**An Irrevocable Shift: Detailing the Dynamics of Rural Poverty in Southern England, 1762-1834: a case study[[1]](#endnote-1)**

Existing studies of the ‘Old Poor Law’ in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries appear to have left few stones unturned. The functions of poor relief and the ‘disincentive’ effects of wage supplements were questioned in classic large-scale studies by the Hammonds and the Webbs, and have since been debated in national terms by Karl Polanyi, Mark Blaug, Daniel Baugh, George Boyer and Steve King.[[2]](#endnote-2) The role of poor relief within the changing agrarian economy and the rural labour market, particularly the role within it of women and children, has been explored in depth by Keith Snell, Sara Horrell and Jane Humphries, John Broad, Nicola Verdon, Joyce Burnette, and Samantha Williams.[[3]](#endnote-3)

In the last three decades, attention has also shifted much more to reconstructing the multiple ‘experiences’ of poverty. Parish care for the sick and elderly has been discussed extensively by Tim Wales, Lynn Bothelo, Steve King, Susanna Ottaway, Thomas Sokoll, Nigel Goose, Richard Smith, David Thomson, Edgar Miller, Samantha Williams and Samantha Shave.[[4]](#endnote-4) The role of the parish in relation to pauper apprentices and care of illegitimate children has been explored in recent years by Katrina Honeyman, Tim Hitchcock, Pamela Sharpe, Steve King, Tom Nutt, and Alysa Levene.[[5]](#endnote-5) To these might be added debates about pauper living standards, customary rights and the law, unemployment, rural housing, workhouses, poverty and kinship, the laws of settlement, and whether or not the Old Poor Law encouraged early marriages.[[6]](#endnote-6)

Similarly, the chronology of change has been well-established: of an upsurge in poor relief payments beginning in the 1780s, acceleration after 1794, compounded by wartime inflation, the harvest failures between 1799 and 1801, and the agrarian recession between 1813 and 1825.[[7]](#endnote-7) As a consequence, studies of southern England follow the 1824 Parliamentary Enquiry, in showing how ‘Speenhamland’ or other family-allowance systems operated in the crises of 1795 and 1800-1, and the ‘Roundsman’ system was tried after 1815 by a high proportion of parishes.[[8]](#endnote-8) At the same time, as bills and poor rates ballooned, studies have shown how many parishes took advantage of new powers after 1818 to convene ‘select vestries’, and (in some cases) to begin to amalgamate into unions, under the provisions of Gilbert’s Act and its successors, to contain and reduce expenditure.[[9]](#endnote-9)

Despite this voluminous research, historians have only relatively recently begun to explore the detail of the day-to-day operation of the poor law by reconstructing the multiple experiences of eighteenth-century poverty of groups such as female wage-earners, illegitimate children, the elderly poor, or the chronically sick. Ironically, though, this concentration on specific recipient types may have fragmented our understanding of the changing composition or needs of ‘the poor’ as a totality in any given parish.[[10]](#endnote-10) To date, the most notable examples of this more holistic approach have been the studies of Barry Stapleton, Steve King, Pamela Sharpe, Samantha Williams and Samantha Shave.[[11]](#endnote-11) Indeed, it is only really King’s and Williams’ research that has provided systematic long-term chronological analysis of changes in patterns of relief, recipients and experiences through the period 1760-1835. Only Williams and Shave have begun to consider the life-time experiences of poor relief recipients, by assembling ‘pauper biographies’ and assessing the flows of relief across the life-course.[[12]](#endnote-12)

Both conclude that although the size and diversity of relief payments expanded in the period after 1795, dependence was by no means uniform or universal. For Williams the picture was mixed. For two-parent households with children, ‘the pauper biographies provide strong evidence that such relief was restricted to economic crises and was largely supplementary in nature’.[[13]](#endnote-13) Only a minority of residents (albeit a ‘substantial’ one), often solitary women and men, in Campton and Shefford experienced poverty that was more ‘life-time’ than ‘life-cycle’, with life-courses that were ‘heavily pauperized’.[[14]](#endnote-14) However, she also finds considerable evidence of the effects both of the price-shock of 1799-1801 and the post-war recession.[[15]](#endnote-15) The former caused relief expenditure to peak, while the latter swelled the ranks of able-bodied men claiming relief, as well as pushing older labourers onto the lists of parish pensioners.[[16]](#endnote-16)

For Shave, a detailed consideration of eight pauper ‘life-courses’ reveals a very complicated relationship to relief, in which there were ‘notable *absences* of the poor law in adults’ lives, absences which complicate the idea of a blanket dependency’.[[17]](#endnote-17) Her reconstruction of individual pauper biographies reveals that dependence could be linked to particular family circumstances (such as the number of wage-earning versus the number of dependent children), and that periods of need were often highly sporadic.[[18]](#endnote-18) Consequently, she argues that ‘there was no solitary, universal experience of poverty within the context of the parish… [and] many welfares under the provisions of the old poor law, not just one’.[[19]](#endnote-19)

Systematic studies such as Williams’ and Shave’s have made a substantial contribution to understanding the pervasiveness of poor relief within the household economies of agrarian labouring families in the final years of the Old Poor Law. However, this study suggests that it is possible to extend these detailed approaches further, by reconstructing the overall relief profile of every recipient within a particular parish, and also by analysing the size and dynamics of the *total* levels of relief paid to various categories of recipient (from all sources) in the period 1760-1834.

I

Despite the obvious shortcomings of concentrating on a single-parish, this research focuses on a detailed case study of the well-known Essex parish of Terling.[[20]](#endnote-20) Only by engaging very closely with a particular place over a sustained period of time can we assemble the information necessary to deal with fundamental questions about the dynamics of relief.

In the eighteenth century, Terling was a nucleated settlement, encompassing 3,228 statute acres, clustered alongside the church around a village green, with its centre arranged along the road south to Hatfield Peverel (where it joined the main London-Colchester highway).[[21]](#endnote-21) It was only half a day’s ride from London, and its agriculture benefitted from extensive local and metropolitan demand. By the 1760s, the village had come under the control of the Strutt family. After buying farms in Terling in the 1720s, they cemented their hold on the village by purchasing the manor of Terling and 850 acres in 1760. They set about establishing the village as their powerbase, by building Terling Place, from 1762 (at a cost of over £6,000). John Strutt (1727-1816) became the controlling influence the parish, owning 2,658 acres in 1781, and virtually the entire parish by his death, as well as serving as parish overseer, JP, and MP. Most of these roles were also performed by his son, Col. Joseph Strutt, and his son John. [[22]](#endnote-22)

These developments turned Terling into the classic ‘estate-village’, dominated economically by a single landowner, with land parcelled out to 18-20 substantial tenant farmers, of between 30 and 200 acres, along with an array of retailers, who exercised effective autonomy through the parish vestry.[[23]](#endnote-23) In the 1801 Census Terling had 708 inhabitants, a figure that rose steadily to reach 921 by 1841.[[24]](#endnote-24) The dominance of agriculture was revealed in 1801, with 233 out of these 708 inhabitants (33 per cent) being employed ‘chiefly in agriculture’, and 104 out of the 168 (62 per cent) households containing at least one person employed primarily in agriculture, a proportion that remained fairly constant to 1831.[[25]](#endnote-25)

Table 1 illustrates that its rate of population growth in the first half of the nineteenth century followed the trend of the surrounding parishes almost exactly. Similarly, in terms of gross expenditure on the poor, Terling matched the patterns evident in the Hundred and the County. Figure 1 shows annual totals of poor relief expenditure for each Hundred in the county, indexed on the figures for 1776.[[26]](#endnote-26) More broadly, as Figure 2 demonstrates, the county of Essex was at the bottom end of the increases in expenditure among East Anglian counties as a whole, even if relief levels in this region were high by national standards. Against this regional background, Terling’s rate of increase in poor relief spending falls distinctly beneath that of the region as a whole.

Every parish experienced poverty differently, because each had its own particular socio-economic circumstances.[[27]](#endnote-27) However, because Terling’s population history and levels of expenditure were in line with those of its immediate neighbours, and the wider region, findings from a detailed consideration of this parish may be applicable elsewhere.

II

How much did individual recipients receive in poor relief each week? This is a surprisingly difficult question to answer, and most existing research has adopted one of two approaches. The first is to calculate the per capita receipts (adding up total expenditure per annum in a parish or county, and dividing it by the total number of recipients),[[28]](#endnote-28) a task made easier by the national Parliamentary returns for 1748-50, 1776, 1783-5, and annually after 1813.[[29]](#endnote-29) The second approach calculates the average value of weekly pension payments[[30]](#endnote-30) or other occasional payments,[[31]](#endnote-31) and compares these to various calculations of household budgets (notably by Davies & Eden in the 1790s),[[32]](#endnote-32) or uses relief listings to identify specific recipients, cross-referenced to other records (notably censuses or local listings).

The first method produces a per capita figure that does not allow for variations in the regularity or size of payments to particular categories of recipient. However, it can be applied nationally, particularly after 1813, and Boyer found that ‘taken as a whole, the data offer no evidence of a sustained increase in real relief expenditures beginning in 1795’.[[33]](#endnote-33) Those using the second method have tended to focus on weekly pensions, rather than the much more variable occasional or additional allowances. Analyses of weekly pensions provide the foundations of King’s national comparisons, and in Ottaway and Williams’ local studies.[[34]](#endnote-34) Such analyses are relatively easy to conduct – lists of pensioners and their weekly payments occur in a minority of overseers’ records at Easter and Michaelmas each year, so they are easy to sum at six-monthly intervals. In addition, most studies have found that weekly payments were the dominant form of poor relief expenditure. King suggests that they comprised 64 per cent of total expenditure in his sample parishes in the 1770s, declining to under 50 per cent after 1800.[[35]](#endnote-35) Others have illustrated the extent of local variation.[[36]](#endnote-36) Such ‘pensions’ may not have been particularly large (often only 2-3s. per week, when adult male wages were 8-10s. per week), but their regularity meant that they added up to larger sums in total than one-off payments, which could be larger individually.[[37]](#endnote-37)

However, such pensions clearly do not represent all recipients of poor relief, and may actually reflect a decreasing and highly variable proportion. Similarly, the social profile of regular recipients, who were often the least able to support themselves, might be different to those receiving one-off or ‘occasional’ payments.[[38]](#endnote-38) As Shave has indicated, histories of poverty based on intermittent receipt of relief seem to reveal a more complex picture of needs and resilience.

The solution adopted here is to transcribe all payments, dividing them between weekly pensions, occasional payments, or a third category of ‘additional allowances’ (first listed in 1808, as additional family allowances to male householders), wherever they could be attributed to named individuals. This yielded 86,545 weekly payments between 1752 and 1834, 48,911 occasional payments between 1762 and 1834 and 8,345 additional payments between 1808 and 1834, making 143,801 payments in all, paid to 1,508 individuals. It should be noted that all payments in kind (parish purchases of shoes, clothes or household goods, for example) have been included as monetary values, so these inflate the size of all *per capita* payments mentioned below.

This number excludes only undifferentiated sums paid ‘to the workhouse’,[[39]](#endnote-39) the very occasional instance where a recipient could not be identified,[[40]](#endnote-40) charitable clothing and bread gifts made by Henry Smith’s charity, Benjamin Joscelyne’s 1775 bequest to educate 10 poor children annually, and the value of residence in one of the four ‘parish’ houses.[[41]](#endnote-41) Identities were established by manual comparison between the names of relief recipients, and data on vital events recorded in the Terling parish registers,[[42]](#endnote-42) checked against paper copies of the Cambridge Group FRF (Family Reconstitution forms).[[43]](#endnote-43) As far as possible, payments to children were listed separately where individual children were named or indicated (for example, ‘Jones’ child’). This may overstate the number of children listed as recipients, because has not always been possible to link such descriptions to particular children (which of Jones’ children is it?). Similarly, for simplicity of recording, payments to married men on behalf of their wives have been attributed directly to the women themselves, which gives a misleadingly positive impression of female financial autonomy in Terling. Inevitably, too, such nominal record linkage suffers some of the problems of identification outlined by King,[[44]](#endnote-44) compounded by the fact that in this period the village contained eight women called Mary Thurgood, five people called John Smith, and William Wood, and four called James May, Elizabeth Thurgood, and William White, all alive at the same time! Unless positive evidence exists to show two individuals are the same person, the analysis has kept them separate.

After attributing each payment to a defined individual, the dates of each payment were given a weekly number (to determine when they occurred between weeks 1 and 53 of the year).[[45]](#endnote-45) Despite its calendric inaccuracy, a 53-week year copes with problems of years beginning and ending in mid-week. Payments were then summed per person, per denominated week, to create weekly totals that could incorporate payments of weekly pensions, occasional payments and additional allowances to the same person in the same week.

Such analyses reveal a picture of dramatic change. Figure 3 illustrates the total amounts paid per year to recipients of the three types of outdoor relief granted in Terling, deflated by Feinstein’s Average Real Wage Index.[[46]](#endnote-46) The sharp rises around 1800 and 1815-8 follow Baugh’s general observation of a very close relationship between expenditure levels and wheat prices in Essex, Kent and Sussex.[[47]](#endnote-47) Figure 4 illustrates the gross total numbers of payments made per annum for each of these categories of assistance. Both graphs indicate three step-changes in relief in Terling between 1762 and 1834 that echo Williams’ Bedfordshire parishes and Baugh’s figures.[[48]](#endnote-48) Until 1775, total relief levels were generally below £100 per annum at constant prices, incurred by between 500 and 1,000 relief payments of all kinds each year. Between 1778 and 1784, total spending per annum doubled (discounting inflation), with a more modest increase in the annual number of payments. After declining for the next decade, relief returned to its earlier level after 1794, and peaked at over £300 (at constant prices) in 1801, with the number of relief payments doubling to 2,000 per annum. There was a degree of stabilisation at figures above £200 until 1810, followed by a slight decline until the winter of 1815. For the next decade, total relief costs in Terling spiked repeatedly at two-to-three times the real figures of the late 1770s.[[49]](#endnote-49) The expenditure peak in 1816 was incurred by almost 5,000 payments - almost five times the figure for the early 1760s. Expenditure remained above £300 per annum (in real terms) until 1834, with more than 3,000 payments being made per year until 1830.[[50]](#endnote-50)

Across the whole period, Figure 5 illustrates that between 1762 and 1834, those who only received payments in one week in any particular year comprised almost one-third of the total number of recipients (29.3 per cent), but unsurprisingly that almost two-thirds of the value of relief went to those who received payments for 40 or more weeks per annum. The group of recipients who received payments in fewer than 10 weeks in any particular year comprised almost two-thirds of all recipients (63.2 per cent), but received only 18.3 per cent of annual expenditure. These findings fit with Williams’ study, which suggested that most recipients were relieved by the parish for only a few weeks at a time, while the number of long-term pensioners was always limited (in this instance to 14.3 per cent of recipients), but they received between two-thirds and three-quarters of all relief spending annually.[[51]](#endnote-51) Similarly, the relatively low value of weekly pensions has been demonstrated by other micro-studies.[[52]](#endnote-52)

However, comparable studies have provided less evidence about the relatively large size of such one-off and short-term payments. In Terling, at any rate, one-off payments were made at an average almost equivalent to adult male weekly wages in Essex prior to 1795 and at perhaps 70 per cent in the following two decades. Payments for up to 10 weeks averaged perhaps one-third of this sum.[[53]](#endnote-53) More importantly, the table provides the first illustration of the sharp increases in mean relief payments among regular recipients in the decades after 1795, with rises of between two and five-times for those who received relief for more than 15 weeks per annum.

While Table 2 supports the general consensus that long-term parish pensions were not particularly generous, and designed to support single individuals rather than whole families, it also suggests that less regular sums had a different function.[[54]](#endnote-54) The relatively large size of one-off payments, and of all payments of less than 10 weeks’ duration, implies that these sums represented either short-term ‘replacement’ income, when earning-power was weakened by illness, accident or unemployment, or lump-sum ‘enabling’ payments for the purchase of shoes, clothes or working tools (some of which might be in excess of 10*s*.).

If so, payments that appear pitiful when expressed as sums averaged across all recipients per year start to look like more viable amounts of short-term replacement income when tied to particular recipients in specific weeks.

III

How did this distribution change over time? Figure 6 illustrates the shifts over time in the proportion of the total value of payments awarded to recipients, according to how many weeks per year they received relief. Firstly, it shows that there were fewer short-term payments made, of slightly smaller sums by the end of the period, compared to the 1760s and 1770s. Secondly, and correspondingly, the proportion of payments made to all those who received relief for more than 30 weeks per annum, and the actual sums distributed, rose significantly after 1800. The mean pension paid to heavily dependent groups of recipients, such as widows over 60 years old in receipt of relief for more than 50 weeks in a year, doubled between the 1760s and the 1820s from 1.2*s.*to 3.2*s.*, only coming under pressure in the years immediately preceding 1834. However, the rate of increase was almost as great for all those who received relief for more than 10 weeks in any particular year.

The scale of these expenditure increases is emphasized more fully in Table 3. This depicts the relative increases in the total sums of money spent on each category of recipient in five-year periods, by representing them as multiples of an indexed figure, based on sums for the quinquennium (1770-4), controlled for price inflation using Feinstein’s real wage index.[[55]](#endnote-55) In common with studies by Boyer, King, Williams and Ottaway, the table indicates that increases in the rate of expenditure occurred well before the wartime crises of the late 1790s.[[56]](#endnote-56) The total sums paid to those who received relief for between 3 and 9 weeks had trebled between 1775 and 1789, where expenditure for other recipients had not doubled.

Thereafter, the rates of increase were quite phenomenal. From 1800 onwards total spending on all those who received relief for more than 3 weeks per annum was rarely less than three-times the figure for the period 1770-4. The sums devoted to increasingly regular recipients (for 30 to 49 weeks per annum) jumped to ten times their initial level in the years between 1815 and 1829 and by six-to-eight times for recipients in the 50+ weeks per annum category. By contrast, the total devoted to short-term relief (less than 3 weeks per annum) barely doubled in the years after 1800. Increases in the sums given to those who required regular or semi-permanent relief were largely responsible for the five-fold real-terms rise in the total relief costs for the parish by 1819.

These dramatic changes produced a plethora of initiatives from the parish vestry. As early as 1775, it had sought to crack down on ‘idleness’ by regulating drinking in the village’s alehouses.[[57]](#endnote-57) In 1785, those in receipt of relief were required to provide details of their earnings and employment, and the ‘principal parishioners’ were to visit recipient households to enjoin church attendance.[[58]](#endnote-58) Exhortation turned to concerted action as bills rocketed after 1794. The following year, the vestry initiated the first of many schemes to provide subsidised flour to the poor, and to restrict gleaning rights to widows and poor families.[[59]](#endnote-59) As in other parishes, in the winter of 1800 the vestry provided food supplements and substitutes (herrings and rice) to paupers, commissioned the first of four surveys of pauper households,[[60]](#endnote-60) and established a rota according to which the vestry members visited every recipient household each week.[[61]](#endnote-61) In 1814 John Strutt received an anonymous letter threatening to burn Terling Hall and attack his farmers ‘because they do not find we work’.[[62]](#endnote-62) After 1815, the parish provided road-mending work for unemployed male labourers, and by 1824 it had constituted a select vestry, which paid set day rates for those out of work, leaving employers free to select their workforce.[[63]](#endnote-63) In 1827 the vestry agreed to rebuild the parish workhouse,[[64]](#endnote-64) but only after 1830 did it take concerted steps to reduce the total numbers of recipients and costs, helped by a stabilisation of the rural labour market.[[65]](#endnote-65)

The net effects of this activity are illustrated in Figures 7-10. These indicate the total amounts of relief paid per quarter to several different groups of recipients between 1778 and 1834, corrected for inflation. Figures 8 and 10 show what might have been anticipated if the groups of men and women had similar relief profiles. The sums paid to daughters and sons, young single women and men, and men and women of all marital statuses aged over 60 years had similar trajectories. Payments to younger people were always subject to greater variation, because (as shown below) they encompassed expensive one-off items like clothing and shoes. Payments to those over 60 tended to follow the general increases in relief expenditure, apart from the spike in payments to men in the unemployment crisis of 1816-8.

Figures 7 and 9 tell a rather different story. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there was virtually no comparison between the size of the payments per quarter to working-age widows and widowers. Although widowers’ receipts followed the general trend in expenditure, the graph suggests that they were much better able to support themselves and their families without poor relief than widows. Like elderly women, widows’ relief trajectory matched general spending levels quite closely. The most surprising finding is contained in Figure 7. This shows a complete reversal in the pattern of expenditure. Until 1790, it was rare for working-age married men to receive higher quarterly relief totals than women. Thereafter, except in the years 1812-4, married men *always* received more than women. This disparity widened enormously after 1815, as men received at least four-, and perhaps eight- to ten-times the amount received by women in each quarter. Now that household heads received relief regularly, more money was being channelled their way, as weekly allowances were combined with ‘additional allowances’ to counter high food prices between 1815 and 1830.

IV

Who received poor relief, and for what purposes did they receive it? In the overseers’ accounts, ‘occasional payments’ given to recipients had to be justified by some description of their purpose. By contrast, ‘weekly pensions’ carried little in the way of explanation. We can divide these occasional relief payments into thirteen different categories. These comprised payments to meet the costs of settlement relocation, clothing, footwear, administration costs (particularly legal costs associated with bastardy bonds or affiliation orders), sickness payments, food and drink (notably at pauper funerals), care costs (particularly nursing in illness or child-birth), Baptism, Marriage and Burial fees, the purchase of household equipment, fuel costs (wood and coal), general allowances, rent and wage subsidies. Frustratingly, general allowances (unspecified cash payments) were the largest single category, incorporating (and obscuring) payments for many of these other purposes.

These payment categories can be analysed firstly by examining the distribution of the value of different forms of relief, and secondly, by assessing its significance to different categories of recipients. Table 4 illustrates the distribution of the value of relief expenditure across a series of relief categories. ‘Occasional payments’ encompassed all the categories extending from payments for settlement disputes through to wages. These have been supplemented by the larger sums paid in regular weekly allowances and in additional weekly allowances after 1808. As might be expected, although the range of occasional payments was extensive, they never comprised a large proportion of total expenditure in any five-year period. Although some substantial proportions (of still relatively small totals) were devoted to clothes between 1762 and 1795, as well as sickness and nursing costs at either end of the period, the bulk of the value of occasional payments was located in unspecified (cash) ‘general allowances’. In the years of highest expenditure (1815-24) they amounted to over one-third of the total value of relief payments. In these years, the unpredictable pattern of need seems to have created a shift of resources away from regular pensions, and towards substantial but impermanent ‘occasional’ cash handouts. In general, cash payments of all kinds comprised at least 75 per cent of the value of relief in any five-year period.

The next stage in the analysis is to examine this distribution in relation to different categories of recipient. These included daughters and sons aged 15 years or less, single women and men aged over 15 years but under 60 (and mainly below 30 years), married women and men over 15 years but under 60, married women and men over 60 years of age, widowed women and men under 60, and over 60.[[66]](#endnote-66) Tables 5a & b examine the distribution of the value of relief expenditure to these categories of female and male recipients; Tables 6a & b detail the actual sums spent, corrected for inflation; Tables 7a & b illustrate the mean number of weeks per year in which payments were received, while Tables 8a & b depict the total numbers of recipients in each period.

Tables 5a & b display some strong continuities, as well as changes. Some of these might be expected. Throughout the period, sons and daughters and young single women and men received substantial slices of relief in the forms of clothes and shoes (between 15-25 per cent of total receipts), as noted in Williams’ study of Bedfordshire.[[67]](#endnote-67) Similarly, elderly women (particularly widows) received many payments for medical attendance, nursing and care costs, and the elderly of both sexes received the bulk of their relief as weekly pensions.

Other trends are more surprising particularly the rising proportions of weekly allowances and cash payments received by daughters, sons, and married women of working age. If we include cash payments in the form of ‘general allowances’ and supplementary ‘additional allowances’, married men of working age received just over 75 per cent of the value of their relief in cash between 1815-34. In the last relatively low-pressure period, between 1775 and 1795, the figure was just over 30 per cent. Single women and men received 50-60 per cent of the value of their relief in these payments. We might have expected the relief paid to wage-earners to have been in the form of supplementary goods (‘enabling’ payments for clothing or shoes), or for the costs created by income interruptions (notably sickness, with associated costs of food and drink). These were importance to working-age men, but the predominance of cash payments implies that much of this money supplied income deficiencies.

Tables 6a & b illustrate the sums involved, again corrected for inflation. While the totals increase over time across most categories, some of these real-terms increases are startling. The total for weekly allowances paid to elderly widows increased from £566 between 1775 and 1795 to £1,067 between 1795 and 1815. For married men under 60 years it rose from £89 to £415, but was accompanied by ten-fold increases in the costs of ‘general allowances’ (from £46 to £448). In the period between 1815 and 1834 £2,691 was paid to married men in general allowances, weekly and additional allowances, six times the total paid to the entire group between 1775 and 1795. Married men aged over 60 years also received six-times the sums from these sources over the same period.[[68]](#endnote-68) The sums paid to married men for sickness costs (which may have included family members) also rose dramatically.

However, Tables 7a & b indicate that these increases were not, in general, because ‘occasional relief’ was becoming much more regular, but because many more people were receiving it. Mean numbers of weekly payments per annum crept up from 39 weeks to 45 weeks for elderly women (married or widowed), but fluctuated or fell for other groups (such as daughters, married men under 60 years, single women and married women under 60 years). ‘General allowances’ were clearly becoming more regular, with married and widowed men, and men over 60 years receiving such payments for 9-10 weeks on average by the final period, compared to only 1-4 weeks per annum in the first one. Similarly, while there was a general upward drift in the mean number of weeks in which recipients received relief, this was particularly pronounced among daughters, single women, and widows of all kinds, as well as most groups of men aged less than 60 years. For married men under 60, the mean number of weeks doubled from 4 to 8 across the period, while for elderly widows, it doubled from 10 to 20 weeks per annum - that is, to receiving relief in more than one-third of the weeks in each year.

This impression is confirmed by Tables 8a & b, which detail the number of recipients per category in each 20-year time period. For both men and women, these tables show dramatic increases in the numbers of recipients in these periods. The number of married women receiving payments for sickness more than doubled (from 99 between 1762-75 to 242 between 1815-34), while between the same two periods the number of daughters under 15 and young single women receiving ‘general allowances’ rose from under ten to 46 and 65 respectively. The numbers of recipients in most age/status-categories for women increased at least three-fold across the period. The picture was even more pronounced among men, with very significant increases in the numbers of sons, young single men and married men requiring clothing, shoes, sick-pay, general and weekly allowances. The increased dependence of married men on the parish for small sums to help with the costs of food and drink, household equipment, and fuel is also very apparent.

The rise in the total number of male recipients over these 20-year periods is also staggering. The numbers of sons and young men increased from 85 and 39 respectively between 1762-75 to almost 500 in each case in the 20 years between 1815 and 1834. Meanwhile, the numbers of married men under 60 increased from 324 to 2,844 across these two periods, while the number of married men over 60 increased ten-fold.

V

Seasonality was the other important potential variant in the size and frequency of these payments. Evidence cited above shows that the parish relieved winter unemployment among able-bodied men in the decade after 1815.[[69]](#endnote-69) However, as Table 9 suggests, the total value of payments in the two ‘winter’ quarters was at its greatest in the *first* time period within the survey, for daughters and sons under 15, single women and men, married women over 60 years and widowers over 60 years. Thereafter, there was relatively little variation in the value of payments between winter and summer seasons, as relief was entrenched within labourers’ household incomes, and was focused more on *direct* working-age wage support in winter, instead of *indirect* assistance with the cost of shoes, clothing, care, nursing, household equipment or housing costs in summer and autumn.

The extent of dependence is also indicated by the regularity with which seasonal payments were received. Table 10 shows the mean number of payments made to each (actual) recipient per quarter in each year, averaged over the four 20-year time periods for the different categories of recipient. There were some substantial changes over time. Sons and daughters went from receiving perhaps only 1-2 payments per quarter (and more during the winter months), to 4-5 and 6-7 payments per quarter respectively (with slightly more summer payments). The same dynamics occurred among single men and women, married men under 60 years, widows under 60, married men over 60 and elderly widows and widowers. The increasing frequency of payments to widows under 60, widows over 60, and married men over 60 implies that by the 1820s such people received relief payments almost every week, where they had done so in one week in three or two in each quarter in the 1760s. On average, by the 1820s sons, daughters, young people of working age and married men received payments in between one-in-three and one-in-two weeks in each quarter.

Seasonal variation diminished over time precisely because relief was received with increasing frequency throughout the year by the 1820s. While only the elderly received relief week-in and week-out, possibly to reduce labour competition (as in Campton and Shefford),[[70]](#endnote-70) the able-bodied were now more likely to receive payments in each quarter, and with greater consistency.

VI

These aggregate changes can be examined in more detail by observing their effects on a specific cohort of 53 recipients, men and youths who received relief in the year 1810. This group (and their families) illustrate the categories of recipient (working-age youths, married men with families, and elderly men) who experienced the greatest change in their relationship to poor relief after 1795. A portion of the group (20 individuals) can also be linked to a survey of household incomes recorded in 1809.

Figure 11 illustrates the changing age structure of this group of male recipients over the entire span in which it received relief under the Old Poor Law. Since the majority of the group in 1810 was married men aged between 30 and 60 years, the age distribution altered significantly over time. The proportion of young, unmarried men under 30 declined from over 30 per cent to under 10 per cent by the 1820s; the proportion of married men under 60 peaked at approximately 70 per cent in the 1790s, and declined very slowly thereafter; and the proportion of those over 60 increased with the mean age of the cohort, and accelerated rapidly after 1825.

Figures 12 & 13 demonstrate the profound impact of the post-1795 crisis on this largely able-bodied group of wage-earners. Both graphs show that before 1795, the number and value of payments to this group of self-supporting men was negligible. In the year 1798-9, however, prices jumped by almost 25 per cent, and although agrarian wage-rates rose, real incomes declined.[[71]](#endnote-71) The graphs show that this cohort of male wage earners rapidly became regular relief recipients particularly able-bodied married men aged less than 60. This dependence was increased by further periods of rapid price increases (such as 1808-10), and acute post-war slump (1816-8).

No doubt, this dependence was exacerbated as family-sizes among the cohort peaked in the period 1800-20, and by increased levels of old-age dependence after 1820. Even so, this striking pattern of change endorses the findings of Boyer and Horrell and Humphries that falling real wages and rising parochial wage supplements, resulted in large increases in spending on the able-bodied after 1795.[[72]](#endnote-72)

This is emphasized by Figure 14, which illustrates the changing size of the value of mean payments per head for each group within the 1810 cohort in each quarter between 1778 and 1834. The greatest fluctuations were in the value of payments to young men (generally the one-off costs of equipping them with clothing and shoes to go into service). However, the most significant increases were in mean payments per head per quarter to married men *after* allowing for inflation. These rose from around 4*s* per payment in the mid-1790s to 6*s* to 8*s* between 1814 and 1822.

This was despite the fact that the recorded wages in Terling were apparently quite high. In 1809, Richardson suggests that average agrarian wage levels in Essex were 9*s* 5*d* per week, while Boyer indicates that 12-14*s* per week was required to support a family of six in southern England in 1795.[[73]](#endnote-73) Yet, in 1809, families consisting of husband, wife and six children received between 12*s* and 17*s* 6*d* per week from all sources, with mean male earnings running at 12*s* per week for men employed in ‘husbandry’.[[74]](#endnote-74)

In practice, these sums could vary a lot from week to week. Figure 15 illustrates the relief history of Robert and Susan Richardson, and their nine children between 1808, when Robert and Susan, and their six children, began to receive significant levels of relief, and 1834. It plots the total relief received by the family as a proportion of estimated family income. This ranged from 12*s* per week for eight family members between 1808-10, rising to 16*s* for 9-10 family members between 1811-14, and peaking at 18*s* per week for 11-12 family members between 1814-20, before declining back to 12*s* per week as older children left home between 1824-6, and 8-10*s* by the 1830s, when only the three youngest children (William b. 1814, Thomas, b. 1816 and Joseph, b. 1818) were likely to have remained at home.[[75]](#endnote-75)

Although the amounts received could be highly variable, as needs fluctuated considerably over time, more consistent payments seem to have reached 50 per cent of estimated total family income in the difficult years of 1817-8, and 25-40 per cent of income in the later 1820s. More speculatively, Figure 16 plots mean relief payments per head per quarter for all married men under 60 years as a percentage of two variants of Richardson’s Essex wage data. Married men were chosen because payments to them were likely to be directed at replacing or substituting the adult male wage. Since Richardson’s wage-rates appear significantly below the sums recorded in Terling, these receipts have been calculated as a proportion of his actual wage rates, and against rates totalling 125 per cent of his sums. The graph suggests that the mean level of each relief payment per quarter was in the range of 35-45 per cent of weekly wages in the years after 1810. This is consistent with Richardson’s observation that labourers’ real wages in Essex were only 60-80 per cent of their 1790 value in the decade after 1800.[[76]](#endnote-76)

VII

Even so, mean levels of relief for most recipients equated to the cost of a pair of men’s shoes each year, or attendance by the doctor two births every four or five years, or the price of a single funeral, or ten weeks ‘general allowance’ at the short-term rate of 4*s* per week, or 20 weeks at the more-usual 2*s* per week. In isolation, this does not necessarily represent heavy dependence on poor relief.

However, this study demonstrates that what mattered was the number of people receiving such relief. In the years 1770-4, an average of 65 persons per annum had received poor relief of all kinds. Between 1816 and 1833, there was no year in which fewer than 150 persons received some kind of poor relief. This represented an increase of 230 per cent, during a period when the village’s total population increased from approximately 650 to 890 (or by 137 per cent).[[77]](#endnote-77) Between 1770 and 1774, an average of 34 recipients per year received relief for one week only. Between 1820 and 1824 the mean was 66 per annum (an increase of 194 per cent). In the former period, only the numbers of those receiving relief for 1 to 2 weeks, 3 to 5 weeks and 10 to 29 weeks exceeded five per annum. In the latter, every category had more than three times this number, with an average of 22 persons per annum receiving relief for more than 50 weeks, where only four had done so, on average, in the early 1770s (an increase of 550 per cent). Over the same period, the mean levels of relief paid per annum increased from £80 between 1770-4 to £618 between 1820-4 (or by 770 per cent). The Terling evidence supports the findings of King, Burnett and others, in suggesting that after 1795 many of these additional recipients were able-bodied married men, who turned to the parish (and were relieved by it) because their wages failed to keep pace with wartime inflation, and were depressed by post-war under-employment.[[78]](#endnote-78)

Such observations qualify Boyer’s conclusion that the overall *per capita* relief levels plateaued across the period.[[79]](#endnote-79) Obviously, per-capita expenditure did not increase substantially after 1795 because the *numbers* receiving relief rose so dramatically. In Terling, as total expenditure increased six-to-ten-fold, so did the numbers of recipients, particularly among sons and daughters, single men and women, and the able-bodied married population. As Ottoway has demonstrated, this growth was matched by the rapid decline in the value of pensions and payments to established categories of elderly recipients after the mid-1780s.[[80]](#endnote-80)

These findings support and amplify Williams’ comparative research on Bedfordshire that ‘the nature and “problem” of poverty had altered substantially’ by 1830.[[81]](#endnote-81) They support her chronology of a two-stage shift away from the ‘low-pressure’ relief regime that into the late 1770s. In Terling, as in Campton and Shefford, this had featured fairly extensive and substantial relief that was primarily short-term, and directed towards pensioners who usually comprised a small number of elderly or widowed women and men. After upward pressure on relief levels and numbers of recipients in the decade 1775-85, the situation improved more in Terling in the next decade than in Bedfordshire. However, with the emergence of a war-time economy, shaken by the rapid price jumps between 1795 and 1801, in Essex as in Bedfordshire many more families and individuals received ‘targeted’ assistance from the parish, most for terms of less than 10 weeks.[[82]](#endnote-82) At the same time, though, more married men and women required medium-term assistance, and were paid slightly larger sums.

This ‘emergency’ situation was less dire than the depressed agrarian labouring economy between 1815 and 1824, which appears to have been even more acute in Terling than in Williams’ parishes. In this welfare regime, most categories of wage-earners required some financial assistance (sometimes averaging 25 per cent of their total household income), with increasing numbers of married women and men, and unmarried daughters and sons of working age, needing more money, more regularly than ever before. The size and extent of this shift, and its profound effect on welfare costs indicates that the agrarian labour market post-1815 was unable to ‘bounce back’ to either the levels of employment or real-wages found in the period up to 1780 or 1790.

Arguably, the substantial expansion in the proportion of labouring families who depended on relief for half the weeks in any given year was less significant than the increasing number of households who could no longer do without parochial assistance for each pair of child’s shoes, each lying-in, each new shirt or each week out of work. This need meant that poor relief became woven inextricably into the fabric of daily life for almost half the parish of Terling after 1800 in ways that it had never been before.
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