

Sandra Cavallo, *Charity and Power in Early Modern Italy: Benefactors and Their Motives in Turin, 1541-1789* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995), pp.12, 15 n.11; Linda Martz, *Poverty and Welfare in Habsburg Spain* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983), pp.5, 9; Maureen Flynn, *Sacred Charity: Confraternities and Social Welfare in Spain, 1400-1700* (Macmillan, London and New York, 1989), pp.79-80. Cavallo, *Charity and Power*, pp.219-20, incidentally notes that the definition of the shame-faced poor did not begin to change in Turin until the early eighteenth century.

[26] Charles Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979), p.135.

[27] Lee Palmer Wandel, 'Social Welfare', in Hans J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Reformation*, 4 vols (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996), IV, p.81.

[28] Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms', p.55.

[29] Thomas Foster, *Plouto-mastix: The Scourge of Covetousnesse: or, An Apologie for the Publike Good, Against Privacie* (London, 1631), p.25.

[30] Hindle, *On the Parish?*, chs.2.6 ('Narratives of Distress'), 6.4 ('Petitions and Appeals').

[31] National Archives, London, SP16/188/85.

[32] Thomas Alcock, *Observations on the Defects of the Poor Laws* (London, 1752), pp.16-17.

[33] Robert Pashley, *Pauperism and Poor Laws* (London, 1852), p.240.

[34] Howes, 'A Second "Famylar and Frendly Discourse"', p.426.

[35] Alcock, *Observations on the Defects of the Poor Laws*, p.17.

[36] Dunning, *Bread for the Poor*, p.10.

[37] The vacillations of official policy towards begging can be traced in Slack, *Poverty and Policy*, pp.113-37 (Ch.6: 'The Making of the Poor Law, 1485-1610').

[38] Thomas Firmin, *Some Proposals for the Employment of the Poor, Especially in and About the City of London and for the Prevention of Begging* (London, 1678), p.14.

[39] Firmin, *Proposals for the Employment of the Poor*, pp.14-15 (emphasis in original).

[40] Firmin, *Proposals for the Employment of the Poor*, p.16. For a development of this idea that badging the 'parish-beggars' would 'prevent interlopers more effectively than twenty beadles', see Jonathan Swift, *A Proposal for Giving Badges to the Beggars in All the Parishes of Dublin* (London, 1737), in *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis, 16 vols (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1939-74), XIII, p.138.

[41] John Locke, 'An Essay on the Poor Law', in *John Locke, Political Writings*, ed. Mark Goldie (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997), pp.197-98. For the influence of Firmin's ideas on Locke, see A.L. Beier, '"Utter Strangers to Industry, Morality and Religion": John Locke on the Poor', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 12 (1988), p.37.

[42] Hindle, 'Dearth, Fasting and Alms'; Cumbria Record Office, Carlisle (hereafter CRO), Q/11/1/165/29. Cf. Rosalind Mitchison, *The Old Poor Law in Scotland: The Experience of Poverty, 1574-1845* (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2000), p.98; David W. Howell, *The Rural Poor in Eighteenth-Century Wales* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 2000), p.99; David Dickson, 'In Search of the Old Irish Poor Law', in Rosalind Mitchison and Peter Roebuck (eds), *Economy and Society in Scotland and Ireland, 1500-1939* (John Donald, Edinburgh, 1988), p.151

[43] East Sussex Record Office, Lewes, Shiffner Archives SHR/1556, unfol. (emphasis added).

[44] Under the terms of a vestry resolution of 1775, only those inmates of the Wimbledon workhouse who wore the badge were to be relieved by the parish officers, though how long (if at all) badging predated this order is unclear. *Wimbledon Vestry Minutes, 1736, 1743-88: A Calendar With an Introduction*, ed. F.M. Cowe (Surrey Record Society, 25, 1964), pp.58-9.

[45] C.S.L. Davies, 'Slavery and Protector Somerset: The Vagrancy Act of 1547', *Economic History Review*, second series, 19 (1966), 533-49; Beier, *Masterless Men*, pp.59-60; William C. Carroll, *Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1996), pp.39-47.

[46] Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *English Local Government Volume VII: English Poor Law History Part I: The Old Poor Law* (Frank Cass, London, 1927), p.161; Alcock, *Observations on the Defects of the Poor Laws*, p.17. Cf. *An Impartial Examination of a Pamphlet Intituled Considerations on Several Proposals for the Better Maintenance of the Poor* (London, 1752), p.19. For these debates more generally, see Joanna Innes, 'The "Mixed Economy of Welfare" in Early Modern England: Assessments of the Options From Hale to Malthus (c.1683-1803)', in Martin Daunton (ed.), *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past* (University College London Press, London, 1996), esp. pp.158-60; and Innes, 'The State and the Poor: Eighteenth-Century England in European Perspective', in John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999), pp.225-80; Richard Connors, 'Parliament and Poverty in Mid-Eighteenth Century England', *Parliamentary History*, 21 (2002), pp.207-31. More recent commentators have echoed the Webbs' sceptical interpretation. See, e.g., F.H. Hinton, 'Notes on the Administration of the Relief of the Poor of Lacock 1583-1834', *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*, 49 (1940-42),

p.173; G.C. Edmonds, 'Accounts of Eighteenth-Century Overseers of the Poor of Chalfont St Peter', *Records of Buckinghamshire*, 18 (1966), p.7; G.W. Oxley, *Poor Relief in England and Wales, 1601-1834* (David and Charles, Newton Abbot, 1974), p.54; Slack, *Poverty and Policy*, pp.193-4; Paul Slack, *The English Poor Law, 1531-1782* (Basingstoke, 1990), p.40.

[47] Dunning, *Bread for the Poor*, p.12. Jonathan Swift blamed the failure of the policy in Ireland on the 'wrong way of thinking in some clergymen and the indifference of others', though he claimed that he 'had never heard more than one objection against the expedient of badging the poor': 'what shall we do with the foreign beggars?' Swift, *A Proposal for Giving Badges to the Beggars*, p.133.

[48] Cf. the emphasis on the 'considerable overlap' between lesser ratepayers and those who received relief in Tim Hitchcock *et al*, 'Introduction', in Tim Hitchcock *et al* (eds), Peter King and Pamela Sharpe (eds), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Macmillan, London and New York, 1997), p.10; and the implication that parish relief therefore functioned as form of social insurance across the life-cycle in Peter M. Solar, 'Poor Relief and English Economic Development Before the Industrial Revolution', *Economic History Review*, second series, 48 (1995), pp.7-12.

[49] Valerie Pearl, 'Social Policy in Early Modern London', in Hugh Lloyd-Jones *et al* (eds), *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper* (Duckworth, London, 1979), p.128; Macfarlane, 'Social Policy and the Poor', p.273 n.29; Jeremy Boulton, 'Going on the Parish: The Parish Pension and its Meaning in the London Suburbs, 1640-1724', in Hitchcock *et al* (eds), *Chronicling Poverty*, p.34; E.M. Hampson, *The Treatment of Poverty in Cambridgeshire, 1597-1834* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1934), p.181; Slack, *Poverty and Policy*, p.202 n.27.

[50] Ewing, 'Badges Worn By the Poor', p.1; W.A. Seaby, 'Ulster Beggars' Badges', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, third series, 23 (1970), p.97; W.E. Tate, *The Parish Chest: A Study of the Records of Parochial Administration in England*, 3rd edn (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1960), p.206; Dorothy Marshall, *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century: A Study in Social and Administrative History* (Routledge, London, 1926), p.103; Edward Turner, 'Ancient Parochial Account Book of Cowden', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 20 (1882), p.115; Mary Barker-Read, 'The Treatment of the Aged Poor in Five Selected West Kent Parishes from Settlement to Speenhamland, 1662-1797', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Open University, 1988, p.70; Joan R. Kent, 'The Centre and the Localities: State Formation and Parish Government in England, c.1640-1740', *Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), p.368 n.12; Richard Gough, *The History of Myddle*, ed. David Hey (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1981), p.260.

[51] Hampson, *Treatment of Poverty in Cambridgeshire*, p.181. Steven King, 'Reclothing the English Poor, 1750-1840, *Textile History*, 33 (2002), p.44 believes that by the late eighteenth century, badging was primarily designed to prevent the pawning of parish clothing. For pawning, see Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.1.3 ('The Kindness of Strangers').

[52] Seaby, 'Ulster Beggars' Badges', p.97 (citing a 'Hampshire Poor Letter of 1685' which has proved impossible to trace); *Middlesex County Records: Calendar of Sessions Books, 1689-1709*, ed. W.J. Hardy (Middlesex County Council, London, 1905), p.124; *Warwick County Records*, eds. S.C. Ratcliff *et al*, 9 vols (Warwickshire County Council, Warwick, 1935-64), IX, p.117. For early implementation in Harefield (Middlesex), see Tate, *The Parish Chest*, p.207.

[53] F.W. Grainger, 'Poor Relief in Cumberland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, new series, 15 (1915), p.93; West Yorkshire Archive Service, Wakefield, QS1/55/4; Norma Landau, *The Justices of the Peace in England, 1679-1760* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984), p.259.

[54] Elona Cuthbertson, *Gregory King's Harefield: An English Village in the 1690s* (Hillingdon Borough Libraries, Uxbridge, 1983), p.39; S.A. Cutlack, 'The Gnosall Records, 1679 to 1837: Poor Law Administration', *Collections for A History of Staffordshire, Part I* (Staffordshire Record Society, Stafford, 1936), p.46; S.R. Ottaway, 'The Decline of Life: Aspects of Aging in Eighteenth Century England', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Brown University, 1997, p.195.

[55] F.G. Emmison, 'The Relief of the Poor at Eaton Socon 1706-1834', *Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society*, 15 (1933), p.13; Hampson, *Treatment of Poverty in Cambridgeshire*, p.181; SARS, D/P/stog/13/2/2, unfol.

[56] *Calendar to the Buckinghamshire Sessions Records, 1678-1718*, eds. W. Le Hardy and G. Reckitt, 4 vols (Buckinghamshire County Council. Aylesbury, 1934-51), II, pp.144, 408; III, pp.61, 266; Cutlack, 'Gnosall Records', p.46 (where 1607 is a typographical error for 1697); Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and Piety*, p.183; David Levine and Keith Wrightson, *The Making of an Industrial Society: Whickham, 1560-1765* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991), p.348; Lancashire Record Office, Preston (hereafter LRO), QSP/811/1, 815/16, 820/5-6, 822/40, 824/6; Emmison, 'The Relief of the Poor at Eaton Socon', p.13; Kent, 'The Centre and the Localities', p.368 n.12; *Liverpool Vestry Books, 1681-1834*, ed. H. Peet (2 vols, Constable and Co., Liverpool, 1912,-15), I, 68, 78; Webb and Webb, *Old Poor Law*, p.161; LRO PR/1681/3/58, 6/137; King's College Cambridge Library, MS PC/4/115; Cutlack,

'Gnossal Records', p.46; Hampson, *Poverty in Cambridgeshire*, p.181; John Burman, *The Story of Tanworth-in-Arden, Warwickshire* (Cooper and Co., Birmingham, 1930), p.93; Warrington Public Library MS 185; 1111/8, unfol.; I.F. Jones, 'Aspects of Poor Law Administration, Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries, From Trull Overseers' Accounts', *Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society Proceedings* 95 (1951), p.91; CRO, Q/11/1/97/7, 183/9; Boulton, 'Going on the Parish', p.45 n.95; Edmonds, 'Overseers of the Poor of Chalfont St Peter', p.7; Robert Hudson, *Memorials of a Warwickshire Parish* (Methuen, London, 1905), p.204; *Justice in Eighteenth-Century Hackney*, ed. Ruth Paley (London Record Society, 28, 1991), p.xxiv; Tate, *The Parish Chest*, p.207; Charles Brears, *Lincolnshire in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, Compiled From National, County, And Parish Records* (A. Brown and Sons, London, 1940), p.82; Warwickshire County Record Office, Warwick (hereafter WCRO), DR446/22, p.89; Ottaway, 'The Decline of Life', p.195; Gwyneth Nair, *Highley: The Development of a Community, 1550-1880* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1988), p.135; Peter Rushton, 'The Poor Law, the Parish and the Community in North-East England, 1600-1800', *Northern History*, 25 (1989), p.147 n.30.

[57] S.R. Broadbridge, 'The Old Poor Law in the Parish of Stone', *North Staffordshire Journal of Field Studies*, 13 (1973), 12.

[58] WCRO, DR296/45, unfol. (Kenilworth, 7 December 1695); DR104/63, unfol. (Sowe, 1696); DR404/67, unfol (Fillongley, 1696); NI/17, unfol. (Napton, April 1696); SARS, D/P/but/13/2/1, unfol. (Butleigh, 1698); D/Pdit/13/2/1, unfol. (Ditcheat, 1698); D/P/e.pen/13/2/1, unfol. (East Pennard, 1697); D/P/stog/13/2/2, unfol. (Stogumber, 1698); D/P/wby/13/2/1, unfol. (Westbury, 1700); D/P/wick/13/2/1, unfol. (Wick St Lawrence, 1694). The two Somerset exceptions were Hinton St George and Martock. SARS, D/P/ hin/13/2/2; D/P/mart/13/2/1.

[59] Essex Record Office, Chelmsford (hereafter ERO), D/P 94/1/7; 264/18/5; 277/13/1.

[60] ERO, D/P 16/12/2.

[61] ERO, D/P 50/8/1; 117/8/2; 140/8/1; 181/8/2; 25/8/1.

[62] ERO, D/P 94/5/2.

[63] SARS, D/P/dton/13/10/1; D/P/lox/13/10/1; D/P/blag/9/1/2; D/P/dit/9/1/2; D/P/fitz/13/2/2; Tate, *The Parish Chest*, p.207 (Marston Bagot, Somerset, 1757).

[64] Joanna Innes, 'Social Problems: Poverty and Marginality in Eighteenth-Century England', unpublished paper, 1985, p.37.

[65] Kent, 'The Centre and the Localities', p.368 n.12

[66] Cf. Slack, *The English Poor Law*, p.40.

[67] Devon Record Office, Exeter, 1092A-1/PO113; 22 George III. c.83 (1782); Dunning, *Bread for the Poor*, p.11; Henry Fielding, 'A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for The Poor', in Fielding, *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers and Related Writings*, ed. Malvin R. Zirker (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1988), p.269.

[68] Gough, *History of Myddle*, p.260.

[69] Landau, *The Justices of the Peace*, p.179; *Buckingham Sessions Records*, II, p.144.

[70] CRO, Q/11/1/97/7. For Bowman, see Hindle, *On the Parish?*, chs.1 and 6.

[71] Dorset Record Office, Dorchester, PE/WM VE 1/1 (1745).

[72] Clause II of the 1697 act was repealed by 50 George III, c.52 (1810) but other parts remained in force until 1867; *The Oakes Diaries: Business, Politics and the Family in Bury St Edmunds, 1778-1827*, ed. Jane Fiske, 2 vols (Suffolk Record Society 32-33, 1990-91), I, p.393; Cutlack, 'Gnossal Records', p. 46; Hinton, 'The Relief of the Poor of Lacock', p.173; Tate, *The Parish Chest*, p.207.

[73] Marshall, *The English Poor*, p.103; Turner, 'Ancient Account Book of Cowden', p.115; *Warwick County Records*, IX, p.129; Webb and Webb, *Old Poor Law*, p.161; *Middlesex County Records, 1689-1709*, p.291; Edmonds, 'Overseers of the Poor of Chalfont St Peter', p.7; Cumbria Record Office, Kendal, WQ/SR/93/3; *Hertford County Records*, ed. W. Le Hardy, 9 vols (Hertford, 1905-39), II, p.70.

[74] Edmonds, 'Overseers of the Poor of Chalfont St Peter', p.7.

[75] Tim Wales, 'Poverty, Poor Relief and the Life-Cycle: Some Evidence From Seventeenth-Century Norfolk'; and W. Newman-Brown, 'The Receipt of Poor Relief and Family Situation: Aldenham, Hertfordshire 1630-90', both in R.M. Smith (ed.), *Land, Kinship and Life-Cycle* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984), esp. pp.353, 360-78, 412, 419; Steve Hindle, *The Birthpangs of Welfare: Poor Relief and Parish Governance in Seventeenth-Century Warwickshire* (Dugdale Society Occasional Papers no.40, 2000), p.18.

[76] Richard M. Smith, 'Ageing and Well-Being in Early Modern England: Pension Trends and Gender Preferences Under the English Old Poor Law, *c*.1650-1800', in Paul Johnson and Pat Thane (eds), *Old Age From Antiquity to Post-Modernity* (Routledge, London, 1998), p.75

[77] LRO, QSP/815/16.

[78] WCRO, DR404/67, unfol.

[79] John K. Nelson, *A Blessed Company: Parishes, Parsons and parishioners in Anglican Virginia, 1690-1776* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2001), p.82; Pearl, 'Social Policy in Early Modern London', p.128; Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and Piety*, p.185.

[80] For this formulation, used by a Norfolk labourer in 1700, see Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 2000), p.324.

[81] This is the conclusion of the essays collected in Hitchcock *et al* (eds), *Chronicling Poverty.* For the agency of subordinate groups in general, see the essays in Michael Braddick and John Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001). Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.6.4 ('Petitions and Appeals') suggests that such agency should not be exaggerated.

[82] CRO Q/11/1/221/11; *Buckinghamshire Sessions Records*, III, p.266.

[83] W.G. Hoskins, *The Midland Peasant: The Economic and Social History of a Leicestershire Village* (Macmillan, London and New York, 1957), p.229. Cf. Steve Hindle, 'A Sense of Place? Becoming and Belonging in the Rural Parish, 1550-1650', in Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (eds), *Communities in Early Modern England* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2000), pp.99-102; K.D.M. Snell, 'The Culture of Local Xenophobia', *Social History*, 28 (2003), pp.28-30.

[84] Anon., *Account of Workhouses in Great Britain in the Year 1732*, 3rd edn (London, 1786), p.110.

[85] Swift, *A Proposal for Giving Badges to the Beggars*, pp.134-5.

[86] Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.3.2 ('The Apprenticeship of Pauper Children').

[87] Hindle, *On the Parish?*, ch.6.2.5 ('Painfulness and Carelessness').

[88] Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1998), p.321 n.27 points out that whereas eighteenth-century menservants 'received a livery in addition to their salary',

there is 'no evidence that maidservants were bought a specific wardrobe on engagement'.

[89] *Buckinghamshire Sessions Records*, II, p.144; *Middlesex County Records*, p.291

[90] See, e.g., the case of Myddle *vs.* Wem debated at three consecutive Shropshire quarter sessions in 1701, during which 'a P. made of tin' was 'shewed in Court'. Gough, *History of Myddle*, p.260. Cf. K.D.M. Snell, 'Pauper Settlement and the Right to Poor Relief in England and Wales', *Continuity and Change*, 6 (1991), 375-415; Snell, 'Settlement, Poor Law and the Rural Historian: New Approaches and Opportunities', *Rural History*, 3 (1992), 145-72.

[91] Cf. Levine and Wrightson, *The Making of an Industrial Society*, p.348; Michael J. Braddick and John Walter, 'Introduction. Grids of Power: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Early Modern Society', in Braddick and Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power*, p.42.

[92] Cf. Hitchcock *et al* (eds), *Chronicling Poverty*.