



ESSEX

ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY

David J. Appleby

‘Unnecessary persons? Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex, 1642-1662’

Essex Archaeology and History, 32 (2001), pp. 209-221.

Published online: 16 November 2015

David J. Appleby

Department of History, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom

Copyright © Essex Society for Archaeology and History and the author 2001 and 2015. Reproduced with the Society's kind permission.

The Essex Society for Archaeology and History

The Essex Society for Archaeology and History was founded in 1852, and is the county's major society for those interested in any aspect of the past of this historic English county. For further information, please visit <https://www.essex.ac.uk/history/esah/>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Unnecessary persons?

Maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex, 1642-1662

by D. J. Appleby

Recent debate over the English (or latterly, British) Civil Wars has tended to concentrate on the causes and management of the conflict rather than on its aftermath.¹ Previous studies of the relief of maimed soldiers and war widows reflect this: Underdown analysed West Country petitions to inform his hypothesis of cultural allegiance, whilst similar material from Cheshire has been used to illustrate women's experience during the period.² Far more is known about what happened when the men marched away to war than what transpired when they limped back home. This article seeks to redress that imbalance, through the vehicle of war relief in Essex. During the wars and the military occupations of Scotland and Ireland, the county supplied large numbers of men to various parliamentary armies. The second civil war of 1648 witnessed fighting in Essex itself and, uniquely, substantial recruitment for the royalist cause. These vicissitudes produced a variety of candidates for relief, many of whom appeared as petitioners before the Bench of Quarter Sessions.

As far as is known, no petitions were written by the applicants themselves. Whilst illiteracy should not be equated with impotence there are risks in accepting at face value texts written on behalf of others.³ In the petitions analysed here, however, claims to truth were invoked by the petitioners themselves, whether that 'truth' was any less contrived than the 'will to power' exercised by their social superiors. Far from seeking to avoid scrutiny, maimed soldiers and war widows fought for attention, and repeatedly exploited the context of domination for their own ends.

In 1642, the main instruments of local political and social control remained the Justices of the Peace. Nevertheless, disorder plagued magistrates who forgot that they relied heavily on the acquiescence of the general population.⁴ The Parliamentary County Committee was set up in 1642 to co-ordinate the war effort in Essex, but tensions remained between local interests and the Eastern Association the committee was intended to serve. The creation of the New Model Army in 1645 exacerbated the situation; within months, Essex's tax burden amounted to £9350 per month, of which

only £770 funded local defence.⁵ The military success of the New Model, independent of local control and harbinger of dangerous extremists, caused anxiety among conservative parliamentarians, and in large measure revived royalist sympathies which led to the rising of 1648.

Many of the traditional county elite continued to function as Justices; a survival of traditional values which blunted the radicalism of each succeeding revolutionary regime and eased the transition to monarchical government in 1660. Despite their differences, the gentry's attitude toward social inferiors was habitually derisive, particularly the poor.⁶ This section of the community was seen as synonymous with increasing unemployment, crime and disorder, and military employment was often viewed as an ideal method for culling the pauper host.⁷ Relations with the middling sort were more complex.⁸ Whereas the poorer sort could only hope for the gentry to reciprocate their unwritten obligations, the yeomen and traders who paid taxes and underpinned the life and economy of the local communities were often able to insist.

By the summer of 1643, the escalation of the conflict demanded many more recruits, forcing the county committees to introduce conscription.⁹ Parish constables initially impressed the poor and unemployed, with bachelors preferred to married men.¹⁰ However, as demand grew, many families were left on parish charity as breadwinners were herded away.¹¹ With unrest growing, the Essex Trained Bands were mustered to prevent public disorder.¹² Eventually, there were claims that 'some hundreds have scarce so many men in them'.¹³ From the volunteers in 1642, to the last conscripts of the 1650s, perhaps as many as 12,000 Essex men took some part in the fighting.¹⁴ Eventually these included the Essex Trained Bands themselves. These part-time militia were normally used within their native county to curb civil disorder and deter foreign invasion, but Essex units were sent to the Midlands in 1643, fought on both sides in 1648 and took part in the Battle of Worcester in 1651.¹⁵ The authorities were usually sensitive in their employment, as the middling sort formed the majority of their numbers.¹⁶

Soldiers faced death not only from combat but from disease, malnutrition and exposure.¹⁷ Essex conscripts were certainly neglected: William Harlackenden, an Essex gentleman serving with the Eastern Association army complained that 'the poor soldiers long for [coats] and the time of year calls for them', whilst Nathaniel Rich reported that more men had been lost through exposure than combat.¹⁸ The total number of combat deaths during the civil wars has recently been estimated at over 84,000, with perhaps another 100,000 related civilian deaths in England alone.¹⁹ If so, the effects on local communities must have been immense. In March 1649, Commonwealth forces stood at 44,373, with several thousand already disbanded.²⁰ In 1659 Lord Fairfax presented a petition on behalf of 2,500 maimed soldiers and 4,000 widows.²¹ By this kind of ratio, Essex may have been called upon to cope with over one thousand maimed soldiers and widows. West Ham churchwardens supported two maimed veterans and three soldiers' wives, whilst Waltham parish records name two lamed veterans and several widows whose husbands had been killed in the conflict.²² If even these modest numbers were typical of Essex as a whole, the figure of 1,000 would appear a conservative estimate. The support of local communities upon which the regime in London depended must have been tested by such strain.

War relief for maimed soldiers was not a new concept. An Act of 1601 (43 Eliz. c.3) required a disabled serviceman's parish to sustain him.²³ On 24 October 1642, following the Battle of Edgehill, Parliament undertook to maintain the dependants of those disabled or slain in its service.²⁴ Morality combined with the expectation that such sentiments would encourage further sacrifice. It was soon obvious, however, that voluntary contributions alone would not honour this pledge. An Ordinance of March 1643 required parish officials to levy a discretionary rate on inhabitants and to distribute money to those in need.²⁵ Parish officials, already unpopular because of their part in collecting extra taxes and impressment, proved uncooperative.

In October 1643, Parliament imposed a rate of £4,000 per month on the counties under its control. High Constables were now to send revenue directly to Cordwainers' Hall in London, where appointed treasurers would distribute war relief. Relief was only given to those maimed soldiers and widows that were 'not able of themselves to subsist'.²⁶ The rate allowed by the Ordinance lapsed in August 1644, at which time the treasurers' stock was maintained by excise income and periodic sums of money voted by Parliament. Out of this, the treasurers ran two military hospitals in London and, by 1650, supported some 6,000 pensioners.²⁷ Individual parishes responded to the scheme by passing on their financial burdens,²⁸ whilst county authorities resented Parliament's interference in their

jurisdiction.²⁹ A Parliamentary review in 1647 blamed the failure of the scheme directly on the Justice of the Peace.³⁰

The New Model's petition of March 1647, demonstrated that war relief was crucial to the peace of the nation.³¹ Much as Parliament had denounced the New Model's petition, it recognised the soldiers' concerns for their maimed comrades and widows - and passed responsibility back to the much-criticised Justices. A new Ordinance for the relief of maimed soldiers, mariners, widows and orphans was passed in May 1647.³² Maimed soldiers and widows were required to obtain a valid certificate from the relevant regimental commanders and, returning to their parish of settlement, present it to two Justices. The Justices were then to order relief until the next Sessions at which a proper pension would be arranged. Magistrates had the discretion to withhold payment if they considered that any recipients were able to maintain themselves, although the Ordinance instructed that widows were to be allowed further occasional relief 'over and besides such relief as they shall gain by their work and labour'.³³ A further Act in 1651, covering casualties in Scotland and Ireland, tightened certification procedures still further, and instructed Assize Judges to monitor the performance of the Justices.³⁴

War relief had become a political football between Parliament and the localities, leaving claimants in constant peril of falling between the two. To date, 223 maimed soldiers and war widows have been identified in the various Essex sources; possibly one-fifth of the county's estimated casualties.³⁵ Some people survived on their own resources, or by the charity of their family or friends. When such support failed, individuals like Martha Emming (previously kept by her son), or Ann Fookes (subsidised by her Halstead neighbours) came to the notice of the authorities.³⁶ After so many policy changes, provision for maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex was confused, with some pensioners maintained by their parish, some by the county and others by the state.³⁷ Claimants had to calculate which of a bewildering range of official bodies offered the best chance of success. Applications for war relief became a significant portion of the business conducted at the Essex Quarter Sessions.³⁸ Outside the independent jurisdictions of Colchester,³⁹ Harwich, Maldon and Havering, two 'Treasurers for Maimed Soldiers and Charitable Uses' co-ordinated collection and distribution of war relief in the East and West Divisions of Essex.⁴⁰ The 1651 account of the Treasurer for the West Division,⁴¹ shows only twenty-five pensioners, most, if not all, veterans and war widows.⁴² The relatively generous pensions⁴³ enjoyed by these individuals, compared with the paltry awards then being handed

out at the Quarter Sessions,⁴⁴ suggests how far charity had declined during the three civil wars.

Casual payments to maimed soldiers returning to their homes reveal attitudes to war relief at the level of the parish. Waltham and West Ham, lying on main thoroughfares, gave money to a total of 103 maimed soldiers between 1642 and 1660. More distant Hornchurch entertained fourteen and Great Bromley, in north-east Essex, only seven during the same period. Waltham and West Ham were more generous than Bromley; awarding average gratuities of 4s.5d and 4s.9d respectively, compared with Bromley's average of 2s.8d. A survey of the four parishes shows that the flow of maimed soldiers peaked around 1645.⁴⁵ Average gratuities declined drastically in proportion to the frequency of passing soldiers, and churchwardens scrutinised certificates and passes more closely as time went on.⁴⁶ Parish officers appear to have retained a clear distinction between maimed and able-bodied soldiers. Misbehaving soldiers billeted in West Ham in 1648 engendered considerable grievance, but the parish continued to contribute to the county stock for war relief and to make payments to their maimed soldiers and widows.⁴⁷ The distinction between the recipients of war relief and the indigent poor was less clear; churchwardens defined transactions involving maimed soldiers and war widows as 'Payments for Use of the Poor'.⁴⁸

Parliament had instructed communities to hold their war widows in special regard. In fact, many Essex parishes already subsidised wives whose husbands were away fighting, either voluntarily, or because the Essex Committee ordered it.⁴⁹ Women constituted 34 per cent of the petitioners to the Bench, but received 38 per cent of the pensions.⁵⁰ Although most widows had families to maintain, two-thirds of maimed soldiers also had families and childless women sometimes obtained higher awards than men.⁵¹ The prospect of favourable treatment may have encouraged one Colchester woman to petition for relief on behalf of her family, even though her husband had returned home.⁵²

Victory always awakened charitable impulses. After Parliament's victory at Worcester widows of parliamentary soldiers were voted compensation ranging from £200 for a captain's wife, to £20 for that of a common soldier.⁵³ The Worcester grants demonstrated a predictable scale of *wergeld*. It is noticeable, however, that only one parliamentary officer, Thomas Hightaune, appears in the Quarter Sessions bundles and only one, John Arnett, in the Essex Committee papers.⁵⁴ Both pleaded poverty, although Hightaune had also lost his legs. Given that many officers must have been killed or wounded, their absence from Commonwealth records was, as we will see, in stark contrast to royalist claimants after the Restoration.

Inadequate as the provision for maimed soldiers and war widows was, both local and national government appear to have demonstrated a greater degree of responsibility for the maimed and bereaved than for serving soldiers. There were some common motivations behind medical treatment and long-term financial care. A genuine sense of *noblesse oblige* could variously be interpreted as an acceptance of social reciprocity or simple moral guilt; General Deane demanded maintenance for his wounded by arguing that 'victory is purchased with the blood of those who were precious in the eyes of the Lord'.⁵⁵ The concern of the New Model soldiery for invalids and their families confirmed the belief of many in authority that war relief provision encouraged soldiers to fight. The question as to whether it encouraged the localities to continue to support the war is another matter. War relief in the communities helped to preserve order and confirmed 'neighbourliness', both of which influenced the treatment of soldiers' wives. Many parishes, however, would plead that charity was not to be measured in terms of private suffering, but with regard to the problems of the wider community. The extent to which maimed soldiers and war widows were aware of such issues, and formulated their personal strategy accordingly, is a question largely answered by the language and content of their petitions.

Petitioning in early modern England was an industry in which most communities boasted skilful exponents. Petitions were rarely, if ever, created by the petitioner alone. Sympathetic officials and fellow claimants circulated information, whilst local scribes such as ministers and schoolmasters gave help and advice.⁵⁶ If the individual's claim was adopted by the parish the petition became more a communal than a personal application. In 1646, Oliver Bonden's petition was written up and signed by his local minister and twenty-nine Springfield parishioners; Bonden attested to his community's previous generosity and their inability to contribute further. Richard Ellsing's petition, read at the same sessions and signed by twenty neighbours, declared that his allowance was under threat because 'the parish in regards of the smallness thereof and the many other poore thearin, besides the extra ordinary charges imposed upon them, is very unable to maintaine'.⁵⁷ Claimants were not always pawns. William Pileston's petition of Michaelmas 1647 attacked Marks Tey Overseers for withholding his maintenance, whilst another maimed soldier, John Morrell of Bocking, petitioned against a magistrate who had refused to renew his pension.⁵⁸

As knowledge of entitlement to war relief is believed to have been widespread, it is surprising that the total number of claimants identified in Essex remains a comparatively small proportion of the projected casualties. William Yorke of Coggeshall

declared that he had not previously known of any general relief to be had,⁵⁹ and it would be interesting to discover how many shared his ignorance. Social stigma may explain many missing claimants, despite evidence that war relief was considered a right.⁶⁰ It is possible to *believe* in one's right to income support, and yet still feel stigmatised by *claiming* it; stigma, by its nature, is often invisible. Most relief took place in the parish, where maimed soldiers and war widows were lumped together with the indigent poor. Martha Emming feared to 'come to the charge of the parish', while Ann Fookes relied on the help of her friends, rather than formal parish charity.⁶¹ Sarah Bott, George Clarke, Mary Bromfield and John Busbie struggled on for years without claiming.⁶² Hudson's analysis of Cheshire war widows has uncovered similar tales of subsistence, including those who sold their belongings to survive.⁶³ The culture of 'neighbourliness' meant that those who became a burden to their community risked being exiled to its margins. War relief was socially preferable to parish charity,⁶⁴ not least, one would assume, for the fact that it had less impact on the neighbourhood. Stern community values may also account for the low levels of fraud; English society did not lack for neighbourhood informers, whether competitors for a pension, or disgruntled taxpayers.⁶⁵

The overwhelming majority of war relief candidates identified in Essex records came from Hinckford and Lexden Hundreds. The fact that these two areas were then both the poorest and most populous in the county is significant:⁶⁶ if, as seems likely, they supplied the greatest number of recruits, the greatest burden of casualties therefore fell upon Essex' poorest parishes. Further research might explain why southern Essex seemed better able to support recipients within informal networks, and whether public charity carried greater stigma there as a consequence.

Apart from these interstices in statistical evidence, reservations remain as to whether a document transcribed by a social superior can be considered the 'authentic' voice of an illiterate petitioner. Caution is called for, although two tiny discrepancies in Martha Emming's petition of 1653 give encouragement:

*...it pleased god to take away the life of my said husband and soone after hime one of my sonnes in Ireland to the great grief and also to the hinderance of your poore petitioner she being very aged and past her labour..*⁶⁷

Clearly, the scribe taking dictation became so engrossed in Martha's story that he inadvertently lapsed into the first person. His slip provides evidence that these documents can display a brand of truth other than the values of the elite. Petitioners were capable of deciding how to sell

themselves, and on which stage they were to perform.

Some claimants calculated that their best route of appeal was to the Essex Committee. These included an impoverished officer as well as humbler folk such as an Earl's Colne woman whose son had been slain.⁶⁸ However, most Essex petitioners looked to the county's Quarter Sessions for relief. Here they competed not only with other petitioners, but routine administrative affairs. The busy Justices were obviously the primary targets of a petition, and their limited attention span an important consideration in its literary construction. However, there was a wider audience to be wooed: the public paid to view proceedings from the gallery,⁶⁹ whilst further afield the petitioner's community awaited the verdict. Justices, acutely aware of this public gaze, were therefore as much on show as the petitioners, and social prestige, political or religious beliefs and *noblesse oblige* all played their part.

Supplicants usually had to appear before the Bench in person for their petitions to be considered.⁷⁰ Those who could afford to attend could therefore create considerable visual impact, especially widows with their orphaned children.⁷¹ In addition, some were able to redress omissions in the written testimony. Although Margaret Walker of Coggeshall had not mentioned a family in her petition, two children were specified in the Order Book. This additional information, which undoubtedly affected the award, must have been given at her hearing.⁷² We cannot know which supplicants were tongue-tied and which eloquently persuasive. Widows seem often to have appeared in organised groups. The evidence of the Essex Order Book shows at least seven such groups, either consisting of a mixture of soldiers and widows, or women alone.⁷³ As natives of a predominantly oral culture, many may have proved engaging storytellers. 'Communal' petitioners, moreover, would have rehearsed their story before their neighbourhood supporters. The impact these heart-rending stories made on the Justices can be measured to a certain extent by comparing the details recorded in the Order Book against those emphasised in the petitions. In those cases where the fate of surviving petitions are recorded, such comparison can be used to indicate how successful a petitioner was in getting their message across.

Promoting oneself as a fit object for war relief called for a delicate balance of social deference and emotional blackmail. It was not injury, or loyalty, that brought recompense, but the economic hardship that resulted from it. Justices were not legally obliged to grant pensions;⁷⁴ furthermore, they could, and did, strip recipients of their awards if it was decided that they could maintain themselves.⁷⁵ Maimed soldiers and war widows were well advised to humour the prejudices of the Bench.

Deferential formulae, characterised by phrases such as "the Right Honourable and Worshipful His Majestie's Justices" and "humbly sheweth", may appear hollow to us, but would have been a catastrophic breach of etiquette if omitted. Some skills and experiences were better unused. After the army mutinies of 1647, nothing would have irritated a provincial Presbyterian Justice more than an assertive, articulate New Model veteran. As commissioned officers, Thomas Highaune and John Arnet, and the drummer Thomas Hewes, were probably literate, but still chose to have their petitions written by others.⁷⁶

The most effective petitions featured detailed information on the petitioner's circumstances - family, health, poverty and sobriety. Widows, as a group, appear to have been more accomplished than soldiers at presenting themselves as victims of war. In contrast to Natalie Davis' findings that 16th century Frenchwomen's testimony was 'shorter and flatter in emotion',⁷⁷ Essex war widows usually employed more demonstrative language than their male counterparts. The maimed soldiers, even amputees, tended to repress their emotions, presenting horrid experiences in a matter-of-fact manner, whereas women such as Sarah Bott usually painted a more vivid picture:

*...it pleased god that presently after the first great fight hee dyed Leaveing your peticoner wth five small children in a very sad and deplorable condicon destitute...*⁷⁸

Of the surviving petitions in the Quarter Sessions Bundles, 86 per cent of widows mentioned dependants, as opposed to 55 per cent of maimed soldiers; 43 per cent of the widows supplied specific details of their families, compared with 30 per cent of the men. The impact on the Bench is indicated by the entries made in the Order Book, which recorded detailed family information for eleven war widows (34%) as opposed to just three men (5%). Petitions which emphasised the family were effective: those granted pensions were almost three times as likely to have cited specific information about their children than those awarded gratuities. The Justices may have expected widows to have families rather than maimed soldiers. Geoffrey Hudson has pointed out that the printed certificates issued by the Treasurers at Cordwainers' Hall had space to record dependants in the widow's version, but not in the soldier's.⁷⁹ There are some practical reasons for this discrepancy; married soldiers were unlikely to have their families with them in London. However, it is noteworthy that although 55 per cent of the maimed soldiers' petitions mentioned their family, only 17 per cent of maimed soldiers in the Order Book were recorded as having dependants, as opposed to 41 per cent of widows.⁸⁰

Maimed soldiers often emphasised their 'victimisation' by presenting themselves as civilians

snared by war. The most common method of doing this was to mention one's peacetime occupation. Over half the male petitioners did this, to some effect.⁸¹ The fact that most maimed soldiers were careful to relate their military service to their civilian misfortune reflects their awareness that war relief legislation required evidence that wounds or bereavement had affected their ability to maintain themselves. Richard Glascock, for example, having lost one of his legs in 1645, declared himself thereby 'utterly disabled for the acquiring of his trade & living in that Course of life wherein hee hath formerly beene bred & brought upp'.⁸²

The timing of a petition could affect its chances of success. Most claimants, like Glascock, presented their petitions within two years of their injury. Those who took longer had to explain the delay. Martha Emming, petitioning nine years after her husband's death, mentioned her son's charity. William Yorke, appealing ten years after his wound, stated:

*...knowing not of any generall reliefe to be had, have by his industry made shift for a hard living hetherto, but nowe by reason age groweth upon him and his wounded partes of his body very paynfull, disabling him from worke.*⁸³

Yorke compensated the chronological weakness in his petition with an itinerary of his long and faithful service to Parliament. The high percentage of maimed soldiers who indicated the circumstances of their recruitment (75%) shows that they considered it an important element of their claim. As the Quarter Sessions orders rarely repeated the information, it appears that the Justices only occasionally agreed. The question as to whether soldiers and husbands had joined the fight as volunteers, conscripts, or seconded militia affected the petitioners' ability to profess fidelity to Parliament. Volunteers invariably proclaimed their 'good affection', no doubt in the belief that the Justices would be sympathetic.⁸⁴ Sometimes former volunteers attempted to invoke the empathy of their judges by repeating the political slogans of the 'well-affected'. However, as Cliftlands has shown, the definition of 'well-affected' changed, and petitioners had to be careful to take this into account.⁸⁵ Thus, Richard Glascock in 1647 declared 'he voluntarily took upp armes for the Servis of the King & Parliament', whereas by 1653 events persuaded John Busbie to state that he had 'advanced his life in the service of the Common wealth [against] the Common Enemie'.⁸⁶ That plebeians were aware of the political implications of such slogans is suggested by the examination of a turncoat, George Mason of Wivenhoe.⁸⁷ Only 25 per cent of conscripts and militia made similar professions of loyalty in their petitions, apparently preferring to revive the neutral image they had had when wounded.⁸⁸ There was occasionally some official sympathy for families

affected by impressment. In 1649, the Colchester Committee instructed churchwardens in the parish of St. Runwald's to support two wives of husbands impressed in the parish, and ordered relief for a maimed soldier impressed in Lexden.⁸⁹ Normally, however, neither the circumstances of recruitment, nor professions of loyalty, appear to have influenced the Bench's awards.

If most of the tactics for soliciting a pension were passive declarations of helplessness, there were more aggressive options. Widows appear to have been more willing to quote legal or moral precedent to the magistrates than their male counterparts. Margaret Beavis asked the Court to grant her a pension, 'according to the act of Parliament as to other Widows in the like case hath bin granted'.⁹⁰ This was not the only arena in which women often felt more able than men to confront authority.⁹¹ Lecturing magistrates on their legal and moral duty was risky, however; those quoting precedent tended to be less successful in obtaining pensions. A more successful 'offensive' strategy was importunity - returning with a fresh petition even when previously ordered to trouble the court no further. Essex, like every other county, had its share of repeat petitioners, driven by a stubborn belief in their right to receive compensation, or by desperation. William Gray of Braintree was perhaps the most determined and ingenious importuner of the Essex Bench, with at least three petitions in 1657 alone. Eventually the Bench, worn down by Gray's tenacity, or genuinely impressed by his inspired recourse to an independent medical examination, granted him a pension.⁹²

Endorsements, whether communal or solicited from an individual, were often a vital element of many petitions.⁹³ The requirement for claimants to produce a certificate from the regimental commander of the maimed or dead soldier does not appear to have been uniformly enforced, but most maimed soldiers and widows were able to give such details. Endorsements from military officers, even though they included Oliver Cromwell himself,⁹⁴ were far outweighed by demonstrations of community support. As has already been discussed, there was often a considerable element of self-interest involved, not least the prospect of passing on the financial burden. At other times, the undertaking was a genuine campaign for a respected neighbour. In the case of Sarah Bott the local minister, John Fuller, signed ahead of six parishioners and added a postscript that the inhabitants of the parish knew Sarah 'to bee Industrious in hir calling and living honerably'.⁹⁵ Such demonstrations of community support must surely have made an impression on the Justices. The surviving petitions indicate that 42 per cent of those receiving pensions had received communal endorsements, as opposed to 10 per cent of those

merely given gratuities. Widows were twice as likely to enjoy such support as maimed soldiers. It was the widow who could more readily demonstrate that she had made some effort to subsist by herself - precisely the moral contribution required of 'deserving' poor. Many of the maimed soldiers, however, did show concern for the burden shouldered by their community, such as the former weaver Richard Ellsing of Helions Bumpstead, who, on losing his leg in the war, 'hath been ever since very chargable to the said Parish'.⁹⁶ Thus, in addition to the poverty of the individual, the Justices were frequently called upon to consider the poverty (real or pretended) of their community. In areas where maimed soldiers and war widows appear to have been numerous, notably around Braintree, Bocking and Coggeshall, such hardship was real, and a strain on the 'good affections' of the area.

Petitioners, much though they could pressure the Justices into granting an award, had little opportunity to negotiate a price. Many petitioners had a clear idea of the amount they desired from the Bench, as Mary Burnham of Steeple Bumpstead revealed,

*For the Lords sake to grante a Continuance unto her, the said petitioner of ffoure pounds per annum for the reliefe of yor said petitioner & her poore children.*⁹⁷

In the event, she received an annual pension of £2.⁹⁸ Trooper Jeremiah Maye's phrase, requesting the Justices to award, what "your pyous wisdomes shall seeme meete", was a more typical gesture of deference; an admission of dependency.⁹⁹ The only redress for a claimant unhappy with their pension or gratuity was to resort to importunity and pester the Bench to increase their maintenance. Despite the success of William Gray and others, this approach carried the risk of losing the Court's goodwill. Daniel Wright, a limbless ex-dragoon with a pension of 40s was sent packing without an increase.¹⁰⁰ War widows, with an average pension of 44s 5d per annum, appear to have been treated almost as generously in Quarter Sessions Orders as maimed soldiers, who were awarded an average of 45s 5d. Excluding amputees, maimed soldiers usually fared worse than widows.¹⁰¹ The average widow's gratuity recorded in the Order Book was 40s 8d, compared to the maimed soldier's average award of 36s 7d. There were occasionally orders of apprenticeship for orphans of dead soldiers.¹⁰² These awards compare unfavourably with related grants to normal civilians such as the pension of £4 per annum awarded to a man plundered of his goods in 1648.¹⁰³ However, the most telling statistic lies in a comparison with the wage rates set by the Bench in 1660. These show that both sets of pensioners received, on average, less than the legal yearly rate for teenage wash maids.¹⁰⁴

The cultural skills and political awareness of the petitioners meant that they were not completely powerless. This knowledge informed their decisions on which aspects of their story to emphasise, and which to palliate. The lack of religious imagery in maimed soldiers' petitions is all the more noticeable when compared to its continued use by war widows, particularly when set against the often florid petitions submitted by civilian supplicants.¹⁰⁵ A faint echo of the social strata which we know existed in the military community remains to distinguish petitions from cavalrymen such as Jeremiah Maye from dragoons such as Daniel Wright or the conscripted infantry. Sarah Bott was careful to state that her dead husband 'did voluntarily at his own charge furnish himself with a horse and armes' for Parliament's service.¹⁰⁶ Essex petitions, however, betray no signs of 'lateral' consciousness or the radical idealism within the New Model Army. The sense of religious purpose, those tenets of armed *Israel* defiantly expressed by serving soldiers, are missing, replaced by a desire for survival and a fearful concern for their future in the local community. Maimed soldiers and war widows, increasingly viewed as parish poor, mostly endeavoured to conform, making the moral contributions required of 'deserving' poor in order to receive the support of their communities.

In the petitions, however, it can be seen that certain skills, 'weapons of the weak' in James Scott's phrase, were deployed with telling effect. Informal communications networks spread news of entitlement to war relief, helped by sympathetic social superiors as well as the close proximity of news outlets in the clothworking towns of north Essex. Illiterate petitioners were aware of flaws in their petitions, and consciously accentuated stronger elements to compensate. Not only were they able to cope with the requirements of written evidence, but the theatre of a Quarter Sessions enabled them to deploy practised visual and oral skills.

The advantages of moral support from the community, whether inspired by sympathy or self-interest, were appreciated by claimants, and eagerly solicited. The Justices should not be denied genuine feelings of pity for individual suffering, nor a sense of moral justice. In considering the wider problems of poverty induced by the conflict, however, the disproportionate success of 'communal' petitions indicate that it was the disruption of the local community, with its attendant threat to local order, which was uppermost in their minds.

In 1660, the new Essex Bench, once again styled "His Majesty's Justices of the Peace", included several survivors from the Protectorate. The continuity represented by such men contributed to precisely the social stability they most earnestly desired; a society led by the landed gentry, in which everyone knew their place.¹⁰⁷

The study of war relief in Essex during this crucial period is hampered by the fragmentary evidence of the Quarter Sessions archives. The old Order Book closed with the Sessions of October 1661. Its successor, together with most petitions for war relief submitted after the Restoration, has not survived. As these documents covered the years following an Act of 1662 designed to relieve ex-royalists, a comparison with war relief under the Commonwealth is thereby severely limited.¹⁰⁸ The survival of seventy-six relevant Quarter Sessions orders of 1660-1661 allow us at least to compare the treatment accorded standing parliamentary pensioners with that of the new royalist claimants. Twenty-four of these orders relate to former parliamentarians, fifty-two to royalists. There are, in addition, at least 41 Essex-based royalist officers featured on the *List of Indigent Officers*, published in 1663.¹⁰⁹

By the Restoration, unpleasant memories of the recent military regime coupled with a general desire to put 'the troubles' behind them, had engendered an intense public dislike for all things military. Maimed soldiers and war widows, whichever side they had fought for, appear to have had few friends. The fact that Lord Fairfax had presented a petition on behalf of 6,500 claimants as late as 1659 indicates that war relief was still a significant burden in many parts of the country.

In Essex the work of the Treasurers for Maimed Soldiers and Charitable Uses continued. West Ham churchwardens made their highest recorded payment to the High Constables, £1 2s 9d, in 1661. The parish's contribution had been subtly renamed 'Charitable Uses', a styling soon echoed by Waltham officials.¹¹⁰ Although the Divisional Treasurers apparently continued to be honour war pensions for the time being, many recipients must have realised that their income was threatened. Only two fresh claims were registered from former parliamentarians, both of which displayed considerable ingenuity.

At the Quarter Sessions of May 1660,¹¹¹ John Baxter was quite candid in his submission that he had lost one of his legs 'in the late Service of the Parliament'. Baxter, however, did not initially petition for money, requesting instead that his parish provide him with a loom and tools to work 'in the trade of a Weaver wherein he was brought up'. The combination of lost limb and willingness to work at no cost to the county stock obviously impressed the Bench, which duly granted the order.¹¹² Having established his 'deserving' credentials with the Justices, Baxter attempted to elicit money at the next Sessions.¹¹³ John Merrington of Halstead, recommended to the Bench for relief in January 1661, demonstrated a diplomatic grasp of political niceties; although he had clearly incurred his disabling wounds in

Commonwealth service, Merrington referred to his old commander, George Monck, by the General's new title of Duke of Albemarle. The Justices, perhaps appreciating the irony, awarded £4 13s. 4d. but warned Merrington, 'not to trouble this Court any more for a pension'.¹¹⁴

At the same Sessions, the Bench began to pay off parliamentary pensioners. The court ordered that four pensioners be given gratuities "in full Compensation of all Pensions for the future". Three were given 40s. and one, John Baxter, 20s.¹¹⁵ Surprisingly, two other maimed soldiers, Andrew Hall and Thomas Butcher, had their pensions confirmed.¹¹⁶ Another batch of pensions were terminated at the Michaelmas Sessions. Fourteen maimed soldiers and one widow, Mary Bromfield, were given an average of 24s each in lieu of further payments. The disappearance of the replacement Order Book allows only speculation as to whether further cessations were ordered. An order sent to the Midsummer Quarter Sessions in 1665 instructed the Justices to report persons disaffected to King Charles II, particularly 'such persons who have been in actual arms against his Majesty or his Majesty's father of blessed memory, and have not given Testimony of their sorrow of the same'.¹¹⁷ It is also possible that following the Act of 1662 an influx of royalist pensioners may have contributed to a further eviction of former parliamentarians.

Little is known about royalist activity amongst the middling and poorer sorts of Essex. A considerable number of Essex gentry joined the King in 1642-3, but few plebeians appear to have followed them. Ninety-four officers and men are known to have claimed some manner of war relief in Essex, compared with 1,142 royalist pensioners in Wiltshire and Dorset.¹¹⁸ However, this figure may actually be more representative of Essex royalists than the present total of known parliamentary claimants. The vast majority of royalist officers and men performed their service in Essex in 1648.¹¹⁹ When it surrendered at Colchester, Lord Norwich's army totalled 3,526 men, of which the Essex contingent was unlikely to have been much over 1,000.¹²⁰ Supposing the casualty rate of ten per cent earlier projected for parliamentarians (and given that many would have died in the decade before the Restoration), the figure of 94 known claimants may well represent most of those in genuine need. Colonel Farr's regiment of the Essex Trained Band was severely mauled fighting for the royalists on the first day of the Colchester siege. As many in its ranks must have left widows, their absence from the Quarter Sessions requires some explanation.¹²¹ It is also important to remember that there were degrees of indigence. Although, as Dr. Newman has indicated, we may assume that some of the officers "were properly destitute",¹²² their poverty, and even that of non-commissioned officers, may have been

measured against the expected living standards commensurate with their social status.

Between 1660 and 1662, indigent royalists had little alternative other than to apply to the Quarter Sessions for satisfaction. There had, of course, been little point in them petitioning before. Before the Cavalier Parliament's legislation of 1662, 'knowledge of entitlement' among royalist soldiers was a question of moral belief and expectation rather than legal fact. Communication between potential royalist claimants often appears to have been through their former military contacts rather than through normal communal channels.¹²³ Indeed, the kind of underground networks which operated among royalist gentry during the Protectorate may have existed further down the social scale.¹²⁴ Women tended to be excluded from such networks, which may explain why royalist war widows were significantly less prominent than their parliamentary counterparts. Such a practical explanation would be consistent with the observations of both Hudson and Underdown, that the royalist attitude to women was typically one which envisaged them in a 'natural' state of subordination.¹²⁵ In addition, indigent royalist widows would have been forced to survive on poor relief for at least twelve years before the Restoration, and children would either have died or grown up. The Justices would thus have had little pressing incentive to accept responsibility for their maintenance.¹²⁶

Following one or two early opportunists, royalist claimants appear to have petitioned en masse in 1661. Whereas the numbers of war relief claimants during the previous decade had never exceeded sixteen in one year, the Quarter Sessions of April 1661 alone dealt with a batch of 32 royalist petitioners, who were dealt with in bulk. Only cursory information was consequently entered into the Order Book.¹²⁷ There are perhaps several reasons why none of these petitioners were granted pensions. If many of them had attended in person, the effect on the Sessions House would have been chaotic, with little chance of any individual making an impact. Furthermore, if they were indeed organised (possibly by the officers in the group) and hoped by their number to pressurise the Bench into granting stipends, they were to be disappointed.

The next Quarter Sessions, July 1661, processed nineteen more royalist claimants, including three widows.¹²⁸ Most of the soldiers, or husbands, of this collection appear to have served in Major Stephen Smith's company, of the militia regiment which had followed Henry Farr over to the royalists in 1648. Rather than appearing en masse, these former militiamen and their relatives appear to have organised themselves through normal civilian networks, and certainly adopted traditional methods of presentation. The Bench was clearly alarmed at

the continued influx. John Eldred senior, Treasurer of the East Division, was ordered to transfer £50 into the keeping of three Justices, who,

... considering the merritts of each Petitioner, would be pleased to gratifie each Petitioner soe farr forth as the said fifty pounds will extend. And the respective Petitioners are to accept of what summe the aforesaid Justices or any one of them shall order as a farewell. And this Court doth declare not to accept of any Petitions of this nature for the future.¹²⁹

The Justices had not reduced their burden of parliamentary pensioners with the intention of supplanting them with royalists. The fact that petitions were submitted after the Bench's declaration not to receive any more, is almost certainly due to the passing of the 1662 Act. Virtually identical in its provisions to the Parliamentary Ordinance of 1647, it declared maimed soldiers and war widows to be the responsibility of their parish. Claimants were now required to demonstrate that they or their husbands had loyally served the King. Ever since his execution in 1649, royalist propoganda had promoted Charles I to the status of a saintly martyr, with Christ-like imagery that often bordered on the blasphemous. Service to the dead king was promoted as a sacred duty, while opponents were castigated as foul murderers.¹³⁰ The language of the Act allotting £60,000 to relieve indigent officers reflected this, requiring claimants never to have deserted King Charles II, or 'His Blessed Father's Service During the late times of Rebellion and Usurpation'.¹³¹ For the Justices, especially those who had been magistrates under the Protectorate, hearing fresh petitions became not simply a legal duty, but politically expedient. In the increasingly charged atmosphere around the Cavalier Parliament, accusations of 'disaffection' could prove lethal.

From the available evidence, royalist soldiers and widows appear to have used much the same tactics as their parliamentary predecessors, with deferential preambles, and closing 'prayers'. The number of petitions is too small to allow conclusive judgement as to whether royalist women as a group were more likely than men to present detailed information on their charges and circumstances. Some certainly did; the Order Book recorded that the death of her husband at Colchester had left Margaret Alsoppe of Chelmsford with 'six small Children to provide for'.¹³² The fact that at the time of her petition the youngest of Margaret's children by Richard Alsoppe would have been at least twelve years old betrays an element of rhetoric sometimes overlooked.¹³³ All post-1660 petitioners featured in the Quarter Sessions Bundles show an awareness of the efficacy of mentioning their 'charges', an indication that children were still an important lever of successful petitioning.¹³⁴ The presence of Mary Gill's petition as late as 1670 is proof that women's

petitions were not totally excluded from royalist war relief. The fact that she only received a gratuity of 20s. despite having four children and being 'her selfe very low in condition', however, lends credence to the view that war widows after the Restoration no longer enjoyed equal access to the county's charity.¹³⁵

The 1662 Act required magistrates to satisfy themselves that petitioners were destitute because of their service. The effect of these discretionary powers could lead to considerable differences between neighbouring counties such as Wiltshire and Dorset, depending on the Justices' interpretation.¹³⁶ As the events leading to the claim had taken place over a decade before, it was somewhat difficult for petitioners to claim that they had been unable to maintain themselves. The petition of Robert Browne, Thomas Sharpe and John Sweeteing stated ambiguously, that their service had left them 'much impoverished thereby'.¹³⁷ Three fellow members of the Essex Trained Bands similarly declared that they had 'sustained great losses thereby'.¹³⁸ Few, having survived so many years, impressed the Justices with evidence that their wounds had disabled them from following a living. Alexander Brookes of Witham was paid 20s. 'in regard he was wounded at Colchester Leaguer', but was warned 'to trouble the Court noe further'.¹³⁹

Appreciating such flaws in their application, most royalist petitioners appear to have emphasised their loyalty to the Crown. Facing Presbyterian magistrates who had actively opposed Charles I, as well as Justices who had been sequestered for their royalism, it is possible that many petitioners sought to exploit perceived divisions on the Bench, exerting moral blackmail on one side, whilst inviting empathy from the other. Royalists made little effort to appear unwilling victims of war; displaying instead the zeal of the volunteer. Aping royalist propoganda such as the *Eikon Basilike*, phrases such as 'his sacred Majesty' and 'Charles of Blessed Memory' were commonly inserted, together with references to faithful service and endurance. Many of the common royalist soldiers may genuinely have held a strong belief in Royalist principles. The service of a Hertfordshire labourer, who fought for the monarch in all three civil wars, suggests a deep commitment.¹⁴⁰ Where parliamentarians had tended to argue that their moral right to relief stemmed from economic and social disfunction within the community, royalists emphasised their individual fidelity. Henry Stokes of Widford mentioned his infirmity, but based his request for money on the grounds 'that he might bee allowed some reasonable satisfaccion for his service'.¹⁴¹

There is some evidence within the surviving documents to indicate that communal petitions may have survived as a tactical ploy, particularly among

widows. Mary Gill's petition was written for her by the Vicar of Naseing, who, together with the constable, the overseer and three other parishioners, certified that she was 'a very pittifull object of charitie'.¹⁴² The Bench would often respond to less convincing parish petitions by returning the burden to their care. Browne, Sharpe and Sweeteing, for example, were simply recommended to the churchwardens and overseers of their respective parishes.¹⁴³ Individual endorsements from dignitaries were still eagerly sought. As late as 1678, Thomas Petchy, a Blackmore labourer was able to obtain the endorsement of Colonel Henry Farr, a royalist hero of the Colchester siege, along with two supporting dignitaries to further a belated claim for maintenance.¹⁴⁴ Such support was probably necessary, as Petchy's claim for war relief, made some thirty years after his service, was extremely tenuous.¹⁴⁵

Royalist petitioners in Essex fared worse than the parliamentary pensioners dismissed by the Bench in 1661. Unlike the confirmed parliamentary pensioners noted above, none of the royalists appear to have been awarded pensions.¹⁴⁶ The gratuities, like the majority of the parliamentary claimants were 'in full Compensation for all pencions for the future'.¹⁴⁷ Worse than this, whereas the parting remuneration averaged 26s. 4d. for the Roundheads, the royalists received an average award of 23s. 6d. – and that weighted towards the officers in the group.

The political complexion of the Essex Bench at the Restoration had a residual Presbyterian influence. This made it noticeably less reactionary than many equivalent bodies in areas such as the West Country, where traditional Cavaliers had regained control. The impact on petitioners for war relief was significant. Royalist petitioners in Essex, no less aware of the nature of their 'audience' than their parliamentary predecessors, were notably less successful. Whereas Justices in the West Country were willing to bestow hundreds of pensions for loyalty to the King, in Essex they were not. Not only were numbers of indigent royalists in Essex far lower than Dorset, or even Cheshire, but few had solid support from their community. It is noticeable that Justices preserved the stipends of some Roundhead veterans, while the paucity of gratuities given to royalist petitioners indicate the Bench's lack of enthusiasm for their claims.¹⁴⁸ How the Act of 1662 affected this policy remains an item of conjecture, as the Restoration Bench in Essex clearly intended to dismantle the whole system at the earliest opportunity.

War relief for maimed soldiers and war widows was not, in itself, a blunt instrument of social control. Initially, it was an aid to the parliamentary war effort, encouraging soldiers to fight. By 1647, war relief formed part of a wider Parliamentary policy to persuade the New Model to

disband peacefully, and so defuse tension in the provinces. To the Essex authorities, war relief was a method by which to restore familial order and thereby a traditional culture of 'neighbourliness' dented by tax, bereavement and conscription. The survival of traditional civilian communities not only prevented the middling sorts from turning civil war into revolution; it dissipated the radicalism of returning soldiery. The ideological reconciliation effected by the Essex gentry in 1660 was reflected in the composition of the Restoration Bench. The short shrift given to new royalist claimants as well as old parliamentary pensioners reflected the fact that war relief had already served its purpose in the search for social settlement.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the great help and encouragement given by staff of the Essex Record Office and the History Department of the University of Essex, particularly by Professor John Walter, during research into this topic.

Author: D. J. Appleby, School of History and Classics, Keele University, Staffordshire ST5 5BG.

The Society is grateful to its Publications Development Fund for a grant towards the publication of this article.

Notes

- 1 A useful anthology of current historiography can be found in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), *The English Civil War* (London, 1997).
- 2 D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford, 1985); G. Hudson, 'Negotiating for Blood Money', in Kermode and Walker, eds., *Women, Crime and the Courts* London (1994), pp. 146-169.
- 3 H. Mah, 'Suppressing the Text: The Metaphysics of Ethnographic History in Darnton's Great Cat Massacre', *History Workshop Journal*, 31 (1991), pp.1-20; R. Rosaldo, 'From the Door of His Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor', in J. Clifford and G. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture* (1986), p. 79.
- 4 For example, the Maldon grain riots of 1629. J. Walter, 'Grain riots and popular attitudes to the law: Maldon and the crisis of 1629' in Brewer and Styles eds., *An ungovernable people* (London, 1980) pp. 47-84.
- 5 Figures taken from Morrill, p. 85.
- 6 See Wrightson, p. 19.
- 7 In 1624 the Privy Council advised the Lord Lieutenant of Essex to enlist men for Dutch service, citing 'the ease and benefit the country will find in being disburdened of so many unnecessary persons, that want employment and live lewdly and unprofitably'; Hunt, p. 183.
- 8 J. Morrill, p. 27; Cliftlands, p. 4.
- 9 Firth & Rait, I, pp. 245 & 248-9.
- 10 Stowe 189, f.16; Stowe 842, f.25; Egerton 2647, f.86.
- 11 Stowe 842, f.6.
- 12 Holmes, p. 167; Egerton 2647, f.241; Add MSS 37491, ff.18 & 19.
- 13 Egerton 2647, f.199.
- 14 Although not met in full, the impressment ordinances account for thousands; Firth & Rait, I, pp. 73, 123, 241-2, 245-6, 330, 472-3, 938-40, 997-8.
- 15 See D. Appleby, 'Essex Men at the Battle of Worcester', *English Civil War Times*, Partizan Press, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, , 52 (1997), pp.24-8, and M. Atkin, *Cromwell's Crowning Mercy* (Stroud, 1998).
- 16 Witness their bounty for Worcester; S/P28/227.
- 17 Carlton claims camp fever had a 75% fatality rate. It was probably responsible for the deaths of 4,500 New Model troops campaigning in Scotland in 1650. Carlton, p.212.
- 18 Kingston, pp. 134, 147; Egerton 2647, f.223.
- 19 Carlton (pp. 204, 213-4), with a lengthy caveat, estimates total deaths in England at 190,000 (3.7% of the population), 60,000 in Scotland (6.0%), 618,000 in Ireland (41%). Firth's estimate (p.22) that the total number of troops raised in England was around 120-140,000 would tend to argue against such a high figure. One would suspect that Firth's estimate should be raised and Carlton's scaled down.
- 20 Firth, p. 34.
- 21 CJ, vii, p. 627.
- 22 D/P265/5, ff.24-5, 77; D/P75/5/1, ff.114-7.
- 23 See Firth, pp. 264-5.
- 24 Firth & Rait, I, p.36.
- 25 Firth & Rait, I, p.102.
- 26 Firth & Rait, I, p.328.
- 27 Firth, p. 266.
- 28 This is the most obvious purpose behind Waltham churchwardens' payment of 5s. 'given to Widow Nicholson to bear her charges to London with the vestrye's consent', D/P75/5/1, f.117.
- 29 The Parliamentary Committee for Maimed Soldiers appointed local agents to monitor local authorities.
- 30 LJ, iv, p.127.
- 31 See Clark, pp. x-xi.
- 32 Firth & Rait, I, pp. 938-9.
- 33 Firth & Rait, I, p. 939.
- 34 Firth & Rait, II, p. 556. This Act was also cited in the certificates issued to Essex militia wounded at Worcester.
- 35 The author has thus far found positive evidence for 223 maimed soldiers and war widows in Essex records.
- 36 Q/Sba2/82, 84.
- 37 That state pensions were awarded to Essex claimants is indicated by the request of the Bench for William Humphreys to 'bring the like Certificate from the Savoy as he now hath from Ely House that he hath noe pencion there'; Q/SO1, ff.183v, 188v.
- 38 Allen (p. xxvi) has calculated this at 11.3%.
- 39 The Colchester Assembly issued detailed instructions for war relief within its parishes in 1654. Magdalen parish was exempt from the charges, perhaps because its hospital included military patients; CRO D/B5 Sr43. The Assembly was diligent in chasing tardy parish contributions; Stowe 842, f.1.
- 40 Appleby, MA, appendix III. The evidence of the Order Book 1651-1661 suggests that the East Division bore a far higher burden of war relief.
- 41 The Hundreds in the West Division were rated separately for Charitable Uses (£12 9s. 3d.) and for Maimed Soldiers (£15 11s. 9d.); D/DM 04.
- 42 Thomas Highaune, at the top of the list, and John Kettle at the bottom, can both be positively identified as veterans. Q/Sba2/61; Harl. 6244, f.25.
- 43 £2-4 per year.
- 44 Appleby, MA, appendices V and VI.
- 45 Appleby, MA, appendix I.
- 46 This is particularly noticeable in Waltham; D/P75/5/1, f.124v.
- 47 D/P265/5, f.41.
- 48 D/P265/5, *passim*; See also E223/8
- 49 D/P265/5, ff.24, 25, 29; Stowe 842, f.6.
- 50 *Ibid.* Hudson's figure for Essex (pp.161-2) is slightly different.
- 51 Q/Sba2/61-100; Harl. 6244, f.25.
- 52 Harl. 6244, f.17.
- 53 Firth, p. 265.
- 54 Q/Sba2/61; S/P28/227.
- 55 S/P46/114, f.123.
- 56 Hudson (p. 148), cites the information and encouragement given to Cheshire widows by Captain Bertles. There are several examples in the Essex Quarter Sessions of claimants banding together.
- 57 Q/SBa2/61.
- 58 Q/SBa2/105. This petition is included in the Epiphany Sessions of 1666, but as the Justice in question, Herbert Pelham, appears to have relinquished his office in 1660 the document must predate the Restoration.
- 59 Q/SBa2/92.
- 60 Hudson, p. 149.
- 61 Q/SBa2/82, /84.

- 62 Q/SBa/78, /82
 63 Hudson, pp 154-5, Appleby MA, Table 7.3.
 64 Hudson., p. 149.
 65 See Underdown, chapters 6 and 7; P. Newman;
HJ, 30 (1987), p. 889.
 66 K. Burley, p. 21.
 67 Q/Sba2/82. Author's italics.
 68 S/P28/227; Harl. 6244, f.25.
 69 Allen, p. xv.
 70 Hudson, p. 156; Davis, pp.20-21.
 71 John Arnet pleaded he was 'unable to beare the
 chardge of travayling' to collect money awarded
 him by the Essex Committee in 1651; S/P28/227.
 72 Q/SBa2/91; Q/SO1, f.114v.
 73 Margaret Walker may have appeared with a
 relative.
 74 The Ordinance of 1643, for example, states that
 awards are for those maimed soldiers who 'are or
 shall not be able to maintaine themselves'; Firth
 & Rait, I, p. 328.
 75 See the cases of Abraham Emming and Widow
 Saunders; Q/SO1, f.166v.
 76 Q/SBa2/61; S/P28/227; Q/SO1, f.101r. Drummers
 were equivalent in rank to senior NCOs, and
 many military manuals of the time emphasise
 that they should be literate. Martha Emming's
 'mark'(Q/SBa2/82), a very firm 'm' in a secretary
 hand, also suggests someone used to handling
 writing materials.
 77 Davis, p. 87.
 78 Q/SBa2/78. Hudson (p. 153) has noted a similar
 trend amongst Cheshire war widows.
 79 Hudson, p.153; Essex examples can be found in
 Q/SBa2/78 & 82.
 80 Appleby, MA, appendices IV and V detail the
 calculations stated in this section.
 81 Those who specified their trades tended to be
 from the poorer middling sort: two husbandmen,
 three clothworkers, a blacksmith, and a
 cordwainer.
 82 Q/SBa2/63.
 83 Q/SBa2/92.
 84 In fact all the surviving petitions of volunteers or
 their widows do this.
 85 Cliftlands, *passim*.
 86 Q/SBa2/63, 82.
 87 CRO D/B5 Sb2/7.
 88 Jeremiah Maye was an outstanding exception,
 declaring that he had refused a £40 bribe from a
 Cavalier. Q/SBa2/78.
 89 Stowe 842, ff.6,7.
 90 Q/SBa2/82.
 91 See the protest recounted in D. Woodward & C.
 Cockerill, *Siege of Colchester* (Chelmsford, 1979),
 p. 22, and John Walter's account of the 1629
 Maldon riots.
 92 Q/SBa2/97, 100; Q/SO1, ff.141v, 145v, 154v.
 93 Only seven such entries appear among 93 orders;
 Appleby, MA, appendix VI.
 94 Q/SBa2/78.
 95 Q/SBa2/78.
 96 Q/SBa2/61.
 97 Q/SBa2/82.
 98 Q/SO1, f.30v.
 99 Q/SBa2/78.
 100 Q/SBa2/92.
 101 See Appleby MA, appendices.
 102 Q/SO1, f.177v.
 103 *Ibid.*, f.163r, 177r, 157r.
 104 *Ibid.*, f.254v-255v.
 105 The petition of Thomas Anderson of Barking, for
 example, deliberately employed extensive
 Christian imagery to highlight the fact that his
 son was held prisoner by infidel Turkish pirates;
 Q/SBa2/61.
 106 Q/SBa2/78.
 107 See J. Cliffe, p.191.
 108 14 Car. II c.9. Statutes of the Realm, V. (1819),
 pp. 389-90.
 109 Newman; *HJ*, 30 (1987), pp.894.
 110 D/P265/5, f.103; D/P75/5/1, ff.206, 210, 212.
 111 The language of the Clerk of the Peace shows
 England still nominally to have been a republic;
 Q/SO1, f.209r.
 112 Q/SO1, f.214v.
 113 Q/SO1, f.224r.
 114 Q/SO1, f.239v.
 115 Q/SO1, f.240v.
 116 The details of Butcher's pension match exactly
 with the awards given him in 1654 and 1657;
 Q/SO1, ff.89v, 158r.
 117 D/DM5 O13.
 118 Underdown, pp. 295-6.
 119 At least 21 out of the 52 Royalists in the Order
 Book served at Colchester, and there is reason to
 believe that the rest did as well. Similarly, at least
 16 of the 41 Royalist officers in the 1663 List also
 fought in the campaign; most of them had
 commands in Farr's regiment of the Essex
 Trained Bands.
 120 Carter, p. 222. This figure excludes perhaps
 another 500 men lost through death or desertion.
 The contingent from Kent was perhaps around
 2,000, with sizeable contributions from London
 and Hertfordshire.
 121 The timing and circumstances of this regiment's
 defection to the royalists at Chelmsford would
 have left the militiamen little time to arrange
 substitutes.
 122 Newman, p. 886. Three officers (Lieutenant
 Mason and Ensigns Bond and Rule) received
 awards from both the *List* and the Quarter
 Sessions.
 123 The batch of 32 officers and men processed at the
 April 1661 Sessions appear to be in some
 semblance of regimental order. Certainly,
 Lieutenant Solomon Mason and Ensign John
 Bond, who follow each other in the Order Book,
 served in Captain Barker's company of Sir
 Charles Lucas' foot regiment in 1648.
 124 See Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England
 1646-1660* (1960), regarding the Royalist gentry's
 networks. The chronology of events in 1648 also
 suggests the prior existence of such networks.
 125 Hudson, p. 151; Underdown, *Revel, Riot and
 Rebellion*, p. 286.
 126 Norfolk Justices explicitly banned widows from
 stipends in 1663.
 127 Indeed, the only way they can positively be
 identified as royalists, is the appearance of
 several of the officers in the *List* of 1663.
 128 Q/SO1, ff.259v, 263v, 264v, 266r, 266v, 267v,
 268v.
 129 Q/SO1, f.264r.
 130 C. Wedgwood, *The Trial of Charles I* (1964),
 pp. 206-211.
 131 14 Car. II c.8; Newman *1663 List*, p. 887.
 132 Q/SO1, f.260r.
 133 See Hudson, p. 153.
 134 It should be remembered that they were also an
 important cause of poverty!

- 135 Q/SBa2/108.
 136 Underdown, pp. 192-3.
 137 Q/SO1, f.266r.
 138 Q/SO1, f.266v.
 139 Q/SO1, f.259v.
 140 P. Leask, 'Aftermath 2: Hertfordshire',
Intelligencer, 5 (1994), p 19.
 141 Q/SO1, f.264r.
 142 Q/SBa2/108.
 143 Allen, p. 198.
 144 Q/SBa2/124.
 145 Possibility this was an attempt to attract some
 money before the 1662 Act lapsed, in 1679.
 146 It is possible, of course, that some may have
 received stipends following the legislation of
 1662.
 147 Q/SO1, f.248r.
 148 It will be interesting to find out how many other
 counties did this, and where.

- Appleby, D.J. 1997 *Essex Men at the Battle of Worcester*,
English Civil War Times, 52, Partizan
 Press, Leigh-on-Sea, pp.24-28.
 Burley, K.H. 1957 *The Economic Development of Essex
 in the Late Sixteenth and Early
 Seventeenth Centuries*, University of
 Essex Ph.D. thesis.
 Carlton, C. 1992 *Going to the Wars*, London.
 Cliffe, J.T. 1984 *The Puritan Gentry*, London.
 Cliftlands, W. 1987 *The Well Affected and the County*,
 University of Essex Ph.D. thesis.
 Davis, N.Z. 1987 *Fiction in the Archives*, Stanford.
 Firth, C.H. 1902 *Cromwell's Army*, London.
 Holmes, C. 1974 *The Eastern Association in the
 English Civil War*, Cambridge.
 Hudson, G. 1994 *Negotiating for Blood Money: War
 Widows and the Courts in
 Seventeenth-Century England*, in
 Kermode and Walker, eds., *Women,
 Crime and the Courts*, London,
 pp.146-169.
 Hunt, W. 1987 *The Puritan Moment: The Coming of
 Revolution to an English County*,
 London.
 Kingston, A. 1902 *East Anglia and the Great Civil War*,
 London.
 Morrill, J.S. 1976 *The Revolt of the Provinces*, London.
 Newman, P.R. 1987 *The 1663 List of Indigent Officers
 considered as a primary source*,
Historical Journal, 30, pp.885-904.
 Scott, J.C. 1990 *Domination and the Arts of
 Resistance*, London.
 Underdown, D. 1985 *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, Oxford.

Bibliography

Manuscript material

Essex Record Office, Chelmsford

- D/P Deposited parish records, as endnotes.
 Q/SBa2 Quarter Sessions Bundles 1642-1678.
 Q/SO1 Quarter Sessions Order Book
 1651-1661.

Essex Record Office, Colchester

- D/B5 Sb1/4-9 Colchester Sessions of the Peace.
 D/B5 Sr/43-45 Colchester Sessions Rolls.

British Library

- Add MSS 37491 Divisional Committee Book for
 Southern Essex 1643-1654.
 Egerton MSS 2647 Eastern Association Committee
 Correspondence 1643-1645.
 Harleian Judgements of the Standing
 MSS 6244 Committee for Essex 1649.
 Stowe MSS 164 Order Book of the Chelmsford
 Committee 1645-1646.
 Stowe MSS 842 Committee Book of Colchester
 1644-1656.

Sources and Calendars

- Allen, D., Essex Quarter Sessions Order Book
 ed. 1974 1651-1661, Chelmsford Clarke, W.
 The Clarke Papers, ed. C.H. Firth
 (rpt. London, 1992)
 Firth, C.H. and Acts and Ordinances of the
 Rait, R.S., Interregnum, 3 vols, London
 eds. 1911
 Journal of the House of Commons
 (CJ)
 Journal of the House of Lords (LJ)

Secondary Works

- Appleby, D.J. 1995 *The Culture and Politics of War Relief
 in Essex 1642-1662*, University of
 Essex, M.A. dissertation.