1

Introduction

Alannah Tomkins and Steven King

Historiography of parish poor relief

Olwen Hufton could hardly have realised her future impact on the history of welfare when in 1974 she titled two of her chapters on the poor in France ‘The economy of makeshifts’.¹ It is a phrase which neatly sums up the patchy, desperate and sometimes failing strategies of the poor for material survival and has been much repeated since 1974. Other phrases (discussed below) may try to represent the same essential idea but none have been so successful in capturing the imaginations of historians. Furthermore ‘the economy of makeshifts’ has become the organising concept for a number of historians of English welfare who wish to stress the disparate nature of income for poor households, in contrast to a concurrent research trend which would allow parish poor relief a predominant role. This is important given the past preoccupation with particular places and single forms of income. Such approaches have been successful in their own terms but now seem rather insular or parochial in the context of the recognisably varied and integrated reality of poor incomes.

The success of ‘the economy of makeshifts’ during the last twenty-five years is partly explained by the increasing interest shown by historians in the experiences of poor people rather than accounts which deal exclusively with government policy, elite or at least literate opinions of poverty, or the administrative machinery built up to deliver welfare. Histories of poverty initially (and understandably) tended to address the welfare measures and organisations which left the largest paper trail. For England, this has meant repeated, detailed studies of parish poor relief. In the first instance, parish papers were annexed for information relating to local policy and the power of individuals or governing groups,

treating the recipients of relief *en masse*. Thus the monumental histories compiled by Sidney and Beatrice Webb² (significantly as part of a larger project on the history of many aspects of local government) and by Dorothy Marshall³ set the pattern for multiple, shorter, works on the intricacies of local parish management.⁴ Paupers made regular appearances in these works, but as illustrations of policy in practice rather than as individual people with an existence outside the framework of parochial relief. It is implied that the relief dispensed to these characters, and the experiences of the characters themselves, were static whereas it is more plausible to consider relief as a process rather than an event, and the experience of poverty as mutable according to age, employment and other factors.

The emphasis of these early works was decidedly critical; the old poor law was examined and found wanting. Many local examples of cruelty, mismanagement, undue thrift or inappropriate largesse were taken as indications that the system was faulty in design and negligently executed. The Webbs undertook a painstaking progress through 400 years of welfare history spread over two volumes and found much to criticise at every point. They concluded that legislation was merely cited to bolster local autonomy in matters of relief, leading to severity of attitude and no continuity of treatment towards the poor, while an absence of legal amendment was castigated as neglect. Marshall in contrast focused fairly consistently on the eighteenth century and charted the development of the legal framework that sustained and amended parish relief, the manifestations of outdoor relief and the ebb and flow of enthusiasm for setting the poor to work. In particular she grappled with the issue of *how* different parishes implemented the law and although she accorded limited success to some of the outdoor relief measures tried by parishes, she repeatedly labelled most of their efforts as 'failure'.

In both works, the charges levelled at the statutory framework and the host of local variant practices were broadly twofold. First, the poor law was incapable of making a significant dent in the misery of poverty and even inflicted new suffering of its own devising, particularly in the form of the mixed, general workhouse and the stringent application of settlement law. Second, developments at the end of the eighteenth century were guilty of contributing to the increase of poverty, by tending to draw greater numbers of people into the remit of the poor law in the short

term and by supporting demographic changes which would increase the number and size of pauper families in the long term. The worst culprit was identified as the income supplement system which created a sliding scale of benefits for families based on the price of bread, the number of children in the family and an estimate of the total nutritional requirements of that family. Earnings which were insufficient to purchase the estimated minimum of food were topped up by poor relief funds. It was surmised that this practice gave workers no incentive to earn enough to keep their families, since the poor law would step in to pay for food, and gave encouragement to early marriage and independent household formation because the relief system seemed to remove the risk of hunger and suffering if employment failed (or even if the form of employment on offer was unpalatable).⁵

The latter judgement constituted an endorsement of the conclusions reached rather earlier by the Hammonds, who twinned the enclosure movement with developments in parish relief to account for the desperate plight of the agricultural poor, and the ‘Swing’ riots, in 1830. The Hammonds had condemned the allowance system as ‘the prison of the poor’ in rural England.⁶ They effectively confined their consideration of urban poverty to the post-1800 period, and then chiefly in the context of mechanised industry and factory establishments: the classic manifestations of the ‘Industrial Revolution’.⁷

Alternative sources of assistance for the poor were addressed largely as free-standing exercises, giving rise to separate, parallel strands of enquiry relating to very poor, disadvantaged or marginal people. Jordan’s attempt to evaluate the contribution of endowed charity endeavoured to grasp the issue of comparability between parish relief and non-statutory gifts, but the flaws in his research blinded historians to the merits of his approach and the important, if limited, implications of his findings for a long time.⁸ Other works catalogued the genres of charity and changes to their operation and scope over time; these either did not attempt an evaluative exercise⁹ or made judgements on the basis of thin evidence which were subsequently easy to challenge.¹⁰ The consequence of these researches and their rejection led to the perception in the 1960s that welfare aside from poor relief meant ‘charity’ and that charity was a sham which did little to alleviate poverty and served the needs of donors rather than acting sensitively or helpfully towards recipients. Similarly, research on activities which

were not overtly related to welfare but which effectually gave rise to alternative income strands for the poor comprised discrete studies of, for example, work, crime, or common rights without consciously connecting their findings to a broader picture of poverty and survival via manipulation, ingenuity and desperation.¹¹

The early twentieth-century assessments of the old poor law and charity are unsurprising in that they reflect strongly the priorities and preoccupations of the decades in which they were written. In the 1920s, when the Webbs and Marshall were published, there was a tendency to view past experiments as faulty forerunners of the then modern, liberal welfare policies. By the 1950s and 1960s, the 'welfare state' had been established and the state's legitimate role aimed at nothing less than comprehensive provision for all legitimate needs, making the role and future of voluntary organisations and charities uncertain. Indeed the major development in the history of poverty in the 1960s was to rescue the old poor law from some of the opprobrium cast by the Webbs, and shed a more positive light on past efforts by the state. Mark Blaug's close examination of the demography of late eighteenth-century England argued that poor law measures such as the income supplement were implemented in response to change rather than supplying a major cause of change.¹² While the philosophical basis for his research, results and inferences have subsequently been challenged, the tenor of his work struck a chord with many welfare historians and even Blaug's critic, Williams, thought it 'futile to condemn the poor law in the 1800s for not paying universal full subsistence allowances when these were only put on the agenda in the 1940s'.¹³

In the last thirty years two strands of thought have emerged, generating a profusion of books and articles clustering round the issue of the poor law and its adequacy. Blaug's work cleared the way for an optimistic interpretation of statutory poor relief under the old poor law, which stresses material generosity, in both the amounts of money redistributed and the types of assistance countenanced by local authorities, and the humanity of a face-to-face, parochial system. At first this up-beat line was followed rather diffidently, by work such as Geoffrey Oxley's positive if slightly pedestrian survey,¹⁴ but it was taken up more vigorously in the 1980s. Keith Snell's detailed research on agricultural labourers' quality of life in southern England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries surmised that the seasonality of rural unemployment

and consequential population mobility pointed up the crucial importance of uncomplicated access to poor relief. He saw the poor law in the eighteenth century as a miniature welfare state, offering generous, comprehensive security and relief.¹⁵ This view was consolidated by Paul Slack, whose studies of the parish relief dispensed in seventeenth-century towns demonstrated how individuals experienced relief and the relative liberality with which they were treated.¹⁶ His most recent work moves away from the circumstances of the individual poor but finds virtue (where the Webbs would have found fault) with the flexibility of local responses to poverty and the energy with which the urge to reform both the law and the poor was taken up.¹⁷ Perhaps the most outspoken, ambitious exponent of the view that the old poor law provided an effective welfare safety net, Peter Solar, argues that parishes manipulated their implementation of the poor laws in accordance with local perceptions of labour supply and demand.¹⁸ He considers that this tailoring of the poor law to labour needs produced a near-universal welfare system which supported a mobile, responsive workforce and so facilitated early industrialisation. As yet this thesis still awaits a convincing body of empirical evidence.

Writers in this positive vein have made assumptions about the expansive capacity of poor relief, and its consequential dominance in the incomes of poor households. Tim Wales argued that in the second half of the seventeenth century parishes increasingly used extraordinary relief to plug gaps in the needs of households that were not filled by parish pension income. This argument holds that poor relief became the sole or dominant source of income for more and more people, but without confirming that extraordinary relief was routinely given to the *same* people who took regular parish payments.¹⁹ Subsequent research has suggested that there was no stable relationship between the poor who were taking regular weekly or monthly relief and the people who received occasional monies for rent, fuel and other necessities.²⁰ Still, Wales's work has been very influential in that he elaborated the significance of 'lifecycle' poverty, which was implicit in much previous work but rarely spelled out. He grappled with the extent to which individuals and families became saturated by impoverishment at different stages in their lives, which he gauged in line with the intensity of their impact on parish relief accounts.

Indeed, in the last twenty years the concept of life-cycle poverty has been almost as influential as the 'economy of makeshifts'.

Barry Stapleton has undertaken one of the very few studies to look at life-cycle poverty for a whole community and for more than one generation. According to his findings the early nineteenth century in rural Hampshire saw increasing numbers of people in lifetime poverty; the birth of a first child precipitated families into some sort of dependence for the rest of their lives.²¹ Marjorie McIntosh has also approached the topic at the level of community, to show how the responsibility for care of the needy in the period prior to the formalisation of the poor laws fell variably on institutions, families and neighbours.²² The emphasis on life-cycle has also inspired work on the stress points of childhood and old age. Pam Sharpe is unusual in that she has addressed both of these epochs in different places;²³ widows and the elderly have tended to attract most attention of late.²⁴ Thane's work has explored the expedients of the aged poor in relation to those listed in the Report of the 1832 Poor Law Commission. She found that poor relief was often a component expedient for survival but was usually 'residual and complementary', utilised along with friendly society payments, small-scale savings or bequests, kinship support and crops from allotments. She does not, however, attempt to prioritise the significance of these alternative resources for the elderly people who used them.²⁵ Few studies or individuals have tackled an overview of the whole life-cycle, although Susannah Ottoway and Samantha Williams have emphasised the necessity of prosopography for an adequate examination of individuals over their whole lives.²⁶ There is now room for a refinement of ideas about lifecycle poverty, particularly in relation to children and to men of all ages.

The records generated by parish administration have been used imaginatively to gain some access to the poor and their versions of events, both as individuals and groups. Snell has used settlement examinations to approach experiences of work and unemployment among cohorts of the rural labouring poor.²⁷ Other historians have glimpsed experiences of poverty via readings of pauper letters. This new attention to an overlooked source possibly represented one of the most refreshing developments in the history of welfare of the 1990s. Whether they are used to look at the interactions between an extended family and its parish,²⁸ the experience of a life-cycle stage,²⁹ or another aspect of impoverishment they provide one of the very few ways to investigate poverty using some of the words of the individual poor. Still, the results of this line of enquiry

so far have been limiting in some respects. Steven Taylor's categorisation of the voices of pauper authors (into formal, informative, insistent and desperate)³⁰ has provided a useful initial survey but should not be read as a comprehensive schema into which all narrative voices fit. As a starting point the identification of four types of voice has been helpful, but as a system of classification it would be unhelpfully restricting. Similarly, the stories which unfold from such letters provide some of the most poignant evidence we have for the cruel exigencies of hardship and as such give accounts which are rightly advertised. Yet such treatments have inevitably given much weight to the prominence of parish relief; the rhetoric of powerlessness adopted quite sensibly by pauper correspondents has sometimes been accepted fairly uncritically by historians.³¹ While we would not want to make the mistake of according significant empowerment to the poor via their interactions with authorities it is also too bland to accept accounts of prostration. A scratch at the surface of a pauper letter-writer's story can reveal a much more complex (though not necessarily less heart-rending) situation.³²

Any acceptance of alleged powerlessness at this juncture is surprising, given that recent developments have seen historians increasingly according agency to the parish poor. This has been achieved by stressing the face-to-face nature of parish government (at least in the rural south and midlands parishes) and supposing that they used local knowledge of people and resources, along with powers of persuasion, to negotiate welfare deals.³³ In a related though tangential literature, Thompson has emphasised the vigour with which ordinary people defended and exercised their perceived rights in his 'pre-histories of class formation',³⁴ collected as *Customs in Common*. These essays chart the 'imperfect empowerment'³⁵ open to ordinary people by their assertion of customary culture (often in the teeth of technical or legal opposition). The concept of a moral economy was central to this thesis, whereby high grain prices, enclosure, game laws and other impositions by authority were challenged with some temporary success, by people acting together to obtain a measure of justice.

Therefore the positive school of thought has partly taken on board the challenge (urged by Thompson and others) to confront seriously the problem of writing history from below. Rebarbative sources produced by administrative practices have been used with some success to recover the partial biographies and stated views

of paupers. Nevertheless, some of the conclusions drawn from this work are unwarranted, based on the limitations of the research and the sources. Some challenges have been launched on the basis that authors have been insufficiently sensitive to the context of source production, a thorny question to which we return later in this chapter. Norma Landau, for instance, has questioned Snell's apparent assumption that the laws of settlement were employed solely to remove people who were nearly or actually destitute. She asserts that, prior to 1795, the laws were used by parishes to regulate the mobility of individuals and families who were not already impoverished. Such challenges to received opinion are valuable correctives.³⁶

A recent exemplification of the positive view of the old poor law may be found in the textbook by Lynn Hollen Lees.³⁷ Unusually she covers the poor laws 1700 to 1948, thereby jettisoning consideration of the early emergence of the poor laws (so popular with pioneers in the subject) and implying the essential continuity between the old poor law, its 'new' reincarnation, and ultimately the twentieth-century welfare state. She has written of the widespread acceptance of parish relief by taxpayers and recipients alike before 1800, but after that date she identifies a hardening of attitude which saw the ratepayers become resistant to paying for relief and made the poor more reluctant to apply for it. Her chronology essentially endorses the mainstream view that the old poor law was marked by liberality (of attitude and payment) and the new poor law was implemented with a hard-nosed utility.

Therefore the first strand of recent research has been optimistic about the forms and influence of parish poor relief under the old poor law and the independence of the poor. Conversely a second strand, defined broadly, comprises work on the limits of poor relief, the variety of assistance available to the poor from other sources and the persistent necessity to exploit any and every source available. This line of thought derives from a number of complementary apprehensions about the lives of the poor and the trajectory of the historiography of parish relief. First, it has become very clear that poor households cobbled together incomes from a wide variety of sources and benefits, ranging from ultra-legitimate wage labour to the fragile advantage gained when a landlord withheld foreclosure. Second, an imbalance has been detected in the geographical basis of orthodox views about parish relief, in that understandings have been extrapolated from research that

concentrates on the southern counties, particularly from south-eastern locations. Even this research on the south-east has opened the possibility that poor relief was insufficient on its own to sustain a majority of poor individuals and families.³⁸ Third, there is some doubt about the timing of changes in attitude from generous and expansive to mean and restrictive. Deborah Valenze and others date 'the deterioration of goodwill towards the poor' from 1780 or earlier.³⁹

This corrective, cautionary sometimes pessimistic strand of thought is receiving increasing (though not overwhelming) endorsement by welfare historians. Joanna Innes has given the strand a national perspective by examining contemporary debates about the efficacy of relief, charity and other formal props.⁴⁰ Steven King has directly challenged Solar's thesis by conducting detailed research on parishes in the neglected north and west of England and demonstrating that the poor laws did not necessarily result in the formation of a reliable relief 'system'.⁴¹ Essentially the poor law (and indeed other types of welfare) was resourced by a finite line of supply in the face of potentially infinite demand. There is some evidence that parish authorities in different places were well aware of both parochial and non-parochial sources of relief and set the supply of parish relief (or other controllable resources) at very different levels. The result of this control, be it conscious or unconscious, was a wide variation in provision within the same ostensible poor law 'system'. The aggregate effect of these controls was that there could be as many or more differences between relief, broadly defined, within England as there was between some English parishes and continental units of authority. Access to welfare was pitched accordingly, via a stringent or relaxed set of entry criteria. Pessimists conclude that, instead of marvelling at the extensive *range* of different benefits which could technically accrue to separate subsections of the poor, historians should in fact emphasise the *insufficiency* of welfare en masse.

In part this pessimistic re-evaluation of parish relief has involved a resurrection of charity, a trend in research which has emerged since 1980, although much of this focus on philanthropy continues to be directed at donors and their concerns.⁴² Recipients rarely take centre stage. Nonetheless, the most sensitive accounts successfully mesh the charitable motive with the explication of a charity's operation.⁴³ Recently John Broad has stressed the importance of a holistic approach to welfare which takes account of both the

origins of charity, whether deriving from landowners, clergy, other individuals or endowments derived from enclosure, and the power relations governing the scope of action (by either parish officials or charity distributors/managers).⁴⁴ Crucially he directs attention at the pre-1780 period, before population growth and the broadening reach of deep poverty diminished the relative contribution of charity to welfare. He corrects the apprehension of parish charity as ripe for embezzlement by observing the efficient flexibility with which the majority of parish funds were probably administered.⁴⁵

This divergence between the primacy of state relief versus the complex efforts of the individual poor is unsurprising given the current unease in both government circles and wider society about the appropriate role of the state and the balance it should strike in welfare provision with (once again) proliferating voluntary organisations and charities. Yet the picture of welfare in England in 2003, of a large, unwieldy social security bill combined with eloquent proof (in the forms of evident homelessness and other sorts of visible hardship) that the state is patently not meeting even all the basic welfare needs of the modern population, introduces an interesting possibility for the earlier period being studied here. Increasing state intervention in the problem of poverty 1700–1850, either in terms of new initiatives or money spent, is not necessarily at odds with widespread involvement in the economy of makeshifts by the poor. Central or local government may have made efforts which were suspected of being too generous, but the impact of these measures at the individual or household level might have remained insufficient or even minimal (necessitating recourse to other incomes or strategies).

None of the recent research on English welfare has conclusively unseated the orthodox view that parish poor relief under the old poor law constituted a systematic welfare provision, which may not have been perfect or uniform but was recognisably functional throughout England. We want to argue that a ‘system’, that is to say a coherent, predictable pattern of relatively reliable relief supplying comprehensive benefits to individuals, has not been proved to exist for the whole of England. The old poor law was statutory only in as much as it compelled the propertied to contribute towards the maintenance of the poor; it did not proscribe the format of distributions or the sufficiency of its benefits. While some types of relief became ‘typical’ in the south-east,

securing any relief, or adequate relief, was entirely uncertain in other regions. The portrait of relief in the south-east as a convincingly integrated system becomes more patchy and attenuated the further north and west the historian looks. Jordan made the unwise and sweeping assumption that only those parishes with surviving poor law accounts actually distributed poor relief in the years up to 1660. While it would be plainly unjustifiable to argue the reverse, that relief was probably dispensed even where there are no accounts, we should perhaps re-examine our assumptions about the spread and efficiency of the relief which was being given.

Origins and variants of the 'economy of makeshifts'

Explicit acknowledgement of the gaps in the poor relief 'system' and the consequent search for alternatives has been slow to take hold. As early as 1926 Dorothy Marshall referred to the 'patchwork' of relief supplied by parishes without elaborating on the characters of either the patches or the stitching. The concept was taken no further with the result that in 1981 Karel Williams too found parish relief in 1802–3 'selective, discontinuous and supplementary';⁴⁶ fuller consideration had to wait for an account of the continental European poor, which took a more inclusive approach to the question of 'welfare' by considering all avenues pursued for survival.

It is no accident that the influential expression 'economy of makeshifts' was devised to summarise the French experience of marginality. France in the later eighteenth century possessed nothing that could be described as a system of welfare. The Catholic Church in France retained some responsibility for the relief of the poor, and the foundation of charities and work schemes such as the lace factory in Bayeux undoubtedly provided a measure of relief or a route to self-help for some groups.⁴⁷ The efforts of the Church combined with the provisions of large, institutional charities in some of the larger French cities amounted to piecemeal demonstrations of goodwill but no more. The majority of people in difficulties were thrown back on their own resources. Conversely a phrase like 'economy of makeshifts' could not have been formulated to describe the distribution of welfare in the Protestant Netherlands, for example, which arguably possessed

one of the most definite if decentralised 'systems' in Europe in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A partnership between the municipalities and the State Church ensured that there was a genuine safety net waiting to catch the Dutch poor.⁴⁸

Hufton identified two basic strands to the French economy of makeshifts, corresponding to the two fundamental categories of able-bodied and impotent poor.⁴⁹ The first was physical mobility on a regional or national scale, the temporary response of under-employed agricultural labourers to seasonal jobs available in different regions (or in dire straits a permanent move, from seasonal agricultural work to unskilled urban employment), as a key survival-strategy for the healthy, adult poor. Such movement was a matter of effective coercion in that people were faced with 'the impossibility of making a living' at home.⁵⁰ Subsistence migration was clearly not new to France in the eighteenth century; what was unusual was the 'increasing dependence of communities upon these outward movements'⁵¹ and the rising numbers of people involved.⁵² The advantages were not simply or directly financial, since the net cash gain for migrant workers was typically very small, but arose from the removal of adult men from consumption of food at home, institutional support of families while men were absent, and (in the case of grain harvests) the importance of gleaning rights which accrued to wives.⁵³ There was also a significantly relaxed attitude to migrants surviving *en route* by begging.⁵⁴ Migrants found work as harvesters of grain or grapes, as navvies or pedlars, or as beggars with a *pique* (an account of loss or misfortune endorsed by some official or priest).

Therefore the first strand of the French 'economy of makeshifts' comprised the variety of strategies employed by the migrant/vagrant. The second strand was the practice of localised begging, mostly conducted by groups of the deserving poor. Children were effectively apprenticed in begging and varieties of gleaning, experiences which ranged from pleading for windfall fruit in the countryside, or putrefying food from market stalls, through to collections of shellfish at the coast. The elderly begged for their lives in old age, while lone mothers begged to augment earnings insufficient for themselves and dependent children. Crucially, Hufton originally detailed these makeshifts separately from formal and informal relief, and from types of marginal criminality such as petty theft or prostitution. Her makeshifts can be characterised as akin to work and other economic activities, and different to

survival via external welfare assistance, subsistence crime or strictly legal self-help.

The concept of an 'economy of makeshifts' was quickly adopted by English welfare historians but came to mean something rather different from its original French definition. English makeshifts included geographical labour mobility but did not privilege it as a means of survival in the way that Hufton seemed to do, perhaps as a consequence of the English settlement laws and the absence of a *widespread* tradition of seasonal migration.⁵⁵ Similarly begging fell within its compass but was merely the most desperate of all possible makeshifts. In England the phrase has become a convenient shorthand to represent all of the ways which the mainly settled labouring poor made ends meet, the range of usually short-term strategies which might be brought into play when a family experienced unusual difficulty or was slipping into destitution. Making shift in the English context has therefore evolved into a perception of use of numerous, often local, resources by the poor over time to ensure the survival of individuals and families.

Refinements to this concept of 'makeshifts' have emerged in recent years, to tailor the original continental label to the English context and to clarify the terminology.⁵⁶ Perhaps the most subtle of these has been Joanna Innes's 'mixed economy of welfare' which shifts the focus somewhat from the proactive element or 'aggressive independence'⁵⁷ implicit in French makeshifts towards the English picture of multiple, overlapping authorities providing a plethora of benefits to differently-defined groups of the needy. Other alternatives have been suggested, but focus on the process of making a living amongst the labouring poor most widely defined. Thus Deborah Valenze's phrase 'The economics of survival' is directed at identifying the role that women in particular had in generating and holding on to an economy of makeshifts between 1700 and 1850. Robert Malcolmson's review of 'Ways of getting a living' was the first sophisticated attempt at relating the life-cycle to the economy of makeshifts for the labouring classes.⁵⁸ And Richard Wall's 'Adaptive family economy' focused on both the diversity of coping strategies available to the labouring poor and the way in which issues of life-cycle and household structure could limit or expand the options available.⁵⁹ Inevitably, periodic failure of all options must have bedeviled the survival strategies of the poor, the 'fasts ... which obviously operate as a dole in aid of wages'.⁶⁰

Uncovering an English economy of makeshifts: the issue of sources

Elegant revisions of the rough and ready theoretical and terminological basis of the concept of the economy of makeshifts have thus been made to take account of the peculiar circumstances of the English welfare scene. Yet what is clear from the historiography is that empirical identification, quantification and analysis of the integrated economy of makeshifts at local and regional level has not kept pace with refinements in the conceptual basis of the phrase. How did the poor and the poor law balance the different elements of the economy of makeshifts in response to different life-cycle stages or different causes and durations of poverty? What was the particular place of work and kinship in the economy of makeshifts? How important was working-class self-help in an economy of making do? What impact did the rapid transition of the English population from a rural to an urban industrial population have on the value and composition of the economy of makeshifts? What were the regional differences in the flavour and value of the economy of makeshifts? What was the impact of gender? Was the economy of makeshifts quite fragile and in need of constant remoulding or was it resilient in the face of changes in land tenure and work location? What was the total value of the economy of makeshifts at local level, and what sort of living could its exploitation yield? How was the constant tension between supply of welfare from a widely conceived economy of makeshifts and potentially wide demand, notably at times of trade cycle stress, reconciled? In particular, what impact did access criteria have on the usefulness of the economy of makeshifts? Did different elements of the economy of makeshifts have the capacity to respond to local need at radically different speeds? How did perceptions of the role of, and eligibility for, the economy of makeshifts differ between people caught in grinding whole-life poverty and those who only experienced the odd incident of need? How did individuals and the family as a unit interact in garnering resources from a local economy of makeshifts? Did middling people recognise the importance of an economy of makeshifts and go out of their way to create extra strands to this economy, as they did for instance in Italy? ⁶¹

In contrast to that on the continent, the English historiography provides only partial and limited answers to these important

questions for the central period (1700–1850) covered by this book.⁶² The limitations and complexities of the source base available to the English welfare historian goes some way to explaining this situation. Thus research on the economy of makeshifts is compelled to exploit a source base which is both voluminous and patchy, particularly if the future agenda wishes to move beyond the conjectural scope of makeshifts towards at least a partial quantification for different strands of that economy. The most significant sources for English welfare in terms of their survival quantity, the papers generated by parish poor relief, can be exploited for this purpose but they are both enticing and problematic. The documentary trail outside parish collections is more sparse, more difficult to unearth and highly variable in quality. This section will consider these two (admittedly artificial) categories in turn.

Volumes and papers depicting parish welfare can also contain fugitive evidence of alternative survival strategies by the poor who asked for, received or were denied relief. Such evidence is usually found in those documents created at the start of a relationship between the poor and their parish, or where the responsibility to relieve was subject to ongoing negotiation, such as settlement examinations, petitions for assistance,⁶³ or vestry minutes. The content of these genres is unreliable for two reasons, namely the precise nature of their content and the manner of their interpretation. First the survival of ostensible ‘vestry minutes’, for example, is no guarantee of a sure route into the criteria employed for welfare decision-making or to insights into applicants’ circumstances. All too often a repository catalogue will indicate the presence of minutes, only to conceal the paucity of their content. At their thinnest, vestry minutes will be confined to the revelation that meetings were held on specific days, appointed named officials, or took managerial decisions at parish rather than individual level such as the periodic determination to sweep all poor children into apprenticeships. Such material cannot be turned to any purpose in the historiography of makeshifts. It is relatively unusual to find minutes which account for the fine tuning of applications by the poor and vestry responses over a period of time (in other words, not just for the duration of one or two meetings), but these do exist. Minutes from the early nineteenth century for the vestry of Garstang, a small Lancashire town with a stringent attitude to relief, reveal the full potential of the source for makeshifts.⁶⁴ The minutes comprise a compilation of poor people’s circumstances,

in terms of their family and dependants, their employment record and their immediate perception of deprivation requiring intervention, and the vestry's rejection, acceptance or conditional terms with which the request was met. For example, in November 1815 John Pedder 'attended and wanted some relief. He admits being in constant employ at the castle and earning 6s a week plus meat. He has only a wife and 3 children. His rent is paid by the town. Resolved that he is to have no further relief.' Minutes like these can be utilised to illuminate the interplay between parish relief and other props such as earnings (or perceptions of earning potential), kinship support, pawning, friendly society membership and the use of apprenticeship to lighten the family burden from adolescent consumption. Regrettably, like pauper letters before 1800, their survival is rare.

Second, any source which is essentially a veiled or direct request for money or other help is suspect, raising interpretative problems, because the applicant had a direct material interest in its success. Therefore the originator of the request may be supplying a cool, impartial account or be responsible for some manipulation in presenting their case, ranging from mild exaggeration and emotive language to outright lies (of assertion or omission). This is a suspicion which hangs over all formal and informal petitions, and research relying heavily on, say, pauper letters requires considerable caution and dexterity if historians want to attempt anything other than an analysis of the language of request. Taylor, Sokoll and Andrew have argued for some reliance on the surveillance powers of contemporaries to ensure that gross misrepresentation did not occur in begging letters.⁶⁵ It was certainly the case that parishes might conduct checks, either by their own officers or via a third party, to verify the basic premise of a petition, but these checks were ad hoc rather than a compulsory element of the relieving process. All styles of petition 'had to be credible to be effective',⁶⁶ but a depiction might be theoretically credible without being applicable to the case where it was employed. It is not clear that there is any satisfactory answer to this dilemma, but a measure of verification might rely on proof that a case was endorsed or investigated at the time, assumptions about proximity to the relevant welfare agency giving rise to fear of detection (or distance, potentially enabling a less accurate account), and external evidence such as parish registers (for checks on measurable matters, for example, did the family comprise the number of children cited

by an applicant?). Even setting aside the degree of veracity of any one request, genres of petition contain insistent refrains which strongly suggest that there was an unofficial format being followed by writers/composers derived from the character of their need/request and that there were tacit limits on the material included. Petitions for clemency from convicted criminals, for example, unsurprisingly and routinely asserted a previously good character. They also maintained a demure, subordinate tone and were seemingly less volatile in their mode of expression than pauper letters.⁶⁷ Therefore it is unclear how reticent historians should be in utilising these attractive if slippery sources. Peter Mandler has argued that charitable reluctance to relieve the able-bodied meant that 'some emergency or mitigating circumstance had to be manufactured' by applicants, whose stories were consequently 'theatrical'.⁶⁸ Natalie Davis found that letters of request contain much material suited to tangential studies (in this case, such as kinship support, employment, or crime as a choice for economic survival) without the need for undue hesitation arising from worries about 'literary construction'.⁶⁹ Finally, uncertainties about authorship raise questions about whose account is being given. Is the written version an attempt by a barely literate person to write a convincing request or a fluent and persuasive piece of propaganda written by a well-educated and skilful manipulator? Is it a dictated account from an illiterate petitioner written down by a friend or neighbour, or the creative composition of a third party? It will not always be important to know for sure which of these origins applied in any one case, but such ambiguities make it necessary to proceed with a measure of caution and qualification when dealing with requests of any kind. Such lessons also apply to other sorts of English sources.

The extant sources outside of parish collections have survived and been catalogued erratically. This phenomenon is clearly the result of a wide variety of people and officials being responsible for document collections and changing decisions over time. What mixture of impulses prompts one family or business to retain every scrap of paper despite pressures on space and doubts about utility, and another to burn them, or give in to external injunction, for instance submitting them to wartime paper reclamation projects? It is probably attributable at least in part to an emphasis (an assumed interest by source retainers and preservers prior to professional archival interest) on the supply side of welfare or

material benefits. In the case of formal charity, for example, it is possible to infer from repeated patterns of document retention and omission that there has been an assumption of enduring interest in the legal right of a charity to its income (via ownership of land or investments) and much less concern with the nature of demand (who applied for disbursements); 'charity was a business of giving but not receiving'.⁷⁰ Similarly, gauges of earnings by the poor are reliant on business records beyond deeds of ownership and accounts of operation, requiring those meticulous daily records of employment most likely to have been discarded after their immediate obvious use had expired. This sort of bias is also detectable in sources relating to most, if not all, other formal organisations with a role in the economy of makeshifts. Pawnbroking is perhaps an extreme example of a survival strategy for which very little detailed evidence survives. The pledgebook used in this volume by Alannah Tomkins is one of the only known examples of this type of source for England, revealing the internal workings of a pawnbroking business, relevant before 1800. Alternative external avenues for approaching the topic survive in the forms of references to pawning in the records of criminal prosecutions (either in court papers or in newspaper reports of crimes committed or trials prosecuted), in redemptions by third parties (usually overseers of the poor) and the existence of formal pawnshops may be traced in early directories. However, the full potential of these possibilities has yet to be explored, and the feasibility of such exploration is only now improving via electronic cataloguing of source content.⁷¹ But it is also true that none of them affords comparable material on the day-to-day usage of pawnshops as a component in the economy of makeshifts.

Furthermore, multiple strands of this economy were composed of resources which were never supposed to be backed up by any records at all. Kinship and neighbourly support is probably the most obvious example here, where help must be inferred from demographic potential (families having co-resident kin, or with kin living in the same or nearby communities) or from direct, although often coincidental confirmation within letters, diaries, wills or accounts. Wherever proof of minute detail is found, it is inevitably partial and discontinuous; one family member might record their gifts to poorer kin for a matter of months or years without revealing the practice of the whole family or their own impulses outside the chronology of the surviving record. It is for

these reasons that Sam Barrett in his contribution to this volume uses nominal record linkage to try and infer the character of family and kinship support in the economy of makeshifts from large-scale demographic and poor law data.

These considerations of source quantity and quality have inhibited a fuller exploration of the English economy of makeshifts. But there are routes forward which will permit a more subtle weighing of makeshifts at the level of household, community and region, particularly in relation to the better-documented strands of that economy. Leigh Shaw-Taylor has recently demonstrated the value of revisiting apparently well-known sources, published comments on agriculture in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, to argue that most labourers did not have common rights and therefore could not have been proletarianised by the loss of rights at the time of parliamentary enclosure.⁷² Lyn MacKay has used Old Bailey Sessions Papers to show the potential connections between petty theft and pawning as extensions of neighbourly borrowing and exchange which went wrong.⁷³ Energetic pursuit of unused sources, and particularly creative use of familiar sources, will contribute to a better appreciation of the English economy of makeshifts in the future.

Uncovering an English economy of makeshifts: the lessons of the historiography

For now though, we must focus on the current lessons of the English historiography. As a starting point, it is important to recognise that our most comprehensive perspective on the day-to-day operation of the economy of makeshifts comes from cultural and oral historians focusing on urban Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Carl Chinn, Elizabeth Roberts and Ellen Ross, for instance, have variously emphasised neighbourhood networks, pawning, petty work opportunities, kinship networks and imaginative engagement with the poor law as central coping strategies for the urban poor in a series of challenging methodological and empirical books and articles.⁷⁴ In similar vein, urban historians of seventeenth-century England have emphasised the importance of neighbourhood, kinship and work as coping strategies both for recent migrants and native town dwellers.⁷⁵

The eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries have generated

a more disparate direct literature on the economy of makeshifts. Thus welfare historians have often drawn an implicit (and sometimes explicit) contrast between the potential dimensions of the economy of makeshifts in the rural south and that in the west, midlands and north. The early poor law historians who dealt with the emergence of an allowance system and associated institutionalised coping strategies such as the roundsman system in the rural south, east and midlands were in effect pointing to an economy of makeshifts that had been denuded of key foundations by the later eighteenth century.⁷⁶ Keith Snell in 1985 put more flesh on these bones and made the comparison more explicit.⁷⁷ He traced the decline of the potential of the economy of makeshifts in the eighteenth-century south, noting the disintegration of its central components. Enclosure (and the associated termination of customary rights on the fields and in the forests), the decline of dynamic proto-industrial structures, the lethargic growth of southern towns, changes in work practices that prevented men and women being a foil to each other in earning terms and changes in the scale of charity, combined to generate fragile household economies at the very bottom of the social scale. Detailed analysis of household budgets subsequent to 1985 has apparently confirmed the justice of Snell's analysis.⁷⁸ Faced with the breakdown of the family economy in the rural south and midlands, as well as inexorable population increase, the poor law intervened in a major way to guarantee welfare. It became 'the' core plank on the welfare scaffold.

By contrast, work on the economy of makeshifts in the north and west by Richard Smith and others has emphasised its continued vibrancy.⁷⁹ Here, very considerable areas of waste and common remained, rural industry was much longer lived, towns were more dynamic, northern families (according to Eden⁸⁰) were less demanding about diets, clothing and housing than their southern counterparts, and traditional perquisites, even in very advanced agricultural areas such as the East Riding,⁸¹ were more widely and firmly entrenched. Of course, the starkness of this contrast must be tempered. An allowance system or some variant of family support was common even in the north and west, where the economy of makeshifts was nominally stronger.⁸² The period covered by this volume also sees the transition from rural to urban makeshift economies at national level and it is hard to be sure that we are comparing like with like when attempting to reconstruct

the role of the economy of makeshifts in the north and south. And, as we are now well aware, intra-regional variation in the role and character of the poor law (and by implication the role and character of the economy of makeshifts) could be very considerable indeed. Nonetheless, a broad difference in the strength and composition of the economy of makeshifts between north and south has remained an enduring part of the literature and its most significant organising framework. It is important to remember, however, that this writing on the economy of makeshifts emerges not from specific attempts to look at the subject itself, but as a mechanism for understanding perceived spatial differences in the scale of poverty and the response of the poor law to that poverty in terms of the number of people recognised as poor and the generosity of its treatment.⁸³

Some local, rather than regional or comparative regional, studies have picked up rather more directly on the strongly held view of contemporary politicians and pamphleteers that there was a link to be fostered between collective welfare provision through the poor law and alternative ways of making ends meet such as work, charity and kinship at community level.⁸⁴ Roger Smith, in his study of Nottingham between 1800 and 1850, points to 'that modest area of poor relief that lay outside the orbit of the poor law guardians' and lists friendly societies, endowed charities and voluntary charities as the main coping strategies outside the poor law. By the 1830s and 1840s, some 16 per cent of the population in Nottingham were contributing to friendly societies, there was a co-operative shop with 64 members, almost 1,000 people were members of a Provident Medical Aid Society, endowed charities had invested assets of £37,000 plus land and houses, the hospital and dispensary were spending £4,000 per annum on health care and the Quaker Benevolent Society was distributing £1,000 per annum to the needy. In total the aggregate, calculable economy of makeshifts in the town in 1840 (i.e. that derived from charity and self-help) amounted to around £9,000 per annum, almost one half of the amount spent on poor law expenditure in that year. This comprehensive study mirrors the best studies of urban communities on the continent.⁸⁵ Jean Robin too has specifically addressed the economy of makeshifts in her study of Colyton, albeit at the very end of the period considered by this volume. She suggests that 'welfare' in the village had three (partly overlapping and partly discrete) strands – the poor law, the charitable

funds administered by the Feoffees and two Mutual Provident Societies – and that by the 1890s over 90 per cent of the cohort born in the 1850s had turned to either the poor law or charity, or both.⁸⁶ At the other end of our period, John Broad has emphasised the pressure that movements such as disafforestation could place on the local economy of makeshifts and shown how attempts to create alternative planks in that economy of makeshifts might backfire. His analysis implies that navigating a yearly living when on the margins of poverty was an acquired skill and one which required familiarity with the seasonal and life-cycle manipulation of different welfare avenues.⁸⁷

Most community studies, however, deal with aspects of the economy of makeshifts (and often the welfare process more widely) as a tangential issue. Keith Wrightson and David Levine, for instance, have traced the micro-impact of the development of the coal industry in the seventeenth-century north-east, noting for the village of Whickham⁸⁸ that industrialisation created a conflict between coal mine owners who wanted to exploit common and waste land through open cast mining and the building of tramways, and rural people or seasonally unemployed coal miners who depended upon such land for a significant part of their subsistence.⁸⁹ Similarly, Barry Reay uses a raft of linked nominal data for villages in nineteenth-century rural Kent to suggest that while kin did not offer support in the economy of makeshifts by varying their residential arrangements, they did live very close to each other, forming *de facto* extended families which could share resources, care obligations and negotiate more effectively with poor law authorities, employers and vendors of goods.⁹⁰ Pat Hudson and Steve King pick up on these sorts of themes in their study of industrialising communities in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century West Riding, stressing that kinship was a key factor in keeping people off poor relief but also highlighting the fact that proto-industrial communities had a unique capability to generate and regenerate earning opportunities for women and children even when movements such as technological redundancy spread across entire districts.⁹¹

Historians of rural and industrial popular protest have also displayed a tangential interest in the economy of makeshifts given that unrest was frequently a reflection of challenges to traditional perquisites, work patterns, the withdrawal of access to certain resources or the decline of traditional obligations and relationships

which had been engendered by the presence and management of makeshift resources. Thus Freeman contends that the taking of deer in Whichwood forest continued to be regarded as a right by the very poorest elements of the villages around the forest even when law and ownership transition brought a nominal ending of such rights.⁹² In the same vein, embezzlement, the ability to create time in the working week for alternative welfare opportunities, and regulated access to foodstuffs sold in the market-place (which was in effect part of the economy of makeshifts for urban workers) were vigorously defended when they came under pressure.⁹³ Family historians too have found it necessary to engage with strands of the economy of makeshifts. Will Coster's finding that bequests in wills came to be concentrated ever more strongly on the nuclear family during the eighteenth century has consequences for our appreciation of the economy of makeshifts, both because it implies a restriction of the amount of resources available through inheritance to poorer family members and because it is symbolic of the shrinking role of kinship in that economy of makeshifts.⁹⁴ Richard Wall's analysis begins to address the question of the practical value of the economy of makeshifts more systematically, though in the context of understanding the size and structure of the early modern family. He concludes that the work of women could add 30 per cent to the yearly household income and that receipt of poor relief could provide a further supplement of 9 per cent of the annual income of poor labouring families. If we add the 8–13 per cent that families might also gain from their gleaning activities, a point which is reviewed again below, we can begin to get a broadly quantitative view of the economy of makeshifts from family history research.⁹⁵

Historians of religious groups, such as the Methodists and Quakers, have also tackled the economy of makeshifts indirectly, noting that such groups usually provided informal charitable aid to those who shared their views and often, as we saw from the work of Smith on Nottingham, to the wider community as well. Rex Watson's analysis of Quaker charity in the Marsden area of north-east Lancashire in the first half of the nineteenth century is exemplary, demonstrating that from their own resources and local charitable collections the Quakers were able to distribute clothing, food, cash and other relief to considerable numbers of the marginal families who combined work with petty selling and other income generation strategies because they were not eligible

for poor relief in the harsh poor law regime of this county.⁹⁶ Finally, historians of gender have engaged particularly vigorously with the theoretical and practical idea of the economy of makeshifts. Valenze's gendered account of the Industrial Revolution, for instance, identifies poor women as ubiquitous. She suggests that such poor women were regarded as a pressing social and economic problem at the same time as some contemporary commentators were identifying their ability in bringing together and managing the different strands of the economy of makeshifts as the way to solve an endemic poverty problem in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England.⁹⁷ Penelope Lane deals more directly with one of the strands, offering a gendered view of what she calls the 'informal economy' of resource generation beyond the limits of the law. Using material from Leicestershire and Derbyshire, Lane suggests that because of their demo-economic position, because they did not always get the access to poor relief that their objective economic position might have warranted and because they were hit particularly hard by movements such as enclosure or rural industrial decline, women had a particular need to engage with earning opportunities in the borderland between work and crime. This borderland was complex, encompassing former customary rights such as embezzlement and gleaning or wood gathering and other activities such as stealing and/or selling stolen goods, defrauding the poor law and petty brewing beyond the law of licensing, and it was movable according to national legislative changes and the broad thrust of case law in petty and quarter sessions. Ultimately, however, engagement with the informal economy could provide all or most of family welfare, particularly at times of stress such as trade downturns or bad harvests which drove up food prices.⁹⁸

More work on all of these themes could be reviewed. The key point, however, is that there has been relatively *little work directly on the economy of makeshifts as a collection of coping strategies* in either a theoretical or analytical sense. The detailed balancing of the potential resources available to those enmeshed in the economy of makeshifts undertaken by Catharina Lis for Antwerp is missing. Even rarer are attempts in micro-studies to use nominal linkage techniques in order to trace individuals through different 'welfare' sources (charity accounts, crime records, pawnbrokers' account books, etc.) at different life-cycle points, the starting point for creating the typologies of individual and family strategies which

would really revolutionise the discussion of English welfare patterns and allow us to address some of the rhetorical questions with which we started this section. This neglect is frustrating in two senses. First, because, as Roger Smith shows in his study of Nottingham, it is possible both to identify the individual strands of the economy of makeshifts for any place or at any time, *and* to find the sources to say something useful about these individual strands. Second, because many of these individual strands have their own distinctive historiography which has rarely been linked to other aspects of the economy of makeshifts in either a theoretical or empirical sense.

The literatures dealing with kinship, crime and pawnbroking are reviewed elsewhere in this volume – by Sam Barrett, Heather Shore and Alannah Tomkins respectively – and we return to the literature on coping strategies such as demographic realignment in the conclusion. To move further, and provide an all-embracing overview of the multiple literatures touching somehow on the economy of makeshifts, would be an enormous task for which there is no space here. We hope, however, that we have shown how little work has been done on relating single coping strategies to the wider economy of makeshifts and to creating a generalised methodological or analytical framework of the sort that Hufton has suggested for France or Catharina Lis for the Netherlands. Collectively, our contributors make some headway on these issues, and it is to the lessons from their chapters that we now turn.

Cultures of poverty and making do – the contribution of this volume

The chapters in this book represent the single most significant attempt in print to supply the English ‘economy of makeshifts’ with a solid, empirical basis and to advance the concept of makeshifts from a rather woolly label (used all too often without thought for its meaning) to a more precise (if inclusive) delineation. The themes which emerge pertain to geographical regions and communities, both material and cultural considerations in the composition of makeshifts, the quantification of multiple strands of makeshifts and (less wholeheartedly) to life-cycles for the poor.

In chapters 2 and 3 Steve Hindle and Margaret Hanly deal with the general and particular ways in which ‘makeshifts’ might

be constructed. In the only chapter to deal explicitly with the rural agricultural poor, Hindle unpicks the interrelations between the benefits derived from access to (including technically illegal assertion of) common rights alongside parish poor relief and voluntary charity. By focusing attention on three parishes in Rockingham Forest (Northamptonshire) and looking at three successive attempts to achieve parliamentary enclosure, he reconstructs the shifting hierarchy of 'Fuel, dole and bread' (an explicit case study of Innes's 'mixed economy of welfare'). The centrality of common rights for survival is extrapolated from their vigorous defence by propertyless cottagers in 1607 and again in the 1720s. But the value of those rights was in decline (the commons risked exhaustion in the early eighteenth century) as was the ability of the cottagers to mount an effective protection campaign, such that cottagers's actions in the 1790s were 'futile'. Similarly the chapter looks at the delicate role of a local bread charity, hedged about with stringent and persistent access requirements, which sustained a welfare role so far but no further. The material value of the charity fell, prompting a decline in its symbolic significance. These long-term trends are set against the rising importance of the parish dole; expenditure increased sharply after enclosure signalling a waning of the independence conferred by access to commons and a rising, forcible dependence on relief. Hindle concludes that the gradually changing balance of these elements gave rise to a distinctive 'forest' economy of makeshifts which may have been precarious but could be predictable. In studying the sweep of income props which were technically available over a lengthy period, in the face of patchy manuscript survivals, the chapter provides a model of what might be accomplished elsewhere at the community level. Still it is not in the business of unpicking the minute experiences of individual households, such as the impact of a charity loaf on a household budget.

The family and household perspective is picked up by Margaret Hanly. Focusing on Lancashire, and using a combination of early nineteenth-century censuses of the poor and the record books of Quaker women who dispensed charity, she deals with people labelled as 'poor' by their communities. Her observation that many 'poor' people had little or nothing to do with the communal welfare system has resonance with many recent trends in welfare historiography. Working out from this observation, she is able to begin the process of tracing the intricate and (at household level)

diverse relationship between poor relief, kinship support, work and charity. She suggests that, in Lancashire at least, work was the mainstay of the family-based makeshift economy, even for those on poor relief. It was relatively rare for anyone labelled as 'poor' by their communities to be undertaking no paid work at all. Indeed, in the sense that the poor law itself was a big employer in most localities, relief was tied to work through the institution itself. Other avenues in the makeshift economy also loom large in the censuses of the poor, and Hanly is able to suggest that kinship and (more widely) social credit, were deemed by contemporaries to be important elements in their makeshift economies. Such observations link well with later contributors to the book. Moreover, Hanly also confirms the paltry allowances awarded through the poor law and implicitly contrasts them with the relatively generous schemes operated by individual and institutionalised charities such as the Quakers in Lancashire rural communities.

This theme – the place of formal, voluntary charity in the makeshift economy, particularly in the form of assistance conferred upon the poor by the prosperous – is developed further in chapter 4 by Sarah Lloyd, who begins to unravel the material and cultural implications of incorporating charity within survival strategies. She employs the records of the Welsh charity school in London (opened 1718) to exemplify both the benefits and meanings drawn from charity by recipients. An initial survey of the short- and long-term material gains accrued from charity schooling (primarily in the form of clothing worn by children or otherwise used by families, or as a route to an apprenticeship) is followed by a broader consideration of charity as a means of coping and the contextual rhetoric of charitably-disposed commentators. The chapter concludes that charity donors had little interest in any economy of makeshifts (even if they were essentially aware of its operation), being wholly concerned with the apparatus of giving (committee meetings, portraits of founders, celebratory feasts) and the creation of social distance (via patronage and deference). Nonetheless, it also argues that it is unhelpful and unsubtle to reduce the poor 'to a set of objects in search of objects'. Involvement in charity as a recipient inspired participation and belonging, which might be valued intrinsically and used to generate further opportunities and sources of protection.

Meanwhile, the deployment of crime as a means to get by, on

the part of the idle and disorderly, was a standard theme in eighteenth-century pamphlet literature (which established something of an artificial dichotomy between criminals and the 'honest' poor). In the second of our chapters touching on London and its environs, Heather Shore tackles the complicated relationship between poverty and social crime in the capital by looking at both contemporary published opinion and the evidence of the courts. Networks of criminal contact were demonised by contemporaries, but it is now plausible to emphasise the similarities between criminal networks and the more familiar (and less contentious) meshing of family, friends and neighbours into a physically and emotionally sustaining community. Even in London criminals were far from being anonymous loners or strangers; rather, they belonged. In such a setting the commission of crime, as either a response to a crisis or a long-term solution to discontinuous employment, was a rational, everyday and minor occurrence involving an unsurprising 'overlap' of poor/criminal populations. Yet it must be acknowledged that these were communities with a unique feature which could limit the lifespan of any grouping; informants regularly impeached their fellows, shutting down partnerships or gangs and forcing realignments of loyalty. Furthermore the chapter identifies the importance of life-cycle to induction into crime and its continuance. Contemporaries held up apprenticeship as a vulnerable time replete with temptations to dishonesty, but the records of crimes prosecuted give prominence to thefts by servants and prostitutes. As these labels suggest late adolescence and early adulthood were key periods for prosecution. The London evidence also indicates that women between 30 and 45 were prone to indictment for receiving, but were peculiarly difficult to convict as a direct result of their being embedded within a partially protective community. In this way Shore reworks familiar sources to stress the integrated nature of poor and criminal populations.

Little is known about the function of pawnbroking for the survival strategies of the urban poor, beyond the stereotypical complaints in print of the connection between pawnbrokers and criminal receiving and depictions of the role of pawnbroking for the later nineteenth-century poor. In the first of two chapters grappling with nominal linkage exercises, Alannah Tomkins uses the only known pawnbroker's pledgebook surviving for the eighteenth century to unravel patterns of use by pawnshop customers and their connections with the parish poor. A survey of

pamphlet literature touching on credit, debt and pawnbroking reveals that outspoken, damning criticisms of pawnbrokers were often repeated but rarely qualified by any consideration of the cash flow exigencies of poverty. The example of a pawnshop in York, run by a reputable urban citizen, demonstrates a broader usage of its credit facilities than was conceived in the literature. A significant minority of the city's population found their way to the shop over the eighteen-month period of the surviving pledge-book; many used it only once, while others slipped into a pattern of frequent or regular use. These usages suggest that the shop acted like a relatively respectable bank for the poor rather than a shameful recourse. Crucially there were only slender, discernible connections between the pawning poor and parish paupers; the pawnshop and the parish were used successively rather than concurrently in a downward spiral of impoverishment.

Sam Barrett uses similar techniques to examine the theoretical and actual place of kinship support in the survival strategies of the poor. The historiography of kinship in the context of welfare has tended to circle around the measurable presence of kin, particularly co-resident kin, and to handle more cautiously the topic of effective kin (latterly including fictive kin) as welfare agents. Barrett surveys the contradictions in the existing literature before embarking on an assessment of the functionality of kin in six townships in the West Riding of Yorkshire 1700–1820. Family reconstitution data is linked to poor relief payments to show an unmistakable inverse relationship between presence of kin in a community and the receipt of poor relief, but it also exposes some of the subtleties in the family/parish support nexus. In these townships selected individuals with a high density of kin in the *neighbourhood* (which in this study was not mechanically defined as the township but included adjacent administrative blocks) took poor relief as a short-term aid, between the onset of a crisis and the emergence of effective support from families. Furthermore the presence or absence of lateral male kin had a substantial impact on neediness; people who lacked brothers, and uncles on the father's side of a family, were disproportionately likely to need relief for a protracted period. In an attempt to gauge the connectedness of people who were poor but did not apply to their parish, a cross-reference of those receiving relief with the recipients of formal charity shows that charities favoured applicants with good kinship connections. This finding points up the potential

importance of the extent of kinship links for supplying or easing access to other sources of support. Still, the levels of kin-connectedness in Yorkshire contrast sharply with those found in Essex and Surrey, suggesting that these findings are regionally viable but that it would be unwise to extrapolate them automatically to geographical communities beyond the West Riding.

In his contribution to this volume, Steve King pulls the discernible threads of the economy of makeshifts together to present the aggregate welfare picture in the rural industrial north-west. An analysis of the scope and sufficiency of poor-relief payments in the locale finds the parish provision lacking in most respects. The evidence from vestry minutes points to a sizeable population who asserted claims to relief but were not awarded any, and shows that successful applicants faced chronically inadequate poor-relief payments and relief dispensed in an unexpected or unpalatable form. The chapter isolates the strands of the makeshift economy most pertinent to survival in the region and weighs their changing significance over the period 1750 to 1834. Two strands in particular, charity and work (in the latter case managed in conjunction with relief to yield a predictable income), generated monetary benefits which rivalled or outstripped parish payments alone. Finally a micro-study of the Lancashire township of Cowpe illustrates both the quantity and complexity of the makeshift economy. The 'poor' individuals revealed in payments from the parish and from both formal and informal charity funds are linked up to the employees collecting wages from mill work or 'putting out' work, and to the people carrying end of year debts at the local mill shop. Clearly this sort of nominal linkage exercise is unusual and ambitious. It has entailed making a number of assumptions about additional payments, such as the informal charity practised by local mill-owners who did not keep meticulous personal accounts, but the survival of a couple of excellent sources pertaining to Cowpe obviate the need for over-stretched extrapolation. The result is the only research thus far to demonstrate conclusively the relative significance of each makeshift and the concomitant minority role played by poor relief.

The overall contribution of these chapters is the furtherance of concepts crucial to the appreciation of makeshifts. Regional differences stand out strongly as a central mediator in the hierarchy of makeshifts, both in the extent to which welfare needs were mopped up by poor law solutions and in the range of available

alternatives. In the latter case, these might be defined very obviously by geography (such as proximity to a resource like Rockingham Forest) or in less immediately visible ways (such as kinship and work cultures). Clearly any attempt to quantify the resources available through the different strands of the makeshift economy at community level, possibly through econometrics, will depend on the survival of numerous extraordinary sources; all too often the survival of one is rare enough. Still, the chapters here show conclusively, we hope, that it is possible to identify key players in the assembly of makeshifts and to anticipate the impact of urban-rural/rural-industrial shifts on the balance and access conditions of the economy of makeshifts. These contributions work either at the level of resources technically available for the community according to contemporary accounts or actually garnered by individuals via nominal linkage; future work may hope to discover whether it is possible to engage with the knottier problem of the individual-family dichotomy.

Notes

- 1 O. H. Hufton, *The Poor of Eighteenth-Century France 1750–1789* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1974).
- 2 S. and B. Webb, *English Local Government volume 7: English Poor Law History part 1: The Old Poor Law* (London, Green, 1927).
- 3 D. Marshall, *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century* (London, Methuen, 1926).
- 4 For an early, substantial example of this genre see E. M. Hampson, *The Treatment of Poverty in Cambridgeshire 1597–1834* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1934); there are numerous examples of local history articles taking a similar theme and stance.
- 5 In this way the early writers bought in to Malthus's interpretation of early nineteenth-century population growth and, by implication, his advocacy of sexual restraint: T. R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (London, 1803).
- 6 J. L. and B. Hammond, *The Village Labourer* (London, Longman, 1978), p. 110.
- 7 J. L. and B. Hammond, *The Town Labourer* (London, Longman, 1978).
- 8 W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England 1480–1660* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1959); W. G. Bittle and R. T. Lane, 'Inflation and philanthropy in England: a re-assessment of W. K. Jordan's data', *Economic History Review*, 29 (1976).

- 9 B. Rodgers, *Cloak of Charity: Studies in Eighteenth-Century Philanthropy* (London, Methuen, 1949).
- 10 D. Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660–1960* (Cambridge, Yale University Press, 1964).
- 11 Examples which range from tangential studies to those deeply implicated in marginal survival strategies include J. Styles, 'Clothing the North: the supply of non-elite clothing in the eighteenth-century north of England', *Textile History*, 25 (1994); T. Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London* (London, Longman, 1999); L. Shaw-Taylor, 'Labourers, cows, common rights and parliamentary enclosure: the evidence of contemporary comment, c. 1760–1810', *Past and Present*, 171 (2001).
- 12 G. Boyer, *An Economic History of the English Poor Law, 1750–1850* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990), particularly ch. 5, which maintains that income supplements did indeed have a role in the rising birth rate.
- 13 K. Williams, *From Pauperism to Poverty* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981) see ch. 1 and especially p. 39; of course comprehensive, state-funded welfare, and other sweeping, structural measures such as a minimum wage, had been debated and been the subject of failed legislation before the 1940s, but without the critical momentum of political and popular support.
- 14 G. A. Oxley, *Poor Relief in England and Wales 1601–1834* (Newton Abbot, David and Charles, 1974).
- 15 K. D. M. Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England 1660–1900* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- 16 P. Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, Longman, 1988).
- 17 P. Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1999).
- 18 P. Solar, 'Poor relief and English economic development before the Industrial Revolution', *Economic History Review*, 48 (1995).
- 19 T. Wales, 'Poverty, poor relief and life-cycle: some evidence from seventeenth century Norfolk', in R. M. Smith (ed.), *Land, Kinship and Life Cycle* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 356.
- 20 A. Tomkins, 'The experience of urban poverty – a comparison of Oxford and Shrewsbury 1740 to 1770' (unpublished DPhil, Oxford University, 1994); ch. 4 suggests that 'medical' relief, broadly defined, was not typically distributed to dependent parish paupers.
- 21 B. Stapleton, 'Inherited poverty and life-cycle poverty: Odiham, Hampshire', *Social History*, 18 (1993).
- 22 M. McIntosh, 'Networks of care in Elizabethan English towns: the example of Hadleigh, Suffolk', in P. Horden and R. M. Smith (eds), *The Locus of Care: Families, Communities, Institutions and the Provision of Welfare Since Antiquity* (London, Routledge, 1998).

- 23 P. Sharpe, 'Poor children as apprentices in Colyton 1798–1830', *Continuity and Change*, 6 (1991); *idem*, 'Survival strategies and stories: poor widows and widowers in early industrial England', in S. Cavallo and L. Warner (eds), *Widowhood in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (London, Longman, 1999).
- 24 R. M. Smith, 'Ageing and well being in early modern England: pension trends and gender preferences under the English old poor law 1650–1800', in P. Johnson and P. Thane (eds), *Old Age from Antiquity to Post-Modernity* (London, Routledge, 1998); Cavallo and Warner, *Widowhood*; L. Botelho and P. Thane (eds), *Women and Ageing in British Society Since 1500* (Harlow, Longman, 2001); P. Thane, *Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000).
- 25 Thane, *Old Age*, pp. 153–5.
- 26 S. Ottaway and S. Williams, 'Reconstructing the life-cycle experience of poverty in the time of the old poor law', *Archives*, 23 (1998).
- 27 S. Snell, *Annals*, particularly ch. 1.
- 28 P. Sharpe, 'The bowels of compation: a labouring family and the law c. 1790–1834', in T. Hitchcock, P. King and P. Sharpe (eds), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor 1640–1840* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1997).
- 29 T. Sokoll, 'Old age in poverty: the record of Essex pauper letters 1780–1834', in Hitchcock, King and Sharpe, *Chronicling Poverty*.
- 30 J. S. Taylor, 'Voices in the crowd: the Kirby Lonsdale township letters, 1809–36', in Hitchcock, King and Sharpe, *Chronicling Poverty*, pp. 111–12.
- 31 Taylor, 'Voices', p. 114, for example, holds that writers may have coloured their stories but did not deviate too far from their own perception of their circumstances because they were subject to scrutiny by their overseer or the overseer of their adopted township or parish. Also D. Valenze, *The First Industrial Woman* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 22, who suggests that the evidence of settlement exams supports the idea that women might lack knowledge about the settlement, without acknowledging that women might have concealed their knowledge in order to manipulate their legal settlement. For a more sophisticated analysis of pauper letters see T. Sokoll, *Essex Pauper Letters, 1731–1837* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001).
- 32 A. Tomkins, 'Poverty, kinship support and the case of Ellen Parker, 1818–1827', in S. King and R. M. Smith (eds), *The British Experience of Welfare* (forthcoming). See also T. Sokoll, 'Negotiating a living: Essex pauper letters from London, 1800–1834', in L. Fontaine and J. Schlumbohm (eds), *Household Strategies for Survival 1600–2000: Fission, Faction and Cooperation* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- 33 L. Hollen-Lees, *The Solidarities of Strangers: The English Poor Laws*

- and the People, 1700–1948 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- 34 E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (London, Penguin, 1993); D. Eastwood, 'History, politics and reputation: E. P. Thompson reconsidered', *History*, 85 (2000), p. 650.
- 35 Eastwood, 'History', p. 652.
- 36 N. Landau, 'The regulation of immigration, economic structures and definitions of the poor in eighteenth century England', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990).
- 37 Hollen-Lees, *Solidarities*.
- 38 R. M. Smith, 'Charity, self-interest and welfare: reflections from demographic and family history', in M. Daunt (ed.), *Charity, Self-Interest and Welfare in the English Past* (London, UCL Press, 1996), p. 38, which both endorses and puts a different perspective on earlier work, such as D. Thompson, "I am not my father's keeper": families and the elderly in nineteenth-century England', *Law and History Review*, 2 (1984).
- 39 Valenze, *The First*, p. 182; Smith, 'Charity, self-interest', p. 39, finds the value of parish pensions stagnating and declining in real terms after 1750.
- 40 J. Innes, 'The "mixed economy of welfare" in early modern England: assessments of the options from Hale to Malthus', in Daunt, *Charity*.
- 41 See amongst other work S. King, *Poverty and Welfare in England 1700–1850. A Regional Perspective* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2000), particularly ch. 7.
- 42 F. K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1980); D. Andrew, *Philanthropy and Police: Charity in Eighteenth-Century London* (Oxford, Princeton University Press, 1989).
- 43 See for instance M. Gorsky, *Patterns of Philanthropy: Charity and Society in Nineteenth-Century Bristol* (Woodbridge, Boydell, 1999).
- 44 J. Broad, 'Parish economies of welfare, 1650–1834', *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999).
- 45 *Ibid.*, pp. 1002–3.
- 46 Williams, *From Pauperism*, p. 39.
- 47 O. Hufton, *Bayeux in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Social Study* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 90–1.
- 48 R. Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 114.
- 49 Hufton, *The Poor*; the delineation of these categories was not innovative in itself, but drew on much older work by, among others, Le Roy Ladurie.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 70.
- 51 *Ibid.*, p. 71.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p. 127.

- 53 *Ibid.*, p. 76.
- 54 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
- 55 Clearly there was regional movement in search of work associated with particular localities, such as between Kent and London for example, but there was nothing within the confines of England on the scale of the French experience.
- 56 Refinements have also been offered in the continental literature. Most recently, Fontaine and Schlumbohm have employed the phrase 'Household Survival Strategies' in order to recognise implicitly that 'getting by' was a function of the deployment of household labour/effort on the supply side and household negotiation on the demand side, with both processes played out against the backdrop of the constraints of society, economy and culture. See L. Fontaine and J. Schlumbohm, 'Household strategies for survival: an introduction', in *idem*, *Household Strategies*.
- 57 Hufton, *The Poor*, p. 367.
- 58 Valenze, *The First*; R. W. Malcolmson, 'Ways of getting a living in eighteenth century England', in R. E. Pahl (ed.), *On Work* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988).
- 59 R. Wall, 'Work, welfare and the family: an illustration of the adaptive family economy', in L. Bonfield, R. Smith and K. Wrightson (eds), *The World We Have Gained* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986).
- 60 I. Zangwill, *Children of the Ghetto: A Study of a Peculiar People* (London, J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd, 1909), p. 81.
- 61 S. Cavallo, 'Family obligations and inequalities in access to care in northern Italy, seventeenth to eighteenth centuries', in Horden and Smith, *The Locust*.
- 62 We have lagged substantially behind European scholars in the creation of a methodological and analytical framework. For three important early contributions to the European historiography see C. Fairchild, *Poverty and Charity in Aix-en-Provence, 1640–1789* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), who argued that institutional charity, begging and crime lay at the heart of any economy of makeshifts; S. Woolf, *The Poor in Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (London, Methuen, 1986), who demonstrates how work, begging, charity and variation of family structure could be fitted together to generate an overall coping strategy; most importantly, see C. Lis, *Social Change and the Labouring Poor, Antwerp 1770–1860* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 115–62, who tries to quantify and integrate the different strands of the economy of makeshifts in Antwerp, concluding that work, relief/charity, self-help, kinship and demographic expedients such as child abandonment were the key strategies for the urban poor whatever the explicit life-cycle stage. For the most recent attempts to conceptualise and quantify European makeshift economies, see contributions to Fontaine and Schlumbohm, *Household Strategies*.

- 63 In the seventeenth century, formal petitions were submitted to magistrates to change the decisions made by subordinate overseers or vestries; in the eighteenth century, approaches were more likely to be made in person or via informal letters: see Sokoll, *Essex Pauper Letters*.
- 64 Lancashire Record Office DDX 326/3, 'Garstang Vestry Minutes'. See also the chapter by Margaret Hanly in this volume. Vestries were not obliged by law to keep minutes until 1819: Eastwood, *Government*, p. 42.
- 65 Taylor, 'Voices', pp. 112–14; D. T. Andrew, 'To the charitable and humane: appeals for assistance in the eighteenth-century London press', in H. Cunningham and J. Innes (eds), *Charity, Philanthropy and Reform* (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1998), pp. 91–3; Sokoll, *Essex Pauper Letters*, pp. 67–70.
- 66 L. Van Voss, 'Introduction', *International Review of Social History*, 46 (2001), p. 9.
- 67 P. Carter, 'Early nineteenth century criminal petitions: an introduction for local historians', *The Local Historian*, 31 (2001), pp. 143–4; it was in the nature of all petitions to encompass some description of the author's everyday life, see Voss, 'Introduction', p. 9.
- 68 P. Mandler, 'Poverty and charity in the nineteenth-century metropolis: an introduction', in *idem* (ed.), *The Uses of Charity* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 15.
- 69 N. Z. Davis, *Fiction in the Archives* (Oxford and Cambridge, Polity, 1987), p. 3.
- 70 Mandler, 'Poverty', p. 1.
- 71 The Public Record Office's 'Access to Archives' project has catalogued the contents of various quarter sessions papers, giving easy access to multiple references to pawnbrokers and their involvement in court business; see www.a2a.pro.gov.uk.
- 72 L. Shaw-Taylor, 'Labourers, cows, common rights and parliamentary enclosure: the evidence of contemporary comment c. 1760–1810', *Past and Present*, 171 (2001).
- 73 L. MacKay, 'Why they stole: women in the Old Bailey, 1779–1789', *Journal of Social History*, 32 (1999).
- 74 C. Chinn, *Poverty Amidst Prosperity: The Urban Poor in England, 1834–1914* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1995); E. Roberts, 'Women's strategies, 1890–1940', in J. Lewis (ed.), *Labour and Love: Women's Experiences of Home and Family, 1850–1940* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986); E. Ross, 'Survival networks: women's neighbourhood sharing in London before World War I', *History Workshop Journal*, 15 (1983).
- 75 J. Boulton, *Neighbourhood and Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- 76 See, for instance, P. Dunkley, *The Crisis of the Old Poor Law in England 1795–1834: An Interpretive Essay* (New York, Garland, 1982).

- 77 Snell, *Annals*.
- 78 S. Horrell and J. Humphries, 'Old questions, new data and alternative perspectives: families' living standards in the Industrial Revolution', *Journal of Economic History*, 52 (1992).
- 79 Snell, *Annals*; Smith, 'Charity, self-interest and welfare'.
- 80 F. M. Eden, *The State of the Poor: A History of the Labouring Classes in England With Parochial Reports* (reprint, London, Augustus Kelley, 1963).
- 81 See S. Caunce, 'Twentieth-century farm servants: the horselads of the East Riding of Yorkshire', *Agricultural History Review*, 39 (1991).
- 82 J. S. Taylor, 'A different'.
- 83 This is true also of King, *Poverty and Welfare*.
- 84 For a review of this literature, see Innes, 'The "mixed economy of welfare"'.
- 85 R. Smith, 'Relief of urban poverty outside the poor law, 1800–1850: a study of Nottingham', *Midland History*, 4 (1974).
- 86 J. Robin, 'The relief of poverty in nineteenth century Colyton', *Rural History*, 1 (1990) and *idem*, *From Childhood to Middle Age: Cohort Analysis in Colyton 1851–1891* (Cambridge, Cambridge Group, n.d.).
- 87 J. Broad, 'The smallholder and cottager after disafforestation – a legacy of poverty', in J. Broad and R. Hoyle (eds), *Bernwood: The Life and Afterlife of a Forest* (Preston, University of Central Lancashire, 1997).
- 88 K. Wrightson and D. Levine, *The Making of an Industrial Society: Whickham 1560–1765* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991).
- 89 In line with the value of common land and common rights set down by Neeson or Humphries. See J. M. Neeson, *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700–1820* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996), and J. Humphries, 'Enclosure, common rights and women: the proletarianization of families in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries', *Journal of Economic History*, 50 (1990).
- 90 B. Reay, *Microhistories: Demography, Society and Culture in Rural England, 1800–1930* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- 91 P. Hudson and S. King, 'A sense of place: industrialising townships in eighteenth century Yorkshire', in R. Leboutte (ed.), *Proto-Industrialization: Recent Research and New Perspectives* (Geneva, Droz, 1996).
- 92 M. Freeman, 'Plebs or predators? Deer stealing in Whichwood forest, Oxfordshire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries', *Social History*, 21 (1996). See also the discussion of the enclosure of the Otmoor wetland in S. King and J. G. Timmins, *Making Sense of the Industrial Revolution* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2001).
- 93 There is a considerable literature on these issues. For two examples, see J. Rule, 'Against innovation? Custom and resistance in the workplace, 1700–1850', in T. Harris (ed.), *Popular Culture in England*

- 1500–1850 (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1995), and J. Bohstedt, *Riots and Community Politics in England and Wales, 1790–1810* (Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1983).
- 94 W. Coster, *Family and Kinship in England, 1450–1800* (Harlow, Longman, 2001).
- 95 R. Wall, 'Some implications of the earnings, income and expenditure patterns of married women in populations in the past', in J. Henderson and R. Wall (eds), *Poor Women and Children in the European Past* (London, Routledge, 1994).
- 96 R. Watson, 'Poverty in north east Lancashire in 1843: evidence from Quaker charity records', *Local Population Studies*, 55 (1995).
- 97 Valenze, *The First*.
- 98 P. Lane, 'Work on the margins: poor women and the informal economy of eighteenth and early nineteenth century Leicestershire', *Midland History*, 22 (1997).