

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

Faculty of Humanities
School of History

'These Meritorious Objects of the Royal Bounty ...'

The Administration of the Out-pension of the Royal Hospital,
Chelsea in the early Eighteenth Century

by

Andrew Edward Cormack, FSA, FRHistS

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (History)

Re-submitted November 2016

Abstract

This paper explores the establishment and operation of the Chelsea Out-pension from 1688 up to 1755. It asks why such rewards for service to the Crown should have been paid to members of the labouring classes distributed across the British Isles, at a time when central government welfare did not exist.

It examines the structure and organisation of the Army, with particular emphasis on the recruitment of the Other Ranks, who were the recipients of the pension. It describes the work of soldiering in the early eighteenth century; accounts for the reasons why men reached the conclusion of their military service - whether long or short - and it examines the qualifications that entitled soldiers to a pension or debarred them from it.

The process of discharge is rehearsed against the background of statistical examination of length of service and age at discharge along with a major study of the incidence of wounds, illness or injury that terminated soldiers' service.

How the pension was paid; what verification procedures were instituted; whether abuses of the system were perpetrated and how it was reformed, occupy the latter part of the narrative. The study concludes with some consideration of the sufficiency of the pension to sustain life and how Out-pensioners managed for the remainder of their days as, mostly elderly and increasingly infirm, civilians.

Through this investigation light is shed on concepts such as the 'duty of care' that the State was prepared to adopt in respect of its servants and its willingness and capability to undertake the multitude of tasks required in administering and paying the pension.

List of Contents

Introduction	1	
Prologue	15	
Chapter 1	The Condition of the Soldiers	25
Chapter 2	The Pension starts	49
Chapter 3	On becoming a pensioner	75
Chapter 4	The End of Service	107
Chapter 5	Wounds, Injuries and Diseases	145
Chapter 6	How the Out-pension was paid	189
Chapter 7	Frauds and Abuses	239
Chapter 8	The Reform of the Out-pension	273
Chapter 9	On being an Out-pensioner	295
Conclusion	317	
Appendices	325	
Glossary	385	
Bibliography	388	

List of Tables

4-1 Cavalry - Length of Service

4-2 Foot Guards - Length of Service

4-3 Marching Foot - Length of Service

4-4 Marines - Length of Service

4-5 Cavalry - Age at Discharge

4-6 Foot Guards - Age at Discharge

4-7 Marching Foot - Age at Discharge

4-8 Marines - Age at Discharge

6-1 Dealers in Great Britain with Out-pensioner clients living in Ireland

6-2 County origins of recruits

6-3 Numbers of Out-pensioners examined per year

6-4 Dates of the announcements of verification checks on Out-pensioners

Author's Declaration

Academic Thesis: Declaration Of Authorship

I,

[please print name]

declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

'These Meritorious Objects of the Royal Bounty ...' The Administration of the Out-pension of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea in the early Eighteenth Century.

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. Either none of this work has been published before submission, or parts of this work have been published as: [please list references below]:

Signed:

Date:

Acknowledgements

Work on this thesis was commenced at the University of Leeds under the guidance of Professor John Childs in 2006. Owing to my supervisor's illness, in 2008 I left Leeds and continued research without supervision for two years. In 2010 the late Professor Richard Holmes kindly accepted me at Southampton University as his final PhD student after retiring from Cranfield University. During that time my internal adviser was Dr. John Oldfield. Following Professor Holmes' death on 30th April 2011, Dr. Oldfield continued supervision and Professor Geoffrey Hudson of the Northern Ontario School of Medicine, History Department was invited to comment upon the chapters submitted. On Dr. Oldfield's move to the University of Hull as Wilberforce Professor of Slavery and Emancipation in January 2013, supervision was taken over by Professor Christopher Woolgar and Dr. John McAleer, with continued assistance from Professor Hudson. To all of these gentlemen I would like to express my deep appreciation for their patience and commentaries. I have received further assistance by way of commentary on chapters from Dr. Andrea Tanner for whose generosity and friendly encouragement I am much indebted.

Much useful and stimulating conversation has been provided by the members of The Cumberland Society, in particular Professor Roger Knight, Colonel Hugh Boscawen, Drs. Yolande Hodson, Alan Guy and the late John Screen and from Mr. Stephen Wood. Special thanks are due to Dr. John Houlding for his interest, insights, questions and encyclopaedic knowledge of the British Army of the eighteenth century.

No historical research project in the UK can fail to acknowledge the staff of The National Archives at Kew, in particular its military specialist, Mr. William Spencer. Almost all of the surviving documents generated by the Royal Hospital have been deposited at Kew. Nevertheless, the archives of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea have unhesitatingly opened their

doors to assist my enquiries, as have county record offices in Cheshire, Essex, Norfolk, North-East Somerset and Staffordshire to whom I express my appreciation. The British Library, both at Euston and the Newspaper Library, formerly at Colindale, has, as always, generously given access to its riches, as has the Family History Centre of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, formerly in Exhibition Road, London, where microfilms of parish registers may be consulted. The archives of Lambeth Palace produced a solitary, but most interesting document bearing on the foundation of the Royal Hospital. The Regimental archives of the Grenadier Guards, Wellington Barracks, London produced an important document on courts martial having a bearing on qualification for pension. The catalogue of the National Army Museum has revealed several useful documents, as did Cambridge University Library.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of my brother, Peter Cormack, MBE, FSA, whose questions about the pensioners have led me down several useful and interesting pathways. I am grateful to Mme Nicole Fabre who provided a haven of tranquillity and hospitality in which the complexities of Chapter 8 were worked out. The project is unlikely, however, to have been finished without the constant support, encouragement and interest of my wife, Helen.

Note on the word limit

An extension to the normal 75,000 words was applied for in June 2015. Professor Andrea Reiter approved an extension to 85,000 on 11th June 2015. The inclusion of Introductory paragraphs recommended by Professor Hudson and Tables within the text has resulted in a further extension of the word limit. Discounting those two sources of words, the basic text stands at 85,117 words. The footnotes and bibliography are formatted according to the *Style Guide of the Modern Humanities Research Association*, 2013.

Note on the database

This study is founded upon a database of all 25,026 men who were examined for Out-pension by the Commissioners of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea from 1715, the earliest date at which records are available, until 1755. The latter date has been chosen as it marks a major reform in the system of payment and comes just before the next major 'world' war - the Seven Years War. These records are available in The National Archives (UK) under reference WO116. Every entry has been transcribed *verbatim* into the database, though additional information to clarify regimental identities has been added.

The opportunity has been taken to integrate into the data from the Examination/ Admissions registers, details of particular individuals gleaned from the following sources:

Letter Books of the Secretaries-at-War.

Letter Books of the Secretary of the Royal Hospital, Minutes of Commissioners' meetings and the Hospital Journal.

The Hospital burial register.

Marriage and burial registers of the parishes in which the various fortifications manned by the Invalid Regiment and Companies were stationed. The personnel of the Invalid service was drawn from the Out-pensioners.

The ships' logs and muster rolls of the Anson expedition, 1740 whose contingent of marines was largely made up of Out-pensioners or drafted Invalids.

The report on the Out-pensioners resident in Ireland, 1744. (WO118/45)

The Muster Rolls of the Garrison of Chelsea Hospital, ie. the rolls of In-pensioners.

It should be noted that the database was not compiled starting in 1715 and proceeding to 1755. The individual database record ID numbers do not therefore run in sequence with the dates of examination. The first entries made in the database were from 1730.

Individual Out-pensioners are thus referenced by the Admissions Register in which they appeared WO116/ 1, 2, 3 or 4 followed by the date of examination and their database record ID number, thus the reference for Private James Cormack of St. Clair's Royal Regiment of Foot (The Royal Scots) pensioned in August 1747 is:

TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 17.8.1747, DB 16093.

Note on the titles of Regiments and Troops.

During the period under consideration the four Troops of Horse Guards and the two Troops of Horse Grenadier Guards were designated by their precedence numbers. Similarly the three regiments of Foot Guards were known by their numbers, though the 2nd Regiment bore the title The Coldstream Guards and the 3rd Regiment, as it had originated in the Scots Establishment before the Union in 1707, was very occasionally referred to as the Scots Guards. In this paper they will be referred to primarily by their numbers. The regiments of Marching Foot were known by the names of their colonels until 1751 and will be so named in this paper. When occasionally it is necessary to mention a regiment across an extended period of time during which it had several colonels, its precedence number post-1751 will be used. For instance, the Horse regiment commanded in succession by Thomas Windsor (1712-1717), George Wade (1717-1748) and Sir Charles Howard (1748-1765) will be referred to as the 4th Horse. After December 1746 it was re-named the 3rd Dragoon Guards.

In cases involving different regiments commanded by members of the same family or surname, the Christian name will be given to differentiate them. For instance Thomas Handasyde and Roger Handasyde. Where the same man commanded different regiments in the same branch - Horse, Dragoons or Foot - in succession, the precedence number will be given. For instance, Lord Mark Kerr commanded the 29th Foot between 1712 and 1725 and the 13th Foot between 1725 and 1732.

Regiments which possessed titles - the King's Regiment, the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, the Black Watch - will be referred to by those titles.

Note on money

Under the Imperial system money was expressed in Pounds, shillings and pence. Twenty shillings to one Pound and twelve pennies to one shilling. Pennies themselves could be divided into ha-pennies - a half - or farthings - a quarter.

Sums involving Pounds, shillings and pence in this paper will be expressed in the form £15.2.3 meaning fifteen Pounds, two shillings and three pence.

Sums involving shillings and pence only will be expressed 7/6 - seven shillings and six pence.

Guineas were one Pound and one shilling - 21 shillings.

Note on the calendar

Up to 1752 the Julian calendar was in use in England, Wales and Ireland, though it had been adopted in Scotland in 1600. The year started on 25th March and the day dates ran twelve days behind those of the Gregorian calendar used in continental Europe. In 1752 the country adopted the Gregorian calendar so that the year started on 1st January and the day dates were advanced by twelve days so as to match those in the rest of Europe.

In this paper, and in the database, all year dates have been adjusted so that they conform to the Gregorian calendar with regard to year, so called New Style, but the day dates have not been changed.

Note on County Names

The English and Welsh counties that appear in the text bear the names current in the early eighteenth century prior to the major changes of 1965 in respect of London and Westminster, and the greater changes of 1974. The Local Government Act 1972 introduced metropolitan counties and did away with Cumberland, Herefordshire, Rutland, Westmorland and Worcestershire, re-distributing them to their neighbouring counties or amalgamating and re-naming them.

Definitions

Great Britain - the land-mass of England, Wales and Scotland with its associated islands, but not including Ireland.

The British Isles - Great Britain and Ireland.

Abbreviations

In the interests of easy legibility, abbreviations have largely been avoided and have not been used at all in the body of the text. In the footnotes, the following have been used:

SaW - Secretary at War. Appendix Int-1 gives a list of all of the politicians who held this post during the years covered by this study.

TNA - The National Archives, Kew, formerly The Public Records Office.

WO - The War Office.

INTRODUCTION

This study of the Chelsea Out-pension originated from two sources. The first was my own work on the *Journal of Corporal William Todd, 1745-1762*¹ and the other was Michael Mann's book entitled *The Veterans*,² his brief history of the men of Chelsea Hospital, which takes the story from its origins up to the mid-nineteenth century. Though charming and providing food for thought, Mann's work is a popular history with general references for each chapter, but no specific footnotes. In correspondence with him, he acknowledged that the Out-pension was not dealt with 'except tangentially' in his book and that it required more research.³ William Todd's experience of military service extended from the last Jacobite Rebellion until the end of the Seven Years War. He was remarkable as an ordinary soldier in being astonishingly literate and keen to set down his thoughts about his experiences. When Todd was released from the Army as 'worn out', though with less than twenty years in the ranks, he received a Chelsea Out-pension. Thereafter, as with almost all ex-soldiers who returned to civilian life, there was no trace of what he did until his death was recorded in 1791.

What then had been his experience of being a Chelsea Out-pensioner for twenty-seven years? How had he lived? How had he received his pension money in an era when there were no cash-dispensing facilities, and what importance did the small amount which he received play in sustaining him and his family through two and a half decades? How did the pension authorities get to know when he had died so that they stopped paying his pension? Pondering the subject in a wider context, raised questions about how many of Todd's comrades were similarly

¹ A. Cormack & A. Jones, *The Journal of Corporal William Todd, 1745-1762*, (Stroud: Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2001).

² M. Mann, *The Veterans*, (Norwich: Michael Russell (Publishing) Limited, 1997).

³ Correspondence with the Reverend Michael Mann, Dean of Windsor, December 1997.

circumstanced, when did the payment of the Out-pensions start, were there changes to its management and, indeed, who managed it and how? A further strand of enquiry might be raised in relation to how Irish soldiers of the British Army were dealt with and whether, as might easily be supposed, all of them were looked after by Kilmainham Hospital outside Dublin, or whether Chelsea - for some reason and by what means? - extended its responsibilities into Ireland. Moving on from such considerations, the notion that the Royal Hospital at Chelsea might have been responsible for pension provision to men who were resident in any town or village between St. Peter Port, Scourie, Southwold and Sligo⁴ prompted questions about the development of the administrative competence of the British state during the eighteenth century. Was the administrative machinery in London able to keep track of large numbers of men so widely scattered; to make sure that they received what was due to them, but also to make sure that fraud or malpractice of any kind in relation to the distribution of cumulatively large sums of money in many thousands of tiny amounts did not happen? Was the required procedure connected in some way or related to the concept of the contractor state - the controlled use of agents outside direct government employ to exercise a function on behalf of government?⁵ And what might it tell us about the development of the fiscal-military state and its mobilization of resources to deal with the consequences of war rather than the pursuit of victory?⁶

⁴ Towns situated at more or less the furthest extremes of the compass of the British Isles in the Channel Islands, Sutherland in Scotland, on the Suffolk coast and on the west coast of Ireland.

⁵ Much discussion and writing has appeared on the subject of the contractor state in recent years. See R.T. Sanchez (ed.), *War, State and Development. Fiscal Military States in the Eighteenth Century*, (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2007); S. Conway & R.T. Sanchez (eds), *The Spending of States - Military Expenditure during the Long Eighteenth Century: patterns, organisation and consequences, 1650-1815* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2011); G.E. Bannerman, *Merchants and the Military in Eighteenth Century Britain: British Army Contracts and Domestic Supply, 1739-1763* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008); H.V. Bowen & A. Gonzalez (eds), *Mobilizing Resources for War: Britain and Spain at Work during the Early Modern Period* (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2006).

⁶ C. Storrs, (ed.), *The Fiscal-Military State in Eighteenth Century Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009); A. Graham & P. Walsh, (eds), *The British Fiscal-Military States, 1660-c.1783* (London: Routledge, 2016).

Background reading soon established that these questions had not previously been posed. Although the Royal Hospital at Chelsea has attracted various studies, the grand architecture of the buildings and the seductive twinkle in the eye of present-day beneficiaries has drawn historians, or anyone tempted to write or broadcast about the institution and its inmates, away from its early history. To modern perceptions, the mention of Chelsea pensioners conjures up only one image, the usually sprightly veteran of a conflict in the third decade of the twentieth century who appears at public functions in an archaic, though attractive uniform. The only Chelsea pensioners today are In-pensioners and the notion that such men have always been only a tiny minority of those looked after by Chelsea Hospital is unknown. The quaint and delightful survival of this special type of welfare provision in respect of a small but easily recognizable section of the military community has served to blot out the much more extensive welfare provision distributed by the Hospital in former times. Mention of welfare, of course, sits slightly oddly as a concept during a century in which, though with notable exceptions, the growing confidence of the British nation manifested itself in a rampant individualism and a boisterous self-interest not over-endowed with humanity.⁷ Welfare did exist, but was usually dispensed on a very local basis in accordance with the Poor Laws that had come into existence at the beginning of the seventeenth century.⁸ The support that emanated from Chelsea Hospital, however, was truly national in terms of its coverage, its organization and in the interest which central government took in its finances.

Charles II's foundation has, however, received the attention of writers. Major-General George Hutt published an invaluable book in 1872 in which he reproduced many original documents relating to the hospital.⁹

⁷ L. Colley, *Britons, Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, (London: Vintage Books, 1996).

⁸ S. Hindle, *On the Parish? The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England c.1550-1750* (Oxford: OUP, 2004).

⁹ G. Hutt, *Papers Illustrative of the Origin and Early History of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1872). Hutt was

His concern was to illustrate its organization, its management personnel, the acquisition of its lands and the construction of its buildings, how much the whole enterprise cost and how many men it looked after. He was aware of the Out-pension and included a section in his work on it, but nowhere in the book is there any analysis of how this out-relief was provided and, particularly in relation to the Out-pension, how it was administered in the counties. Nor is he remotely concerned with how or why soldiers ended their days requiring the services that Chelsea provided. He gives a very official, centralized view, devoid of the human element of the story. The value of the book is in the concentration of documents that Hutt was able to study.¹⁰ The accuracy of what he presents therefore cannot be open to question, but he presents no interpretation of it and advances no historical argument drawn from his compilation. His book is a source of raw data with a little narrative linkage.

Captain G.C.T. Dean, late Royal Artillery, served as Captain of Invalids from 1929 to 1939 and thereafter as the adjutant of the Hospital. He published his account in 1950.¹¹ The work is well researched, though presented in a popular style with few footnotes and references.¹² It is a delightfully entertaining book with immense amounts of detail, but is very much about the Hospital, its buildings, gardens, finances and internal organization. Like Hutt, Dean mentions the Out-pension only in passing and he makes little mention of the Invalid companies. His

clearly using material from the Hospital's own archives, but also transcribed papers in the British Museum Library, now the British Library. Hereafter cited as Hutt.

¹⁰ When the present author approached the Royal Hospital in 2006 to enquire what archives it still held, he was jauntily advised that there was a file note from the 1970s or '80s in the Registry somewhere which indicated "... 6 tons of paper, disposed of - 3 to the Public Record Office - 3 to the incinerator ...".

¹¹ C.G.T. Dean, *The Royal Hospital Chelsea* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1950). Hereafter cited as Dean.

¹² A list of his references arranged chapter by chapter and with indications of the line in the printed text to which the reference applies is lodged in the local history department of the Central Library of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. I am grateful to the staff for providing me with a copy.

purpose was to give a narrative of the institution in south-west London and the care that it took of its residents; he was not concerned with exploring the work it did beyond its own walls. Michael Mann's book, commented upon above, gives rise to some useful questions though providing, in relation to the Out-pension, no specific answers.

The surveys of the armies of Charles II, James II and William III and the study of the Nine Years War by John Childs provide a most useful general background to the soldiers who were the first beneficiaries of Chelsea Hospital.¹³ The rather older book by R.E. Scouller on the Army of Queen Anne continues this survey.¹⁴ It must not be forgotten, however, that the discharge of soldiers with recommendations to the sovereign's bounty did not only happen during or immediately after wars or as a consequence of combat. There was a continual flow of men to the Hospital during peacetime, and some of the reasons why this should have been so are discernible through the major study of the eighteenth century army by J.A. Houlding in *Fit for Service, the Training of the British Army 1715-1795*.¹⁵ The status and treatment of disabled veterans in the period before the founding of special hospitals for old soldiers is explored by G.L Hudson.¹⁶ Medical provision and the attempts to improve the medical conditions in which the wounded were treated have been addressed by von Arni, Charters and Hudson from an analytical point of view.¹⁷ They have also been enhanced by the

¹³ J. Childs, *The Army of Charles II* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1976). J. Childs, *The Army of James II and the Glorious Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980). J. Childs, *The English Army of William III, 1688-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987). J. Childs, *The Nine Years War and the British Army 1688-1697, the operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991).

¹⁴ R.E. Scouller, *The Armies of Queen Anne* (Oxford: OUP, 1966).

¹⁵ J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service. The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

¹⁶ G.L. Hudson, 'Disabled Veterans and the State in early modern England', pp. 117-144 in D.A. Gerber, (ed), *Disabled Veterans in History* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). Hereafter cited as Hudson, *Veterans*.

¹⁷ E.G. von Arni, *Justice for the Maimed Soldier, Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and wounded soldiers and their families during the English Civil war and Inter-Regnum, 1642-1660* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing,

publication of an extremely rare account by a serving cavalry surgeon of his experiences in the 1740s by Kopperman, and usefully augmented by a biography of Sir John Pringle, the Army's Physician General during the War of the Austrian Succession.¹⁸ None of these sources specifically examines the workings of the Chelsea Out-pension and this dissertation is not intended to look into the medical or medico-administrative practices of the Army during the period under study.

In respect of what might be the fate of old soldiers after they were discharged, even if they were honoured with a pension, there is a huge literature on the poor, the Poor Laws, the lives and survival strategies of the labouring classes and the management of them by the upper strata of society. Such life patterns have been dwelt upon by Malcolmson in relation to the provincial working class and, more recently by Hitchcock and Shoemaker in respect of the London labouring classes. Hitchcock, with Sharpe and King, has also addressed the survival strategies of the poor and the latter, with Tomkins, has notably transposed the concept of the economy of makeshifts into the English experience.¹⁹

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to examine the Out-pension and its administration. Occasional reference must be made to the Hospital and to the In-pensioners because, though not stated elsewhere, it is clear

2001); E.G. von Arni, *Hospital Care and the British Standing Army, 1660-1714* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006); G.L. Hudson, (ed.), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* Wellcome Series in the History of Medicine, (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2007); E. Charters, *Disease, War and the Imperial State, The Welfare of the British Armed Forces during the Seven Years War* (London: Chicago University Press, 2014).

¹⁸ P. Kopperman, (ed.) 'Regimental Practice' by John Buchanan, M.D., *An Eighteenth Century Medical Diary and Manual* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012); M. McCrae, *Saving the Army. The Life of Sir John Pringle* (Edinburgh: Birlinn Ltd, 2014).

¹⁹ R.W. Malcolmson, *Life and Labour in England, 1700-1780* (London: Hutchinson Publishing Group, 1981); T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, (eds), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1997); S. King & A. Tomkins, (eds), *The poor in England, 1700-1850. An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).

that all pensioners were first received as Out-pensioners, and only a minute percentage of them ever became In-pensioners. It is clear that there was not a two-tier classification of beneficiaries that definitively placed the recipients in one class or the other. Though only a small proportion of pensioners ever enjoyed the hospitality of the buildings, the barrier between those in the 'House' and those outside it was porous, impermanent, almost casual on occasions, and soldiers who were in the Hospital could be ejected and placed on the Out-pension, when emergency admissions became necessary, or could be brought into the House with or without their active consent when required.²⁰ In-pensioners could also elect to leave the House and go onto the Out-pension. This illustration of the choices available to the pensioners and the flexibility in their management tends to run counter to the arguments of Hudson in respect of Greenwich Hospital for Seamen and Jones commenting upon *Les Invalides* that military hospitals were 'first and foremost' policing operations in the control of disabled veterans.²¹ What is also clear is that the purpose of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea was not to attempt to cure disabled soldiers so that they could be released back into the Army for further service. Over an extended period, 1715 to 1748, only six men who presented themselves for pension were ordered to have their wounds 'drest' by the Hospital's own surgeon, though more than a hundred were noted as having actively running wounds, ulcers or sores.²² Of course, medical care was provided for those who either entered the Hospital in immediate need of

²⁰ Archives of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea (hereafter cited as RHC), I/P 9 Register of Admissions and Discharges 1743-1748. This document appears to be a section of a much larger register recording both pensioners and members of staff who entered or left the Hospital. It clearly indicates that there was no absolute barrier between Out-pensioners and In-pensioners and that members of the former group could join the brotherhood of the latter on a temporary basis, probably by means of a private arrangement between old comrades.

²¹ G.L. Hudson, (ed.), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2007), p. 18. See also G.L. Hudson, 'Disabled Veterans and the State in Early Modern England' in D.A. Gerber, (ed), *Disabled Veterans in History*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), p. 126.

²² The database of admissions to pension consulted on 23.2.2012 the total number of those examined standing at 21,290.

it or who, as In-pensioners, subsequently developed conditions that required it, but that was not its primary purpose.

As the vast majority of the recipients of the royal bounty were resident outside London, it is they who will feature largely in this study. The principal source used is the Admissions Registers now classed within the United Kingdom National Archives as WO 116. A database of these pensioners has been compiled of more than 25,000 entries covering the period 1715 to 1755. These Admissions Registers have been chosen because they record the results of the examinations of all men discharged with recommendations to the Hospital in chronological order. Other versions of the registers exist, but they represent sub-sets of the information contained in WO 116. Two of the other sets of registers are incorrectly catalogued or the deductions made about their contents are erroneous.²³

The working out of the method used by the Hospital to administer the Out-pension is partly discernible through the Hospital Journal, the Minute Books of the Commissioners' meetings and the Out-letter Books of the Hospital Secretary and Registrar, who was also the Agent and Solicitor of the Invalid Corps.²⁴ Regrettably no correspondence from the Out-pensioners themselves, the local helpers of those who were illiterate, any local officials – constables, magistrates or Poor Law administrators – with whom pensioners may have come into contact, or even the officers of the Invalid companies has survived. The relationship of the individual pensioners with the authorities at Chelsea must, therefore, be reconstructed from only half the evidence that is truly desirable, namely the instructions, advice, orders, admonitions or

²³ WO120 is commonly believed to be a re-arrangement in regimental order of WO116, but comparison of the two documents reveals that it is no such thing. WO120 contains only a proportion of the names that appear in WO116. WO118/45 is believed to relate to the pensioners of Kilmainham Hospital outside Dublin. It certainly relates to pensioners resident in Ireland, but almost all of the names are traceable in the Chelsea Admissions registers. The author is not aware of any extant admissions registers for Kilmainham covering the eighteenth century.

²⁴ These records appear in The National Archives (TNA) in the War Office classes WO250/458-460, 250/470 and 246/92-95.

requests emanating from the Hospital in the form of Out-letters. In respect of the payment of pensions in the period up to 1755, this was allowed to settle in the hands of private enterprise, in effect money-lenders, who advanced ready cash to the pensioners against promissory notes which permitted the lenders to collect the pensions in London when they were issued. Although it is possible to reconstruct the general arrangements by which these 'dealers' conducted their affairs, no account books or other documents have been found which permit the precise examination of the individual transactions between a pensioner and his dealer. Evidence of their methodology generally arose in cases of complaint when appeal was made to the Hospital to resolve the dispute. After 1755, the payment of the pension was in the hands of the Excise collectors in the localities.

Much material relating to the Hospital, the Invalid Corps and the method by which soldiers were discharged and brought under the care of the Hospital is available within the records of the Secretary-at-War.²⁵ Contemporary manuals for the instruction of officers also offer some assistance. The absence of muster rolls for the Marching Regiments of the Army prior to the 1750s means that, at least in respect of the men that they discharged to Chelsea, the Admissions Registers are a most important source from which to make an assessment of the condition of the regiments which made up the Army.

The purpose of this study is therefore to explain how the Out-pension worked, who received it, how and why. It will be confined in its dates from the foundation of the Hospital by Charles II until 1755, the year in which a major change took place in the method of paying the Out-pension. The study will throw light on the business of soldiering in the first half of the eighteenth century and the physical condition, in respect

²⁵ The Out-letters of the various Secretaries-at-War are contained in TNA, WO4. In order to avoid having to give the names of the various Secretaries in references to these letters, a list of them for the relevant period is provided as Appendix Int-1. It is taken from Secretaries at War, a Note by A.P.C. Bruce, *JSAGR*, Vol. LIII, (1975), p. 177. When referenced in the footnotes therefore the formula used will be SaW to the addressee of the letter.

of fitness, health and age, of the armies of George I and George II. It will therefore, though from a different viewpoint, add to the picture presented by Houlding in *Fit for Service* and it will form a prelude to the old work of Sylvia Frey and the more recent work of Glenn Stepler on the Army of George III.²⁶ It will also make a contribution to the understanding of the development of the administrative abilities of government and how it deployed resources to deliver a national welfare scheme to numerous recipients throughout the British Isles. In this respect, it will assist in the understanding of the larger questions regarding the reach of the administrative machinery of the State into the provinces that Brewer examined, and which has been enhanced by the work of Stephen Conway, Christopher Storrs and most recently by Aaron Graham and Patrick Walsh.²⁷ Viewed from another perspective, such a detailed examination of what happened to old soldiers, and how they managed to survive after discharge, will contribute, in respect of this special occupational group, to studies relating to the aged. Whereas much of the evidence presented by Ottaway relates to the literate and therefore to the middling classes and those of higher status, the examination of soldiers will provide additional material on the labouring and lower artisan classes.²⁸ The status of old soldiers when they returned to civilian life was, in many cases and in spite of their pensions, that of pauper. Many indeed would, on the evidence of their admission to pension, have been quite unable to earn their living because of the disabilities that they had acquired through their military service. In relation to the story of the disabled, it will augment the work

²⁶ S. Frey, *The British Soldier in America, A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981). See also G.A. Stepler, *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford, 1983.

²⁷ J. Brewer, *Sinews of Power. War Money and the English State 1688-1783* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988); S. Conway, *War, State and Society in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: OUP, 2006); S. Conway, *The British Isles and the War of American Independence* (Oxford: OUP, 2000); C. Storrs, (ed.), *The Fiscal Military State in Eighteenth Century Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009); A. Graham & P. Walsh, (eds), *The British Fiscal-Military States, 1660-c.1783* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).

²⁸ S.R. Ottaway, *The Decline of Life. Old Age in Eighteenth Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

of Turner, who deals mainly with disability suffered because of birth deformities, 'freaks of nature' and the feigning of disability, presenting little material on the causes of it, though he does examine the reactions of the able-bodied to the disabled and the presentation by the latter of their disability as a means of inspiring compassion and alms.²⁹ This study adds to his interpretative work by providing information, in relation to those accorded the special status of military pensioner, about how, and how extensively, disablement happened.

Though it is difficult to identify Chelsea Out-pensioners within the throng of the class from which they came, the common experiences and concerns of that class in general must represent very closely the lives of the Out-pensioners. A considerable number of pensioners would therefore, at some time, have been obliged to resort to parish relief; certainly the nature of the disabilities with which some men left the Army would strongly suggest as much. This study will therefore add to the work on the Poor Laws of Hindle, Slack, King, Tomkins and Snell and will indicate a special, exclusively male, portion of the pauper population whose military service had made them particularly likely to require welfare assistance in addition to their pensions.³⁰ Overall the dissertation will add to the narrative of 'History from below', although inevitably recounted from the records that their social superiors compiled about the men in question.³¹

On commencing this study in 2006 the field was completely new and had never been tackled before in respect of the group under analysis.

²⁹ D.M. Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth Century England; Imagining Physical Impairment* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

³⁰ Hindle, S., *On the Parish? The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England c.1550-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); P. Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (Harlow: Longman Group UK Ltd., 1988); S. King, *Poverty and Welfare in England 1700-1850*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); S. King & A. Tomkins, (eds), *The Poor in England, 1700-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); K.D.M. Snell, *Parish and Belonging* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

³¹ T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, *Chronicling Poverty - The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997), p. 1.

However, an examination of the subject appeared in 2014 in C.L. Nielsen's doctoral dissertation.³² This interesting and wide-ranging work covering the long Eighteenth Century - 1660 into the 1840s - deals not only with the Out-pensioners and the Invalid companies but also the Commissioners' management of both. It discusses the Hospital at Kilmainham and makes comparison with the pension provision made to mariners by the Greenwich Hospital and its predecessors. It takes a sociological approach rather than one rooted in military history and is based upon extensive studies of the Army and its personnel viewed from this perspective. The approach adopted by Nielsen is therefore significantly different from that pursued in this work. The greater span of Nielsen's study in comparison with this dissertation means that only where the two narratives are contiguous will it be appropriate to note similarities or differences of interpretation.

This thesis will argue that the Out-pension was an unprecedented, national, centrally-funded system of relief for old or disabled soldiers and that it was initiated as a temporary expedient in respect of a few hundred old soldiers but turned into a permanent requirement providing relief to thousands of men over an extended period of time. Unlike the hospital at Kilmainham, Chelsea did not limit the number of men it was prepared to consider on recommendation.³³ It will show that the long-term implications of the financial resources that would be required by it were unrealistically assessed when it was introduced, and that this allowed quite generous pensions for some at the start, but that it was necessary to cut back on the allowances once the true scale of the enterprise became clear. It will examine the origins of the money from which the pension was to be paid, which derived from poundage on the monies devoted to the Army and the imposition of a levy of one day's pay per year on all ranks; will reveal the inadequacy of this source when

³² C.L. Nielsen, *The Chelsea Out-Pensioners: Image and Reality in Eighteenth-Century and early Nineteenth-Century Social Care*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Newcastle University, 2014. (Hereafter referred to as Nielsen, *Chelsea Out-pensioners*.)

³³ Numerous entries in the *Dublin Gazette* clearly indicate that Kilmainham did so limit the number of places available on its In-pension. See, for example, Nos. 624, 656 and 690 of 1733.

faced with the demand placed upon it by the first major war of the eighteenth century and the measures that were taken to supplement the fund by parliamentary grants from general taxation. It will account for those who received higher awards than the usual rate of five pence per day. It will explain the administrative procedures that were developed to cope with the examination of those thought worthy to receive the royal bounty and the procedures instituted to verify the claimants when they had returned to their places of abode many miles from London. It will describe the procedures at regimental level that were necessary to recommend men for this special honour. Much material will be presented regarding the method of payment of the pension and it will be shown how this was done, who did it and what little control the Hospital exercised over it for the first several decades for which records exist. The question of fraud, impersonation of pensioners and abuses of the Out-pension by the recipients or the administrators will be addressed. When it became evident in the early 1750s that reform of the payment system was urgently required, it will be shown that the methodology that was put in place to tighten procedure and accountability was makeshift but efficient, and that it lasted well into the nineteenth century. It will reflect upon the effect and the effectiveness of the Out-pension in sustaining through their post-Army lives the men who received it. Overlaid on these administrative matters will be an extensive examination of the military profession in respect of the other ranks of the Army and the factors that eventually led to the soldier's discharge - essentially, why he was no longer considered fit to serve. It will also address the particular qualifications that were deemed to entitle him to recommendation for the royal bounty in contra-distinction to his many thousands of comrades-in-arms who were discharged with no such recommendation. It will thereby amplify the work of Hudson, Charters and McRae, amongst others, mentioned above, who have examined the medical history and practice of the Army.

It is at this point appropriate to define what, in this dissertation, is meant by the British Army in the eighteenth century. This study will encompass the Guard and Line cavalry, the Foot Guards and the

Marching regiments of Foot. It will deal with the ten regiments of Marines raised by the War Office in 1739-'40 for the War of Jenkin's Ear and the War of the Austrian Succession; troops that were transferred to the Admiralty in 1747 and disbanded in the following year. It will not include that section of the British Armed Forces that was controlled by the Board of Ordnance, namely the Royal Artillery.³⁴ However, it must be borne in mind that only those regiments that were stationed in Great Britain, in the Mediterranean garrisons, in North America and in the West Indies were permitted to recommend their discharged men to Chelsea. It will not deal with soldiers of regiments held on the Irish Establishment who were assisted by Kilmainham Hospital, though it should be noted that only after having served for a substantial period on the Irish Establishment did regiments have the right to discharge their invalids to that hospital.

This thematic approach has been chosen in order to elucidate the origins of the problem that the Out-pension was intended to address and all aspects of the process of addressing it. This dissertation will throw light on the lives of the common soldiers of the Army who, in distinction to their officers, have been largely ignored as individuals and hitherto treated simply as an unidentifiable mass. Rooted firmly in the analysis of contemporary records and based on the military history of the period, it will contribute to the history of the Army as seen from below and within, rather than as viewed from an abstracted position informed by a theoretical model. It is above all original research based overwhelmingly on archival sources because the questions that it addresses have not been posed before. The secondary sources on how the poor lived, the Poor Law, the fiscal-military and the contractor states, on disability and on medical care for the military provide many useful suggestions as to the possible background experiences of former soldiers, but they do not deal specifically with the Chelsea Out-

³⁴ Hutt, p. 37 clearly states that the Ordnance Pensioners (Artillery and Engineers) were transferred to Chelsea in 1833 and could make no claims against the Royal Hospital until that date.

pensioners. That special group constitutes the principal focus of this dissertation.

PROLOGUE

The enormous growth of armies during the seventeenth century and in particular, the establishment in many European countries of standing armies in the latter part of the century meant that the profession of arms became a permanent feature of every day life. Before this time armed forces had been raised as and when required and although monarchs and rulers had always kept around them small bodies of household troops, soldiering was not a full-time profession in England for any large numbers of men after the Hundred Years War. Naturally during wartime soldiers were numerous and very noticeable in towns and villages, but the conflict once resolved, they were absorbed back into civil society with greater or lesser difficulty and most returned, if uninjured to their former occupations. There was always a proportion of former soldiers that was unable to re-adjust to civilian life, amongst whom the more enterprising and skilful sought re-employment in the military sphere abroad as mercenaries, and the less orderly took to peripatetic crime, infesting the highways and preying on travellers at home. Those disabled by warfare were little considered and, if entirely unable to support themselves, had no recourse but to descend into a life of vagrancy and begging, relieved, perhaps, by charitable foundations or, particularly on the European mainland, by religious orders.

This state of affairs was regarded as a natural consequence of warfare and the authorities being effectively unable, or unwilling, to attempt to control it, the civilian population guarded against it on a personal level as best it could. Though highly disruptive, this aftermath of disbandment was usually of relatively short duration and the processes of re-integration, capital punishment and rapid medical decay ensured that it did not persist for very extended periods of time. It is nevertheless true that little work appears to have been done to examine the after-effects of war on civil communities and the responses of

civilians to the disruption caused by the disbandment of temporary military forces.¹

This situation began to change in continental Europe in the late sixteenth century with the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt and continued into the seventeenth century when the Hapsburg Empire and the rest of Germany along with Sweden, and later France, was gripped by war from 1618 to 1648, and armies, and thus soldiers, became a permanent feature of society. The states of Europe, which had been evolving at different rates up to the beginning of this period, were forced to concede that the conduct of warfare over such large geographical areas, with numerous forces and for such extended periods of time, required unprecedented efforts of governance by those who wished to, or were forced to, indulge in it. Although mercenary and sub-contracted soldiery still played a large role in this conflict, central governments increasingly assumed the burden of control, not only in a political sense, but administratively as well. Spain, which had been the leading European power for generations, gradually saw itself eclipsed in this period by France under Richelieu, Mazarin, and ultimately Louis XIV, who embodied the centralization of the bureaucracy of the state and its direction by a solitary and unchallengeable authority.

In England the experience of the seventeenth century had been significantly different. Insulated to some degree from the conflict in mainland Europe, the British Isles nevertheless embarked upon a parallel process of development engendered by civil war. Though of much shorter duration and somewhat lesser intensity, the conflict between king and parliament led to the raising of substantial military forces, the devotion of much productive capacity to sustaining the war efforts of both sides and, in due course, to the establishment of the New

¹ D. Hay, 'Dearth and Theft in the Eighteenth Century: the Records of the English Courts' *London Journal*, No. 162, (1982), pp. 117 - 160 and N. Rogers, *Mayhem - Post-War Crime and Violence in Britain 1748-1753* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012) - neither of these accounts are precise enough to link soldiers rather than sailors to the problems they highlight.

Model Army. This development mirrored those in central Europe as, for the first time, it concentrated an efficient and ideologically-inspired, at least at the officer level, military force under the control, not of the king, but of parliament. The latter had become the *de facto* central government: it occupied the capital and principal commercial centre of the kingdom, it controlled much of the financial and administrative machinery of the country and it held a bestowed authority deriving from, at least, some of the people, which could be represented as more legitimate than that held by the king.

The New Model Army introduced to England the concept of a permanent military force and, because of the peculiar circumstances of its creation, one controlled and administered by and through a non-royal authority - parliament. After the execution of Charles I and parliament's mismanagement of the tool that it had created, the New Model under the Protectorate took on a role that gave it the pre-eminent position in the new republic and which, in effect, equated to a position in which the state was the army. There could be no more dramatic organizational representation of this than the division of the country into military districts governed by Major-Generals. The state's army thus became an inseparable part of the workings of central government in the civil sphere; a constant presence, a continual drain on national resources and, in the case of the New Model, a source of frequent interference and disruption in the political life of the nation.

Whilst the experience of mainland Europe might be considered to show the development of an institution by and for the state which required its creator to develop mechanisms by which its military force could be controlled and administered, the English experience, which in fact pervaded the entire British Isles, saw the development of an institution which took over the authority and management of the state which had created it. The death of Oliver Cromwell, the unwelcome nature of the process through which the nation had just passed and the political vacuum which arose almost as soon as the Lord Protector was dead, eventually returned England to a more traditional political condition.

The experience of the period, however, coupled with the firm establishment of the necessity for a state-controlled, permanent military force in any country which considered itself worthy of international consequence, meant that standing armies had become an indispensable feature of modern states.

The advent of standing armies and the benefits that rulers derived from them, brought about a close association between the monarch and his troops. Though soldiering had always been one of the roles of kings and the aristocracy, the political possibilities inherent in the application of a highly organized, professional military force with capabilities far greater than those attainable by a hastily-constructed, usually largely unwilling and untrained temporary force, much enhanced the sovereign's attachment to the military. Not only did soldiers now provide personal security to the sovereign, but they supplied him with a means to achieve political ends in a controlled and, to some degree, assured manner which had been lacking in the past. Naturally rulers warmed both to the possibilities of achieving these ends and to the institution which gave them the means to do so. From the formation of this relationship may be seen the well-spring of the concept of the indebtedness of the sovereign, and therefore of the state itself, towards the servants who were the instruments of the successful implementation of its policies. This reciprocal relationship also found resonances in the developing philosophical ideas of the early Enlightenment which projected the sovereign as the father of his people, beneficent to those who were dutiful, careful of the perceived interests of his people which might best be brought about by the successful achievement of his dynastic aims and the enhancement of his power and prestige. Those who assisted the monarch in procuring these benefits to both the state and to his own *gloire* were naturally worthy of consideration and support after their service. The concomitant benefit of reducing the disruption caused to the civil population by the careless discarding of soldiers after a war, and the avoidance of discontent amongst soldiers who might consider themselves hard-done-by by their former masters, commended to the

thoughtful sovereign arrangements to provide for those to whom the state was indebted.

It was precisely this sort of reciprocal obligation that inspired Louis XIV to establish the first great hospital for disabled soldiers. The *Hôtel Royal des Invalides* in Paris opened its doors in 1674 and was capable of accommodating the large number of 3,000 veterans, both officers and other ranks. It was very soon recognized as exactly the sort of institution that bound an important section of the populace to its monarch, illustrated his enlightenment credentials and served a very useful practical function, as well as having the perceived effect of promoting morale within the army and encouraging recruitment. The Bishop of Nantes expressed his opinion to the Controller General of Finances that the establishment of the hospital 'has brought many men into the service who would never have entered out of apprehension that had they been crippled and unable to make a living, they would have found themselves reduced to demanding alms in order to live'.² The hospital replaced a miscellaneous collection of provisions expressed in Royal *Ordonnances* and impositions dating back into the sixteenth century, by which religious houses took in disabled veterans as lay brothers, an arrangement which certainly provided comfort and shelter but, from the ill-matched natures of the hosts and the beneficiaries, proved a fertile breeding ground for conflict and disagreement.

In England, of course, there could be no recourse to residential religious foundations, which had all been swept away in the sixteenth century. Fortunately the country was rarely engaged in wars of long duration and the problems of dealing with discharged soldiers, whether injured or merely destitute, rested squarely on the shoulders of local authorities which paid subsistence money to move them out of their areas as quickly as possible. The problem was particularly acute in the vicinity of ports, such as Chester, where soldiers returning from Queen Elizabeth's wars in Ireland in the early 1590s caused much annoyance to

² J.A. Lynn, *Giant of the Grand Siècle, The French Army 1610-1715* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), p. 433.

the city and cathedral authorities.³ London also suffered from disturbances by mariners and soldiers and their access to Parliament brought home to legislators the dangers of not responding to their needs. As Hudson has pointed out, these pressures resulted in efforts by the Privy Council from the late 1580s to get local authorities to adopt responsibilities in respect of disabled military personnel having qualifications to succour in their localities by virtue either of having been born or impressed there. Pension provision was given a legal foundation in 1593 whereby military service and injuries associated with it became the defining qualifications for a pension, but these provisions underwent significant changes during the following eighty years. Apart from the disqualification of those who had fought on the losing side during the Civil War, incapacity to work and its consequent impoverishment became the interpretation that justices of the peace placed on the legislation in its amended forms. Pension provision thus ceased to be a recognition of honourable status and a reward for service to the State, and became a means of dealing with the consequences of disability closely akin to the concepts which under-pinned the operation of the Poor Laws.⁴

During the English Civil Wars, hospitals offering long-term, in-patient medical treatment to the parliamentary armies were established at the Savoy palace and at Ely House in Fulham and were maintained until after the Restoration.⁵ Financial support for more than 6,000 disabled parliamentary soldiers was also provided by a sick and maimed fund that had been set up on 16 November 1642.⁶ Former royalist soldiers, of course, had no provision made for them, though those who survived long enough did not hesitate to press their claims after 1660. In 1662 the Elizabethan legislation was further amended to increase tax revenues to provide pensions and to disqualify the king's former enemies, but this

³ P. Thomas, 'Military Mayhem in Elizabethan Chester: The Privy Council's Response to Vagrant Soldiers', *JSAHR* Vol. 76 (1998), pp. 226-247.

⁴ Hudson, *Veterans* pp. 117-144.

⁵ E.G. von Arni, *Justice for the Maimed Soldier* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), p. 153.

⁶ Hudson *Veterans* p. 122.

Act was allowed to lapse in 1679.⁷ Thereafter, in theory, those soldiers incapable of work had recourse only to the Poor Laws or, very occasionally, to alms houses specifically endowed for old soldiers provided by local worthies, such as the Lord Leicester Hospital in Warwick.⁸

Clearly replacement provision for disabled and superannuated soldiers was required. Disabled men continued to trickle home from garrison duty in Tangiers and the wars with the Dutch produced casualties among those soldiers who were serving as marines. The recent opening of the *Hôtel Royale des Invalides* on the outskirts of Paris provided a model that a progressive monarch might follow with advantage, and a Mr. T. Povey was despatched to report upon the institution.

His account was extremely detailed.⁹ It covered the government of the establishment, its funding and regulations and it started with the point that the institution was called an *hôtel* – a hostel - and not a hospital 'which sounds of Beggery, this depressing and dishonouring, the other expressing and honouring the nobleness of a Soldier's profession'. He pointed out that once granted a place, *Invalides* might not leave, except with permission, as to do so was considered desertion. Within its precincts religious toleration prevailed, as the French Army was made up of many nationalities; Swiss and German Protestants having as equal a right to a place as Catholic Frenchmen or Italians. He explained the

⁷ Though the legislation lapsed, the levying of rates for this purpose continued well into the eighteenth century as indicated in the instruction books for Justices of the Peace.

⁸ B. Bailey, *Almshouses* (London: Robert Hale, 1988), pp. 90-91, 105 & 109. Robert Dudley's *Maison Dieu* was established in 1571 for a dozen poor men of the locality, preference being given to those who had been soldiers. Very few other almshouses stated this preference, though old soldiers and sailors, amongst others, were to be received into Sir Thomas Sutton's charity (1611) at Smithfield as they were in Sir Thomas Coningsby's hospital in Hereford (c. 1618).

⁹ Lambeth Palace Archives, MS745, A Description of the Hostel of the Invalides by T. Povey, 1682. It seems probable that the report's author was Thomas Povey, MP, sometime Treasurer of Tangier, Secretary of the Council of Plantations and Treasurer to the Duke of York. See G.A. Jacobsen, *William Blathwayt, A Late Seventeenth Century Administrator* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932), p. 45.

process by which soldiers were recommended and certificated, though he did not detail the examination procedure or the precise qualifications for a place. He claimed that he had secured places for English soldiers disabled in French service and he listed the offences for which *Invalides* could be dismissed or punished.

Povey closely described the funding of the *Hôtel* which received its running costs by a deduction of a farthing out of every twenty *Sous* from all the Ordinary and Extraordinary expenditure disbursed by the King's Treasurer on behalf of the Army including the artillery service. This income was supplemented by the appropriation of those pensions, which monastic houses had paid to the ex-soldier lay brothers for whom they were responsible, as also the revenues deriving from pilgrims', plague and leper hospitals. He provided a complete description of the role and status of the Governor-General of the House and noted particularly his being answerable to no one but the King, and he listed the entire staff down to butchers and laundresses with their duties.

Povey discovered that the *Hôtel* manufactured all the uniform clothing for its inmates, including the weaving of stockings and the manufacture of shoes, and pointed out that it also acted as a factory producing similar items for sale. It occupied those men who could work by providing workshops in the complex of buildings that he described. He was not blind to problems within the institution however, pointing out that there was great complaint that the *Invalides* were not paid, though those capable of earning money were permitted to do so and were allowed to marry and maintain their families. Those too disabled to work were, however, entirely dependent on the bounty of the *hôtel* and this lack of some measure of independence was the cause of complaint.

The presence of Povey's report in the archives of the Archbishops of Canterbury suggests that it was prepared for the Privy Council.¹⁰ His

¹⁰ There is, however, no indication that this document was discussed by the Privy Council and, indeed, no discussion about the founding of

account of the institution clearly contributed to the discussions that led to the establishment of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea and it is evident that his comments upon the dissatisfaction caused by lack of pay for the *Invalides* were duly noted. The method of financing the building and the running costs of the institution was also essentially the same as that used by the French.

The establishment of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea for the reception of old and invalid soldiers by King Charles II may be seen to derive from three factors; compassion, necessity and a spirit of emulation. Charles II, due to his own experience of exile was, of all English monarchs, more familiar with the trials of living in straitened circumstances and without the support that service to the State might reasonably lead the servant to expect. The clamour for recompense in acknowledgement of the sacrifices of his own and his father's followers that immediately arose after his Restoration must have reinforced the impression of indebtedness, not merely to his immediate circle, but to all those who had supported the royalist cause during the civil wars and who had been persecuted for their staunchness during the Commonwealth.

Nor can it have escaped royal notice that those who neglected the concerns of the state's armed forces did so at their peril and were likely thereby to inspire retribution of a most disruptive and uncomfortable kind. The New Model Army had amply demonstrated that the state's ability to call into being armed forces and then to dismiss them unpaid and unsupported when their services were deemed no longer necessary, was at an end and that any attempt to do so in future would have serious consequences. The percolation into the lower orders of both an awareness of, and an ability to strike, a political stance, or at least a response which had to be taken note of by the upper orders of society, meant that in no sphere of the state's concerns would anything be quite the same as it had been before 1642. One of the great lessons of the

Chelsea Hospital appears in the relevant volume of the Privy Council Minutes – TNA, SP9.

disruptions of the mid-century was that the monarch had a duty of care over his people and a very particular pact with his military.

Though Dean ascribes some influence in the matter of the hospital to Charles II's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, who had visited the *Hôtel Royal des Invalides* in 1672 and again in 1677, an equal, if not a greater, impetus must have come from the establishment outside Dublin of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II at Kilmainham in 1679 to cater for the needs of the army in Ireland.¹¹ In combination, therefore, the evident need for provision for old soldiers disabled in the state's service, the impressive example set by Louis XIV in founding *Les Invalides* and the awareness that armed forces, if not carefully managed and given due attention could turn on their masters, prompted the king to act. On 8 September 1681 he gave verbal orders to Mr Stephen Fox to establish a hospital for his English army and these instructions were duly formulated into Letters Patent declaring 'An Intention of erecting an Hospital and Appointing of the Pay-Master of the Forces as [its] Treasurer ...' on 22 December 1681.¹²

¹¹ Dean, pp. 23-25.

¹² Hutt, p. 128.

Chapter 1

The Condition of the Soldiers

This chapter sketches in brief the structure of the Army, its command and its political and financial control. It rehearses the proprietorial nature of regimental and company command and the financial imperatives that operated in units which were, fundamentally, run for, or in the hope of, profit. In relation to the other ranks, who were eventually the intended beneficiaries of the Royal Hospital, it examines how they were recruited into the Army, whether voluntarily or by impressment; why they joined and what the physical and age standards for recruits were and how they varied. It comments upon the terms of enlistment and the large expansions of the Army in time of war and the equally dramatic reductions on the return of peace. Although disablement in war was quite likely and not unexpected, the chapter closes by enumerating the duties the Army performed in Great Britain which, even in peacetime, resulted in a constant stream of soldiers becoming eligible for the royal bounty of Chelsea Hospital.

The Standing Army which came into being after the Restoration was very much a royal instrument and looked to the king for both its orders and its financing. The latter was placed on a stable footing by the work of Sir Stephen Fox.¹ The relief in the political nation that followed the peaceful accession of James II, led parliament to grant that monarch extremely generous financial supplies. The advantages he was believed to have taken of this secure financial position to remodel the Army, both by commissioning Roman Catholics, his co-religionists, and by giving signs of wishing to use the force to impose and maintain absolutist government, prompted Parliament to act differently in 1689.² It made

¹ C. Clay, *Public Finance and Private Wealth, The Career of Sir Stephen Fox, 1627-1716* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 40 et seq.

² J. Childs, J., *The Army, James II and the Glorious Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), xviii & p. 22. No more than 209

quite sure, in the settlement following the Glorious Revolution that neither the sovereign nor the soldiers could ever again act independently of its control.³

The control of the Army post-1689 was a very carefully balanced arrangement in which command and the patronage upon which promotion depended was the responsibility of the crown, but in which financial provision, and therefore the size of the forces, rested with parliament. In addition, the proprietorial nature of regimental, company and troop ownership interposed an element of dependence between those who were in nominal or actual command of the soldiers and the two over-arching powers that controlled patronage and money. Officers at all levels were beholden to both their ultimate commander to progress in their profession and their ultimate paymasters to function effectively.⁴

The Army was controlled through the Secretary-at-War who issued orders from the War Office in Whitehall according to instructions that he received from the sovereign. He had no independent directorial function in respect of the use of the Army overseas or in relation to major internal insurrection. He did, however, have some latitude in the movement of regiments within Great Britain in response to requests from magistrates or customs officials needing to suppress civil disorder or smuggling operations.

On occasion the monarch devolved the operational command of the Army to a Captain-General or a Commander-in-Chief. During Queen Anne's reign the appointment of Captain-General was held by the Duke

Roman Catholic officers can be identified out of an officer corps of 1,869 in November 1688.

³ The differences between the financial settlements accorded to James II and William and Mary are well explained in H. Roseveare, *The Financial Revolution, 1660-1760* (London: Longman, 1991), pp. 30-31.

⁴ J. Childs, 'The Army and the State in Britain and Germany in the Eighteenth Century' in J. Brewer, & E. Hellmuth, (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan - The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford: OUP, 1999), pp. 53-70.

of Marlborough until 1711. For part of the reign of George II, it was held by his second son, the Duke of Cumberland, from 1745. After 1757, the office of Captain-General was abolished and the Army's most senior general became Commander-in-Chief. The Secretary-at-War was the conduit through whom these officers exercised administrative control. He also had influence in formulating or defining administrative procedure, but he was not the originator of policy in respect of Army administration. The Secretary was responsible for the presentation and justification of the financial estimates of the Army in the House of Commons, but he had only incidental influence over the operational deployment of forces and he had no responsibility for the purposes for which they were used.⁵

On matters of administrative procedure, the king sought advice from the Board of General Officers, which acted, initially, as the fountainhead and repository of the Army's custom and practice. Matters requiring clarification by precedent, or proposals for changes whose full consequences might not be immediately evident, were directed to the Board, which submitted the conclusions of its deliberations to the king for his decision. Decisions, once made, were unchangeable and, in effect, became codified into a set of 'King's Regulations' that henceforth replaced the ill-defined but infinitely adjustable customs and precedents from which they had emerged.⁶ They were disseminated to officers by the Secretary-at-War. They remained, however, instantly changeable at the king's command.

Officers received their commissions from the monarch and in them were enjoined to obey all commands emanating from those whom the sovereign had set over them. Regimental colonels, often, though not always, officers holding General Officer rank in the Army, held their

⁵ Tony Hayter, *An Eighteenth Century Secretary at War, the Papers of William, Viscount Barrington* (London: The Bodley Head for the Army Records Society, 1988), pp. 14 & 25-29.

⁶ A.J. Guy, *Oeconomy and Discipline, Officership and Administration in the British Army 1714-1763* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 32. Hereafter cited as Guy, *O&D*.

regiments during his pleasure and in the capacity of semi-independent agents. As Guy has pointed out, officers who rose to this rank were a special group in which royal blood, military competence - if not genius - nobility and its associated land ownership and political influence were generously represented. Almost all were soldiers of long service and varied experience and many were members of parliament.⁷ Once appointed it was extremely rare for them to lose their colonelcies, though they could be moved from one regiment to another, usually a more senior one, or one whose management provided a greater potential income. Some retained their colonelcies for very long periods; James Tyrrell was Colonel of the 17th Foot for twenty years and Jasper Clayton retained the 14th Foot for thirty years. Lieutenant-General Philip Anstruther was Colonel of the 26th Foot for forty years and six months.⁸ Though colonels rarely commanded their regiments in the field in person, such long tenures, particularly if their lieutenant-colonels were elderly or not conscientious in their duties, could lead to the deterioration of the regiments. The Duke of Cumberland recommended in 1745 how much it would be to the benefit of the service 'to get rid of useless and worn out officers ... for two worn out Colonels are of no use to us. One is Major-General Johnson, and the other is Sowl, who is now in a madhouse.'⁹ George II's determination to keep strict control of Army appointments, even against his favourite son's wishes, saved these officers from dismissal.

Colonels received operational commands from the king or the Secretaries of State by way of the Secretary-at-War, and monies with which to run their regiments from the Paymaster General, a member of the government answerable to the House of Commons. The internal

⁷ Guy, *O&D*, p. 137.

⁸ N.B. Leslie, *The Succession of Colonels of the British Army from 1660 to the Present Day* (Aldershot: Gale & Polden for The Society for Army Historical Research, 1974).

⁹ Cumberland to Harrington, 20.7.1745 quoted in F.H. Skrine, *Fontenoy and great Britain's Share in the War of the Austrian Succession 1741-1748* (London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1907), p. 235. Lt-Gen John Johnson remained in command of the 33rd Foot until November 1753 having been appointed in 1739. Robinson Sowle died in February 1746 having commanded the 11th Foot only since May 1743.

economy of their regiments was governed only by general rules and warrants which specified the desired outcomes of the administrative process, but which did not, until at the earliest the 1740s, regulate precisely how those outcomes were to be achieved.

In order to administer the financial aspects of their regimental management, colonels employed agents.¹⁰ These men of business held the money that was intended to discharge colonels' administrative functions: principally the provision of the major garments of the uniform clothing, accoutrements and those arms which were not drawn from the Board of Ordnance, and, in the cavalry, the provision of horses. In addition, the agents met the charges for certain elements of administration that were dischargeable out of sums derived from the pay of a number of fictitious privates per company or troop whose names were maintained in the muster rolls. This fund covered advertising for deserters and any charges levied by the gaols in which they may have been held after recapture; recruiting charges and levy money; subsistence money for discharged men to get them home and fees for sea passages of men on recruiting duty. Pay was issued for these non-existent men in order to be devoted to these purposes. The money attributable to one of these men per sub-unit constituted the remuneration that the agent received for his work. After 1716 these payments, rather than being made in respect of fictional names, were paid as allowances officially intended for the purposes to which they were put, into the regimental Non-effective Funds in the infantry, or the Stock Purses in the cavalry. The agents, always based in London or Dublin, acted as the repositories of these funds and paid them out on the orders of the colonels. They also used the money in their custody to provide the regiments with a day-to-day expenses account covering incidentals – printing, hire of baggage wagons, bills for advertising for deserters or recovering them from distant locations and similar expenses. These charges were periodically added up and submitted for reimbursement as a contingent account of unbudgeted expenses to the

¹⁰ I here follow entirely Guy *O&D* chapter 3 who provides the most graceful account of an extremely complex subject yet produced.

War Office. When Parliament approved the contingent accounts for the whole Army, these expenses would eventually be refunded to the agents. By judicious handling of the monies which rested in their hands, agents were able to show a profit on the regimental account which, when all bills were cleared and approved, would become available for distribution to the colonel and the captains of his regiment.

Just as the colonels ran their regiments as businesses, so the captains ran their companies in a similar manner. The money that passed through the captains' hands was the pay of their soldiers. The majority of this pay – in total forty-two pence per week for a private - was sacrosanct and payable to the men to cover the costs of their food, but six pence per week was reserved by the captain to pay for necessaries – 'small clothes', cleaning materials, minor items of kit, shoes and any necessary repairs to weaponry or clothing. Captains were supposed, instantly, to be able to replace any item of a soldier's kit that was lost or had become unusable. Buying such items in quantity and charging them to the soldiers at a slightly higher figure than the unit purchase price could result in a slight profit accruing to the captain. Men who, by extreme care and good fortune, did not run into debt with their captains, were paid what was owing to them every two months. The demands of normal duty, the poor quality of the clothes that they received and the fact that one suit per year worn in all weathers was all the apparel that they had, must have ensured that the majority of men were only very rarely in credit with their captains.

In consequence, it seems likely that the only money most soldiers acquired which they could truly call their own was that which they earned by practicing whatever trades they had before joining the Army. Such work was done both for the regiment – tailoring, mending shoes and suchlike – or for the civilians in whose town they were temporarily resident. The more significant sums, which the captains might receive, derived from the success of the regiment in not having to spend the money available in the Non-Effective Fund or Stock Purse for the purposes for which it was intended, namely recruiting. The resulting

residue would periodically be disbursed to them by way of reward for their careful management of their men. Frequent desertions and the expenses associated with advertising for runaways and paying the gaoler's fees when reclaiming the men, careless control of soldiers leading to claims for breakages in the public houses in which they were quartered, heavy recruiting charges to replace deserters who were not brought back and suchlike expenses would quickly reduce the fund and diminish the potential pay-out.

A very large part of the British Army served in Ireland, which, during the eighteenth century, was largely peaceful. From 1699 the garrison was supposed to consist of 12,000 men not including officers and this force was paid for by the Irish Parliament. The military establishment of that kingdom was used by London to shelter, at another's expense, a strategic reserve of trained troops that could be called upon in case of need, when their places would be taken by raising new units posted onto the Irish establishment to maintain the garrison at 12,000.

Regimental complements in Ireland were kept low in order to maintain the largest possible number of regiments in being so that they could be quickly augmented with men and transferred to Great Britain or the colonies when required. Almost no establishments exist in the War Office papers giving detailed figures of the intended strengths of regiments serving in Ireland, but that for 1728 indicates that troops in regiments of Horse stood at twenty-five troopers as opposed to twenty-eight in England, dragoon companies were only half as strong at twenty-five privates each and infantry companies contained thirty-four privates as opposed to sixty.¹¹ Nevertheless, Ireland accommodated four regiments of Horse, six of dragoons and twenty regiments of Foot comprising twenty-one battalions. Great Britain, including North Britain (Scotland), maintained similar numbers of mounted units, but only about a dozen infantry regiments, though there were in addition seven battalions of Foot Guards and an Invalid Corps.

¹¹ TNA, Establishments, Garrison of Ireland, 1728, WO24/139A.

These distributions between the two kingdoms were maintained during the period under consideration. The British Army was not permitted to recruit in Ireland except during wartime, when permission was given for regiments stationed in the kingdom, but not those on the English establishment, to take up its manpower. There was no restriction on recruiting ex-patriate Irishmen to regiments in Great Britain.

ENLISTMENT

Regiments were recruited by means of a beating order issued by the Secretary-at-War empowering parties to scour either a restricted area or the country as a whole to attract any fit man who was prepared to serve. An officer with an NCO and a small party of other ranks, including a drummer, would literally beat the drum to attract the attention of those who might be interested in joining the Army. Though not laid down officially or expressed in so many words, in the British Army voluntary enlistment in peacetime was for an undefined term. Clode explains this by saying that acceptance of the king's shilling, and the formal, legal attestation that followed it, constituted a commitment to serve for life or until the crown had no further use for the soldier's services.¹² However, throughout the period covered by this study and beyond, various terms of enlistment short of service-for-life existed in fact, though it was unlikely to have been easy to activate release from limited enlistment. In effect, the majority of men who became soldiers effectively handed over their lives to the authorities who would pay, feed, clothe and shelter them in return for their service. Enlistment was as basic as that, and what the recruit received from the agreement was the guarantee of little more than sustenance and an occupation. However extraordinarily bleak this deal may seem, it was, for the lower orders of society, a great

¹² C.M. Clode, *The Military Forces of the Crown, their Administration and Government* (London: John Murray, 2 Vols., 1869), Vol. 2 p. 24. Hereafter cited as Clode, *Military Forces*.

deal more comfortable than the prospects which many enjoyed in civil society.

Dorothy George explains the work options and circumstances of the labouring classes and makes it evident that personal preferences regarding alternatives to work and even what occupation to adopt were not available to this section of society. The putting out of children to work – at a very young age - was something that parents were expected and obliged to do, and a responsibility which the parish authorities would fulfil if parents defaulted on this duty. Apprenticeship to abusive, unskilled, financially unviable and under-employed masters or journeymen, who were supposed to feed, clothe, house and instruct the child for an extended period in return for its labour, gave rise to circumstances in which the Army's assured provision of these necessities was, for some, an attractive option.¹³

Although soldiers were paid, their income, as we have seen, was subject to deductions towards their clothing, food and lodging which meant that little of their pay actually found its way into their own pockets.¹⁴ Not surprisingly in consideration of a choice seemingly so stark, it may be imagined that only those who were unable in any other way to provide for themselves were tempted by the bargain.¹⁵ This argument, however, ignores the hard, boring and financially precarious life that was the lot of the working-man in the eighteenth century. The Army

¹³ M.D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* 2nd Ed., (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1930). In Chapters 4 and 5 George presents an extremely detailed and wide ranging view of the imperatives and difficulties under which the labouring class managed its experience of work.

¹⁴ Guy, *O&D*, pp. 67-69.

¹⁵ Much interesting material on recruitment appears in Chapter 2 Section 2.1 Recruitment in Britain 1700-1916 of R. Floud, K. Wachter & A. Gregory, *Height, Health and History - Nutritional status in the United Kingdom, 1750-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) in which military data are used as the basis for the survey. However, although the period covered extends well into the eighteenth century the paucity of data for the earlier years encourages the authors to assume that data post 1800 apply equally to the period before that date. This thesis illustrates at various points that such assumptions are not valid.

always experienced difficulties in recruiting and was invariably under-strength in respect of its official establishment, but in relation to its peacetime duties it was always able to remain viable. There were, in peacetime, enough men who were attracted by the security which the soldier's life offered, the variety of the work and the frequent changes of habitation that most of the regiments were subject to, as well as the comradeship and the opportunity either to embrace or to avoid responsibility, to make the deal at least acceptable and possibly attractive. One John Mills may have spoken for many when he told recruiting officers in Bristol in 1727 that he desired to become a soldier again 'because the masters were so severe and the wages so low that he could not live by his Trade and that he would rather be such again and not starve and steal'.¹⁶ When compared to the limited geographical mobility available to working people at this period underpinned by the legally enforceable requirement to return to their parish of birth or place of settlement in the event of becoming dependent on poor relief, and the monotony of most employments of a manual type within a thoroughly familiar community that changed at a snail's pace, the Army offered variety and security. It did, of course, also offer escape from parental or working restrictions and from financial and perhaps family responsibilities. Though a majority of recruits would not long have remained seduced by the uniform, the prospect of a new suit of clothes every year was not something that could be guaranteed in civilian life. Though Mills's reasons probably applied quite widely in bad times, it is impossible to believe that it was only those teetering on the brink of a livelihood or having slipped into destitution or some other undesirable circumstance who were attracted to the Army. Regrettably the overwhelming illiteracy of the class that enlisted denies the historian a representative glimpse into its motivation for doing so. The non-availability of choice to labouring males at the age at which they had to commence work and the frequently dismal experience of work in the civilian context may well have contributed to the attraction of actively choosing to be a soldier.

¹⁶ TNA, Secretary-at-War's Out-letter Books, WO4/28, f. 334. Hereafter cited as SaW Out-letters.

Naturally during wartime the friendly persuasion and cajoling of the recruiting parties, which served in peacetime to keep the Army sufficiently up to strength, was not enough to increase the existing regiments to a war footing or to raise more men for new regiments. Peacetime cajolery was honed to even greater perfection in response to having to fill quotas urgently, and trickery and sharp practice were much more in evidence. Corporal Todd recorded the surreptitious slipping of a coin into the hand of an unsuspecting acquaintance by a youth who had himself recently accepted the king's shilling.¹⁷ The recruiter's blandishments were, of course, lent much more attraction by the plentiful dispensing of alcohol to the unwary or the gullible as Todd also records, nor was he above securing potential recruits by encouraging young men to misconstrue assistance which he offered to get them out of one undesirable situation, only to find that they had unwittingly enlisted for the king's service.¹⁸

The decision to serve was not, however, as simple a matter of personal choice as this summary implies. Though voluntary enlistment was, in principle, an absolute in the British Army between 1660 and 1916, in effect this was not at all the case. Men were pressed into the Army formally during all the wars of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Pressing for the Army took place at least as early as the Third Dutch War in 1672.¹⁹ During the Nine Years War, in which Britain participated after the Glorious Revolution had tied her much more firmly into the politics of mainland Europe, armies expanded to unprecedented sizes and their requirement for men had to keep pace. While only 10,972 native-born British troops were allocated to the Low

¹⁷ A. Cormack, A. & A. Jones, (eds), *The Journal of Corporal William Todd, 1745-1762* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2001), p. 109. (Hereafter cited as *Todd's Journal*).

¹⁸ *Todd's Journal*, p. 113.

¹⁹ Clode, *Military Forces*, Vol. 1 p. 61. J. Childs, *The Army of Charles II* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976), p. 214.

Countries for the campaign of 1689, this figure had increased to 68,725 by 1694.²⁰

Voluntary enlistment usually sufficed for a brief period at the start of a war, but it soon became clear that the required numbers could not be attracted in that way in the long term. By 1695 the law for the relief of insolvent debtors had been amended to the effect that no man below the age of forty could be discharged under the Act unless he enlisted in the Army or the Royal Navy or found a substitute.²¹ Almost immediately after the accession of Queen Anne in 1702, similar provisions relating to prisoners for debt of less than one hundred pounds were introduced, the Act stipulated indefinite service for those released under it and subsequent Acts required service for the duration of the war.²² By the winter of 1703 an *Act for raising recruits for the Land Forces and Marines* was passed by parliament and its provisions were repeated with slight amendments in each year of the war until 1711.²³ Enlistment of criminals was also undertaken, the Mutiny Act of 1702 included provision for those pardoned of a capital offence to be handed over to a recruiting officer, a practice that lasted up to 1814.²⁴ Paupers who had committed no offence but who were 'able bodied men as had not any lawful calling or employment or visible means for their maintenance or livelihood' were also subject to enforced enlistment, though they were entitled to a bounty of twenty shillings, while the constables who presented them received ten shillings for each man. Seven Acts of Parliament between 1703 and 1712 reiterated these or similar provisions, though those who had the right to vote in elections, by virtue of

²⁰ J. Childs, *The Nine Years War and the British Army 1688-1697; the operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), pp. 73 & 250.

²¹ Clode, *Military Forces*, Vol. 2, p. 12.

²² The forcible recruiting Acts were 1 Annae c.19 followed by 2 & 3 Annae c. 10.

²³ G. Davies, 'Recruiting in the Reign of Queen Anne', *JSAHR* Vol. XXVIII, 1950, pp. 146-159 citing 2&3 Annae C 13. The Acts were 2 & 3 Annae c. 19 (1703), 3 & 4 Annae c. 11 (1704), 4 Annae c. 10 (1705), 5 Annae c. 15 (1706), 6 Annae c. 10 (1707), 7 Annae c. 2 (1708), 8 Annae c. 5 (1709) and 10 Annae c. 9 (1711).

²⁴ Clode, *Military Forces*, Vol. 2, p.13.

qualifying on grounds other than the ownership of property, were excluded.²⁵ By 1708 bounty had increased to four pounds for volunteers, but those having no lawful employment received nothing, the money instead being shared amongst the constables, the churchwardens administering the Poor Law in the recruit's village or the poor relations of the man being pressed.²⁶

The precedent having been established during the War of the Spanish Succession, recruitment during future wars was always assisted in this way and similar Acts were passed in 1745 and 1746, though up to this point popular enthusiasm had sustained the war against the Spanish and the initial phases of British support for its Imperial allies in Germany.²⁷ At the start of the Seven Years War in 1756 legislation was introduced to enable 'such able-bodied men as do not follow or exercise any lawful calling or employment or have not some other sufficient support and maintenance'²⁸ to be forced into military service. The Act stipulated that service was to be for five years, though in the following year it was reduced to the duration of the conflict.²⁹ The War of the American Rebellion, after it had broadened into a conflict with France, gave rise to similar legislation. The terms of service offered for volunteers in 1778 was three years, but those impressed were engaged for five years. The Act of 1779 required service for the duration and by a later Act these provisions were continued until 1 May 1782.³⁰

Though several of these Acts specified minimum periods of service for both volunteers and pressed men, the procedure for securing release from the Army by individual petition cannot have been simple or automatically enacted at the conclusion of the agreed term. The

²⁵ *ibid*, p. 15.

²⁶ *ibid*, p. 16.

²⁷ 17 Geo II c. 15 and 18 Geo II c. 12.

²⁸ An Act for the Speedy and Effectual Recruiting of His Majesty's Land Forces and Marines (29 Geo II c. 4) which received Royal assent on 9 March 1756.

²⁹ 29 Geo II c. 4 and 30 Geo II c. 8.

³⁰ Clode, *Military Forces*, Vol. 2, pp. 17-19 referring to 19 Geo III c. 10 and 20 Geo III c. 31.

disappearance of regimental papers recording the precise attestation details, and particularly the terms of service for which individual recruits had been engaged, makes it very difficult to present a scenario supported by evidence which illustrates the recognition of limited service in respect of men forced into the Army under the legislation mentioned above. The standard printed attestation papers that came into use from the 1760s, make no mention of limited service.³¹ Clearly, at the end of a war, men serving overseas and whose regiments were to remain in the colonies were unlikely to be released by officers who would have to replace them, and who would also have had to subsist them, perhaps for many months, in their passage back to Great Britain. It seems highly likely that the 'exigencies of the Service' would have outweighed the niceties of strict adherence to any terms of limited service as they applied to particular recruits. No royal proclamations appeared in the *London Gazette* in 1748-49 or in 1763-64 providing for the release of 'limited service only' men from the Army, though this did happen at the end of the American War of Independence. The elaborately printed discharge certificate of Private Michael Hosinger of the Royal Americans, 60th Foot, mentions that he had served seven years 'and being enlisted to serve only during the War, and therefore entitled to his Discharge by the King's Proclamation' he was duly released on 10 October 1783.³²

Regiments which never left the British Isles or which returned home from service in continental Europe at the conclusion of a war would, in the usual shedding of manpower to reduce the corps to its peacetime establishment, have released men in quite close conformity to the terms of service under which they had been conscripted, but regiments

³¹ T. Sime, *The Military Guide for Young Officers* etc (London, 3rd Ed., 1781), p. 208. (Hereafter cited as Sime, *Military Guide*).

³² NAM, 1992-05-54, Discharge Certificate of M Hosinger, 1783. TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/47, f.270 records an interesting exchange between Henry Fox, Secretary-at-War, and Lord Loudoun, then Colonel of the 30th Foot, concerning the enforced release of four soldiers from the latter's regiment, the men, impressed for three years in 1744, having been 'prevail'd upon' by Major Stillingfleet to engage for another three years in 1747, but who demanded their discharges in 1750.

detained overseas would not have been able to do so. Although the experience of military service of many men, whether volunteers or impressed, would have convinced them that they wished to withdraw from the Army as quickly as possible, others would doubtless have become habituated to the military life, and those having no prospects of successful integration back into civilian society may have dreaded the prospect of return to the uncertainties of their former existence and have contrived to remain regardless of their entitlement to discharge.

Enlistment therefore, whether voluntary or forced, never equated with the irrecoverable sacrifice of civilian life. The experience of the British Isles in relation to a permanent military force during the mid-seventeenth century ensured that the British Army in peacetime was kept extremely small in comparison with the forces of its European neighbours. Certainly, the oft-revived conflicts of the dozen decades after 1660 meant that the Army was frequently enormously expanded for a few years, but it was equally hugely reduced once the conflict had passed. It was, however, very rare indeed for the accretion of strength to be entirely dispensed with at the return of peace. Men who entered the Army during wartime therefore always had some expectation that their service would be relatively brief and that they would be discharged at the end of the war, in the case of volunteers, not because their terms of enlistment had been fulfilled, but because their services were no longer required. This is indeed what happened to many.

After 1688, of the regiments raised by William III on the English, Scottish and Irish establishments for the Nine Years War, forty-one were disbanded by 1700.³³ During the Spanish Succession war fourteen regiments of dragoons were raised after 1702 and all were disbanded in 1713. Fifty-four infantry regiments were raised between 1701 and 1709; twelve were retained at the end of the war, but forty-two were disbanded. In terms of numbers, there were 88,995 British troops in pay

³³ Compiled from W. Drenth, *A Regimental list of the Reduced officers for the year 1699 on the English, Scottish and Irish Establishments* (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2013).

in 1711. During 1712 almost 30,000 of these were discharged and a further 35,696 during 1713, though part of these reductions was achieved by transferring regiments out of the English establishment onto the Irish establishment.³⁴ After the peace in 1748, a plan of reduction envisaged the discharge of 36,524 infantry and 4,524 cavalry making a total of 41,048.³⁵ Clearly, these reductions involved very large numbers of men being discharged back into civilian life and it was not only that numbers of regiments disappeared entirely from the establishment, but the establishments of those regiments which were retained were significantly reduced from their war complements. In the infantry this process was usually managed by reducing the number of companies from twelve to ten, but in the mounted units it was achieved by reducing the number of men per troop. Between 1748 and 1749 the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards dropped from fifty per troop to thirty and all of the Dragoon regiments on the English establishment dropped from seventy-five men per troop to thirty-six.³⁶

Losses of soldiers due to injury, incapacity or age nevertheless meant that the Army always sought to retain a proportion of its young and newly-trained manpower whether in old regiments or new formations to make up for those who, though fit at the beginning of a war, had become incapable of effective service by the end of it. Those new-raised regiments that were retained at each peace accounted for part of this retention, but during wars there was a constant influx of men into those regiments that had existed before the war had started. This process was usually achieved by the mechanism of drafting men from regiments that had been formed during the war, but which never entered a theatre of active operations and whose sole, though unstated, function was to act as gathering houses for manpower which would, once collected and

³⁴ *Journals of the House of Commons* 1714, Vol. 17, pp. 546-551.

³⁵ TNA, Army Regulations, 1748, WO123/113, f. 54. The Holland House Papers, BL Add MSS 51378 ff. 86-88 contain a very detailed set of Establishments for Great Britain and Ireland for the year 1748, including a calculation of reductions amounting to 37,137 men across both Establishments.

³⁶ TNA, Establishment for the Guards and Garrisons effective as from 25 December 1748, WO24/279.

partially trained, be allocated elsewhere.³⁷ This was a necessary, though frustrating and unpopular, *modus operandi* because the officers of regiments on active service overseas could not recruit for their own companies and therefore required others to do the job for them. An attempt was made during the War of the Austrian Succession to retain recruiting companies in Britain from those regiments sent abroad, to serve them with recruits, but the experiment was not deemed a success and was not repeated during the Seven Years War.³⁸ Men joining new-raising regiments therefore might find themselves, at the termination of a war, still with the corps into which they had first entered and find that their regiment would be broken and they returned to civilian life, or they might find themselves in a different unit, either one of the pre-war, permanent regiments or one of the newly-raised ones that was retained on the establishment after the war. Even so, some men were almost always discharged from both the old and the newly-retained regiments because establishments – the number of men officially maintained by a regiment - were reduced to a peacetime level so as to increase the number of regiments within the Army, whilst at the same time satisfying the British parliament's desire to pay for as few soldiers as were considered capable of fulfilling the functions required of the Army.³⁹

RECRUITS

³⁷ A.J. Guy, (ed), *Colonel Samuel Bagshawe and the Army of George II 1731-1762* (London: The Bodley Head for the Army Records Society, 1990). Hereafter cited as Guy, *Bagshawe*. Bagshawe's 93rd Foot was obliged to relinquish men to drafting orders on three occasions. Within sixteen months it was deprived of 515 Men, p. 203.

³⁸ C.T. Atkinson, 'Jenkin's Ear, the Austrian Succession War and the 'Forty-Five – Gleanings from sources in the Public Record Office' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXII, 1943/4, p. 282. (Hereafter cited as *JSAHR*.)

³⁹ Compiled from Establishments TNA, WO24 giving the typical complements of a unit on active service and the same unit two years later on a peace establishment.

Though the Army had to be a great deal less selective in its recruits during wartime, in years of peace recruiting officers were given detailed instructions as to the specification of the manpower that was acceptable and that which was not. As men taken in by recruiting parties could be rejected when they arrived at the regiment, it behoved the officer to send in only those who were definitely acceptable. The recruiting officer's self-interest dictated this, because he was responsible for refunding into the regimental purse monies laid out in bounty and necessaries – the basic clothing kit issued immediately after attestation - for any recruit who was rejected.⁴⁰ The physical standards of recruits varied between the different branches of the service and also varied over time and location. Recruits for the Highland Independent Companies, later the Black Watch, were acceptable at five feet six inches without shoes in 1725⁴¹, but five feet eight inches was the minimum recommended for the Marching regiments in 1742 with another inch being required for the Foot Guards and five feet ten inches being recommended for the Horse and Dragoons.⁴² Two years later it was stated that no one, whether volunteer or impressed man, was to be taken at under five feet five inches⁴³ and that the largest men were to be reserved for the Marching regiments in England and in continental Europe, the second size men to go to regiments stationed in Gibraltar, Minorca and North America and the third size men to be allocated to the Marine Regiments of Foot. These stipulations regarding the distribution of men of different sizes could only apply under the system that operated during the Austrian War of pooling recruits and then allocating them according to height. The normal method of regimental recruiting, and any drafts which

⁴⁰ B. Cuthbertson, *System for the Interior Management and Economy of a Battalion of Infantry* (Bristol: 1776). (Cited hereafter as Cuthbertson.) Cuthbertson's own period of active soldiering went back as far as 1749 and he was Adjutant of the 5th Foot for twelve years from 1755, so the wisdom which he imparted in his book reflected the practice and accumulated experience of the mid century. I am grateful to Dr. J.A. Houlding for these career details.

⁴¹ D. Anderson, 'The Earliest Appearance of the Black Watch' *JSAHR*, Vol. XVIII, p. 16.

⁴² *JSAHR*, Vol. XVI p. 120 Note on Recruiting Standard, 1742. Floud *et al*, *Height, Health and History* p. 63 were clearly unaware of this reference.

⁴³ *JSAHR*, Vol. XX, p. 59 Note on Recruiting Districts in 1744.

might be taken from regiments, naturally resulted in men of varying sizes being transferred into the receiving regiments. Attributes other than height were specified, and Simes reproduces a typical recruiting instruction during peacetime:

*You must Inlist no man ...who has not straight limbs, broad shoulders, a good face, and every way well made. Neither must you Inlist any man who cannot wear his own hair, who is thin, or has the least defect in his knees ... a man who is subject to fits, or has any appearance of a rupture, broken bones, sore legs, scald head, ulcers or running sores ... old wounds ill cured, or any infirmity in body or limb, will not be approved of ...*⁴⁴

Given the absolute necessity amongst all troops, mounted or on foot, of being able to tear firearms' cartridges open with their teeth, the lack of stated qualifications in that particular is surprising. As the eighteenth century progressed, the Army sought to take recruits in their late teenage years or early twenties and Captain Bennett Cuthbertson recommended recruits between the ages of seventeen to twenty-five years as making 'the most tractable Soldiers'. He was firm in believing that men over thirty years of age were to be avoided. He did concede, however, that 'In time of war, the difficulty in raising a sufficient number of Men, makes it necessary to dispense with many niceties, in regard to Size and Figure.'⁴⁵ Such dispensations are very evident from the records of those discharged to the Royal Hospital, Chelsea and, though by approximately 1760, the Army appears to have realized that war was a young man's occupation and that quality, in the form of youth and the presumed physical fitness that went with it, were essential, such considerations had clearly not been as prominent in officers' minds in the earlier decades of the century. Officers at the time, and scholars now, have nevertheless to exercise care in their assessments of the age of soldiers for, as Cuthbertson affirmed, 'Recruits so often vary in the accounts they give of their age ... that it very highly concerns

⁴⁴ Sime, *Military Guide* p. 206. A complete recruiting instruction for 1760 appears in Guy, *Bagshawe*, pp. 210-212.

⁴⁵ Cuthbertson, p. 56.

the Recruiting officers, to depend more on a Man's looks for determining his age, than on what he calls himself: the common people are in general so ignorant on this point, that it is absurd to take a peasant's word for being only twenty-five, when his appearance ... bespeaks him to be many years advanced beyond that age ...⁴⁶ The Chelsea Registers commonly have references to men who clearly had no accurate idea of their ages; Robert Yearly of the Royal Irish Regiment stated his age as forty-two and that he had served thirty years having joined up at age fourteen.⁴⁷ Trooper Archibald McNeal was pensioned with a declared age of sixty having served thirty years, but accounted for the fact that he had no previous occupation by the phrase 'went from School to the Army'.⁴⁸ He clearly had no accurate idea of his age or probably his service.

As Houlding has demonstrated, soldiering in the eighteenth century was a calling quite unlike that which it became during the nineteenth century.⁴⁹ The construction of barracks from the 1790s onwards, and the introduction of a permanent police force from the 1830s, changed the profession radically. Before these changes, and when soldiers were not actively on campaign, their time was occupied with much that had little to do with readying them for fighting. One of the principal activities for those stationed in the British Isles was simply moving around the country. All regiments, mounted and foot, with the exception of the Household Cavalry and the Foot Guards were Marching Regiments. They had no permanent stations – barracks, depots or garrison posts – and they led a peripatetic life, circulating round the country, sometimes in response to civil disturbances, but quite often not in reaction to any specific operational requirement. This mode of life was part of the legacy of the suspicion of a Standing Army and a reluctance to see the presence of troops as a permanent feature in any particular locality for an extended period of time. The forces in England were, in fact, so small

⁴⁶ *ibid*, p. 59.

⁴⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 14.12.1730, DB 1005.

⁴⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 31.5.1745, DB 12999.

⁴⁹ J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), Chapter I.

that regiments were spread very thinly around the country and were very infrequently seen in certain counties – Wales, the north-west, Norfolk and Lincolnshire rarely saw soldiers in any numbers, but the main arteries of travel – the Great North Road, the road between London, Bristol and the far west, the route to Ireland via Liverpool – were never without a red coat.

Nevertheless, what soldiers were called upon to do during their peacetime service could take its toll on the fitness of men and lead to those no longer capable of these duties being recommended to Chelsea Hospital. An analysis by categories of injury or other disability will be presented in Chapter 5, but it was a regular occurrence for men to be recommended to Chelsea as a result of wear and tear, which had little to do with fighting the king's enemies. Superannuation was a particular factor which requires detailed analysis, but accidents and injuries received in the course of normal duties or fatigues contributed to many men becoming incapable of further service. Houlding defines the common duties and activities of soldiers during peacetime as: policing, aid to the Civil Power and the suppression of riot and public disorder; assistance to the Customs service in the suppression of smuggling and owling – the carrying of contraband goods inland from the coast; moving from place to place in the course of duty, an inseparable part of which was the transporting of the entire regimental archives and its reserve of spare clothing, weaponry and officers' baggage; working on road building and other public or fortification work; and training at whatever level of military usefulness the degree of concentration of the regiment permitted. To these may be added: escorts, particularly those required to carry the king out to Hanover or back from Kent to London and other members of the royal family elsewhere; the recruiting service; and the chasing of deserters or their collection from custody.

Almost all of these activities gave rise to circumstances in which injury, of greater or lesser severity but all contributing to a decline in

serviceability, might take place. Private Blinman⁵⁰ of Whetham's Foot had his skull fractured by rioters in Glasgow, where Thomas Ogilvie⁵¹ of Handasyde's Foot had his forehead cut open by stones hurled by the mob. Sergeant Boswell Dick⁵² was stabbed during a riot in Bristol and Moses Lindsay⁵³ was beaten about the head with a brickbat in Dublin. James Farrell⁵⁴ was shot in the groin during a riot in Limerick. In pursuit of smugglers, Private William Wild⁵⁵ had 'his nose beat almost flat' and Thomas Carey⁵⁶ was beaten about the head and Corporal of Dragoons James Hudson⁵⁷ suffered leg injuries, from oars in smugglers' hands. Dragoon William Cam was mortally wounded by smugglers near Hadleigh in Essex in April 1735 and his three comrades were wounded and two of their horses killed.⁵⁸

Building roads in the Highlands of Scotland led to William Mayson⁵⁹ straining his back, which was also the cause of injury to James East⁶⁰ of Harrison's Foot, while Henry Sarratt's⁶¹ disablement resulted from the botched treatment of an injury sustained in blasting rocks for Wade's roads. The frequent requirement to load and unload baggage wagons during regimental marches resulted in ruptures and crush injuries. Edward Ladd⁶² received serious head injuries 'by a baggage wagon going over him' and John Baldwin⁶³ was 'quite disabled' by a wagon overturning on top of him. Hugh Lawry⁶⁴ ruptured himself by lifting a chest of arms into a wagon in St. Albans and William Miller⁶⁵ of 7th Dragoons similarly injured himself lifting baggage. Cavalrymen were

⁵⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.1.1729, DB 4031.

⁵¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.8.1734, DB 4416.

⁵² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 9.2.1736, DB 5200.

⁵³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 10.2.1736, DB 5279.

⁵⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 5.10.1736, DB 6674.

⁵⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 9.1.2.1730, DB 380.

⁵⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 16.12.1729, DB 2284.

⁵⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.2.1736, DB 5051.

⁵⁸ London Gazette, No. 7401, 10-13 May 1735.

⁵⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 9.1.1730, DB 376.

⁶⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 5.2.1730, DB 523.

⁶¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 15.6.1731, DB 1163.

⁶² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.12.1729, DB 2237.

⁶³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.4.1734, DB 4290.

⁶⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 10.2.1736, DB 5275.

⁶⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 17.5.1739, DB 7567.

often rendered unfit in the process of either riding, schooling or looking after their mounts. Horse Grenadier Nathaniel Curry⁶⁶ developed a running sore after his left leg was bruised by his falling horse. His comrade Symond Vials⁶⁷ received internal bruising leading to spitting of blood when his horse threw him and then trod on him. Captain Saville of the 3rd Troop of Horse Guards asserted that Private Gentleman Francis Loxley⁶⁸ was 'carried off for dead' after his horse had fallen on him and thereafter he was no longer capable of duty. Horse Grenadier John Powell⁶⁹ was seized in the right side by his horse which 'bit him ... lifted him from ye ground and tore some of his flesh from him'.

Even when performing extremely familiar drill or guard duty, soldiers could injure themselves severely. John Mitchell⁷⁰ of 3rd Foot Guards disabled his left hand when his firelock went off while he was removing the charge and Thomas Eaton⁷¹ lost his right thumb in the same way. George Moreton⁷² of Hawley's Dragoons was cut across the tendons of his right hand by his right-hand comrade as they were drawing their swords at exercise. Alexander Stuart's left leg was quite disabled by an accident with a bayonet⁷³ and Henry Speller⁷⁴ was disabled in the right hand with a bayonet at exercise.

The policing of public events in London, which was a common duty for the Foot Guards, was not without danger, however celebratory the occasion. Guardsman John Dowler⁷⁵ was stabbed while policing the Prince of Orange's wedding to Princess Anne in 1734, as was James Dew⁷⁶ of the 1st Foot Guards at the Coronation in 1727, where Thomas

⁶⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.12.1730, DB 923.

⁶⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 18.3.1728, DB 6137.

⁶⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 22.4.1736, DB 6405.

⁶⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.7.1738, DB 7308.

⁷⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.5.1735, DB 4808.

⁷¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.1.1728, DB 6125.

⁷² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.8.1740, DB 9406.

⁷³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 21.1.1737, DB 6772.

⁷⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 9.9.1746, DB 14940.

⁷⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 10.5.1738, DB 7233.

⁷⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 3.12.1729, DB 2462.

Dobinson⁷⁷ of the same regiment had his eye poked out by the crowd and Edward Gore⁷⁸ of the 3rd Foot Guards also lost an eye in a scuffle. Despite the Princess Royal paying for treatment for Private Gentleman Francis Jones⁷⁹ of the 4th Troop of Horse Guards, whose horse threw him during an escort, he was incurable and was pensioned in January 1737. Horse Grenadier Samuel Hardwin⁸⁰ was disabled by his horse falling on him when he was guarding the King's Strong Box 'when [he] came last from Hanover'.

It is clear therefore that soldiering in peacetime during the eighteenth century was replete with circumstances that, either of themselves alone, or in combination with age, ailments, wounds or unavoidable medical conditions, brought soldiers to a state in which they were no longer able to serve. A detailed statistical analysis of all of these factors, and including injuries received in combat with the king's enemies, forms Chapter 5 in this study. It is evident, however, that the proprietorial management of regiments and companies encouraged the retention of men for as long as possible, so that the Non-effective fund, from which the officers hopefully drew the dividend for their careful management of their units, could be maintained at the highest level possible. In brief therefore this chapter has shown how soldiers entered, passed through and came to the point at which they were about to leave the Army.

It is time now, however, to go back to the origins of the Hospital and examine what happened to the soldier after the decision had been made to discharge him and to see what manner of provision was made for him when he became an invalid and received his recommendation to the king's bounty of Chelsea Hospital.

⁷⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 17.3.1730, DB 595.

⁷⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 9.1.1730, DB 212.

⁷⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.1.1737, DB 6806.

⁸⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.7.1737, DB 6930.

Chapter 2

The Pension starts

The Out-pension of Chelsea Hospital started as a temporary measure pending the completion of the buildings intended to receive those old soldiers who were deemed qualified for its benefits. It quickly became clear that the accommodation planned would be insufficient for all those eligible to receive it. The large increase in British commitment to continental European wars following the Glorious Revolution only served to exacerbate this mis-match of demand-against-resource and resulted in the Out-pension becoming a permanent feature of Chelsea's provision. The Spanish Succession War added to this problem and gave rise to a 'crisis of doubt' on the part of Government concerning the permanent and increasing need for the charity that the Hospital was intended to offer. Administrative malpractice, or the suspicion of it, added to these doubts. The succession of the Hanoverian dynasty with a more realistic view of the responsibilities of a modern nation, matched with improvements in administration and the advent of an era of political stability under the Whigs, placed the Hospital's proceedings on an even administrative and financial foundation, which it had struggled to maintain during the previous two decades of war.

Despite the large amount of money and the careful consideration that had gone into the setting up of the Hospital, it became evident within less than a decade of its foundation that the institution would not be able to accommodate all those who had a reasonable claim to its benefits. Despite this, it is clear that little thought had been given to the management of those who could not be received into the building itself. Because the hospital was to take much longer to build than anticipated, a system of paying sums to qualified individuals who were not yet resident was put into operation from the earliest days. This had the effect of encouraging any prospective residents – In-pensioners - many

of whom were bound to be disappointed, to linger in the village of Chelsea and environs in order to be at hand when entrants were first admitted. It also ensured that they were conveniently situated to collect whatever out-door relief was distributed by the Hospital before its buildings could be brought into use. These discharged soldiers sought quarters in the inns and taverns of the area and were subsisted by the landlords, largely on credit, in the expectation of eventual payment.

The first regulations governing relief payments in lieu of hospital places were instituted by James II in a royal warrant dated 1 January 1686.¹ This document, which also dealt with compensation payments for wounded and disabled officers and payments to the widows of all ranks, laid down different daily rates of pension according to both the rank of the claimant and the type of unit in which he had served. It was anticipated that soldiers 'that are or shall be disabled by wounds in fight or other accidents in the service of the Crown, are to be provided for in the Royall Hospital ... in such manner as his Majesty shall hereafter direct; *and in the meantime*² are to receive the allowances following' from the Hospital's funds:

Infantry Private	5d
Corporals and Drummers	7d
Infantry Sergeant	11d
Trooper of the Horse Guards	18d
Trooper of Light Horse	12d
Corporal of Light Horse	18d
Private of Dragoons	6d
Corporal of Dragoons	8d
Master Gunner	14d
Gunner	7d

These provisions were also to apply to those who were, or would become, unfit for duty after twenty years service. It is interesting to note

¹ Hutt, p. 146.

² Author's italics.

that at this point in the Hospital's history members of the artillery service, which was the responsibility of the Board of Ordnance were also included.

The operative words '... in the meantime ...' effectively established the Out-pension, though the warrant implies that this provision would be temporary and that those qualified would eventually occupy places within the House, once the buildings were completed. It is not clear, however, whether, on admission, these payments would continue or cease, and that board, lodging and clothing would be the extent of the state's beneficence to In-pensioners. No mention was made as to how these payments were to be made, how frequently, whether in instalments or whether in arrears or in advance.

Thirteen months later, on completion of the first phase of building, a detailed statement of the hospital's dependents was produced.³ It provided a record of 522 soldiers, including all of the ranks and types in the list above, who were at that time in receipt of payments in lieu of accommodation and of 104 candidates whose pretensions to a place or a pension had been entered in the Muster Master General's office in order that they might fill vacancies arising from deaths in the first group. Even at this early period in the Hospital's existence it is clear that admission to pension brought with it a continuing liability to service in the various garrisons of the kingdom if the soldier was considered capable of such duty. Thirteen of the first group were deemed fit and recommended for garrison service and a further twenty-nine NCOs and Men (twenty at Berwick and nine at Carlisle) were considered settled in those places and unlikely to claim their places in the Hospital. Their pay as members of the garrisons acted as a substitute for the Out-pensions to which they were entitled. The purpose of the report was to request that instructions be given to the Muster Master General not to admit any more soldiers to the waiting list until all those presently on it should have been accommodated or eliminated by death. Five hundred and ninety-seven men were therefore occupying quarters in proximity to

³ Hutt, pp. 177-179

Chelsea awaiting admission, though those on the waiting list were not in receipt of any provision for their support.

The money with which to build the Hospital and from which to pay its running costs was provided largely by the ingenious expedient of making the Army pay for its own welfare. From 17 May 1683, Charles II had authorized that one-third of the Poundage - a deduction of twelve pence from every pound expended in the pay of the Land Forces - i.e. four pence in every pound, should be devoted to the expenses of the Hospital.⁴ This proportion was increased to two-thirds from 17 March 1684⁵ and on the same day, a levy of a shilling per pound was ordered to be collected from both the vendor and the purchaser of any commission that exchanged hands by sale throughout the Army. The entire proceeds were to be reserved for the use of the Hospital.⁶ Further supplies were forthcoming in the form of one day's pay per year from every officer and soldier of the Army from 17 June 1684.⁷ In the following reign, profits arising from the sale of licences to drivers of Hackney carriages were added to the fund.⁸ In 1693 the sum deriving from the poundage taken from the pay of the Forces was fixed at £12,000.⁹

These sources of income continued to form the foundation of the money upon which the Hospital maintained itself and its work into the following century. Warrants for the deduction of these monies appear on the last pages of every establishment authorized for the Land Forces paid out of the British Exchequer, but not for those paid for by the Irish Exchequer. Despite this guaranteed income, the sums proved inadequate to the Hospital's responsibilities, and from early in the War of the Spanish Succession additional sources of income had to be found to enable its income to balance its expenditure.

⁴ Hutt, pp. 133-135

⁵ Hutt, p. 135

⁶ Hutt, p. 136

⁷ Hutt, p. 136

⁸ Hutt, p. 141

⁹ Hutt, p. 206

By 1690 the pensions at the various sums mentioned above were being paid to the pensioners 'in their quarters' outside the Hospital on a weekly basis.¹⁰ Building work had progressed to the extent that it was certain that the accommodation would be sufficient for 472 In-pensioners only,¹¹ and as 579 soldiers were at that time receiving out-relief from the Hospital, it became evident that the Out-pension would be a permanent feature of the way Chelsea Hospital dealt with the calls upon its services.

It was not until late January 1692 that the first batch of In-pensioners was received into the Hospital. Sixty soldiers were recorded as resident on 4 February and a further thirty-nine were added shortly afterwards. Deane reckons that the full complement was present by 28 March, citing that day as the first upon which provisions were issued.¹²

From this point, records relating to the reception of invalids by the Hospital and its conversion of them into In or Out-pensioners become extremely sparse. The extended period of conflict in which England was embroiled after 1689 called for unprecedented numbers of troops, firstly to make secure William III's seizure of the country from his father-in-law, and secondly to pursue his policies against the expansionist tendencies of France. The establishment of military forces of 1 April 1689 called for more than 30,000 British troops and six months later almost 50,000 were deemed necessary.¹³ By 1694 in excess of 68,000 were demanded for deployment at home and in Flanders.¹⁴ The armies

¹⁰ Hutt, p. 187 citing State of the Hospital ... Coxe Mss

¹¹ Hutt, pp. 50 - 53 citing the Earl of Ranelagh's report of 5 March 1689/90. In March 1692 when the first In-pensioners entered the Hospital 476 were accommodated. During Queen Anne's reign this dropped to 470, but returned to 476 from 1713 to 1816.

¹² C.G.T. Deane, *The Royal Hospital Chelsea* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1950), p. 130. Hereafter cited as Deane. The document that he describes appears no longer to survive.

¹³ J. Childs, *The Nine Years War and the British Army* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), p. 72. Hereafter cited as Childs, 9YW.

¹⁴ Childs, 9YW, p. 250.

engaged in the Nine Years War grew to enormous sizes and commonly exceeded the capacity of their nations to sustain them. Details of the casualties they suffered are hard to come by and, in respect of the forces commanded by William III, it is impossible, usually, to disentangle the English wounded from those sustained by the rest of the Allied host. The battle of Steenkirk in 1692 gave rise to between 2,500 and 3,500 Allied wounded. The Earl of Angus's 'Cameronian' Regiment had 109 wounded out of 600 soldiers present. The battle of Landen in the following year saw no less than 12,000 Allied soldiers similarly injured. Of the thirteen British battalions engaged in the action at the Heights of Bouge in July 1695, 921 men fell, two-thirds of them being wounded.¹⁵

Casualties such as these, even if quite a high proportion of the men died after removal to hospital, must have resulted in considerable numbers of invalids eventually finding their way back to London with recommendations to the Royal Hospital. Such is the paucity of records, however, that Hutt in his exhaustive compilation of statistics relating to the men and the money of the Hospital was unable to give any figures indicative of the burden that it was obliged to shoulder between 1692 and 1699.¹⁶ In his study of medical provision to the Army between 1660 and 1714, von Arni accounts for 799 British casualties who were admitted to St. Bartholomew's Hospital in London between 1689 and 1697 to continue their cures.¹⁷ It is clear, however, that it cannot be assumed that all of these men were rendered *hors de combat* while on active operations, as the nature of their injuries or disablements is not specified. Furthermore, many of them came from the Foot Guards and the Household Cavalry, a large proportion of whose men remained in London on ceremonial and policing duties and did not serve abroad. Though it cannot be known how many of these referred men were recommended to Chelsea, many of them were sufficiently restored in health either to return to duty or to take advantage of the king's bounty, as only four out of the entire number were recorded as having died at St.

¹⁵ Childs, *9YW*, pp. 204, 241 & 283.

¹⁶ Hutt, pp. 19 & 83.

¹⁷ E.G. von Arni, *Hospital Care and the British Standing Army 1660-1714* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 103-105 & Appendix D.

Bartholomew's. Unfortunately so much of the data that would enable them to be assessed as potential Chelsea pensioners is missing, that the sample is worthless in assisting to draw any conclusions regarding the numbers of men with whom the Chelsea Commissioners had to deal. All that should be noted is that thirty-seven men were referred to St. Bartholomew's Hospital by the Royal Hospital's surgeon as being cases inappropriate to the institution's own infirmary.¹⁸

Though their numbers are unknown, casualties from the war certainly found their way back to London and the Hospital Commissioners duly took responsibility for them. By January 1699 the sum of £1,300 was outstanding in payments for the quarters of the Out-pensioners living around the hospital and a warrant to pay off that debt was accordingly authorized.¹⁹ Financial problems in dealing with the disabled continued and, indeed, were of some long-standing. The Commissioners appointed by Queen Anne at the start of her reign were obliged to report to the Lord Treasurer after the meeting on 6 May 1703 that a residue of Out-pensioners from the war that had ended in 1698 had received no money since 1 July 1696. This group was made up of seventy-eight pensioners on the twelve pence a day rate, seven sergeants at nine pence, five soldiers at six pence, eight 'old Roman Catholicks' at four pence and all of them, except the one-shilling men, were stated to be owed allowances for clothes. Though the burden had declined over the years because thirty-one of the shilling men and all but one of the sergeants had died, as had all of the soldiers and five of the Catholics, nevertheless because the pension was paid in arrears and because credit had been extended to these men until the dates of their deaths, 'near £5,000 or thereabouts ... is owing to the inhabitants of Westminster and Chelsea who have supported them since 1696 in expectation of their pensions'. The Board advised that it was unable to meet this debt,

¹⁸ This early reference makes it evident that the Hospital at Chelsea never was primarily a medical facility, cf. Eccles, A., *Vagrancy in Law and Practice under the Old Poor Law* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 76.

¹⁹ Hutt, p. 210.

adding that the continuing annual charge for the surviving fifty-one men was £889.13.9 plus the charges to clothe them.²⁰

Despite the fact that this overlooked residue of pensioners existed, it appears that the management of those disabled in the Nine Years War had been very carefully controlled. Apart from the In-pensioners, 600 qualified Out-pensioners were maintained in the four Invalid companies, which existed at that time and were paid out of the annual Army estimates as active troops and were not therefore maintained at the Hospital's expense. The fifty-one unaccounted with Out-pensioners were therefore the only element of all the casualties from the war who were still the Hospital's responsibility. Though it seems surprising after such a long and bloody war, the Hospital by 1703 had fewer than 1,200 actual or potential claimants on its books, the entirety of the Out-pensioners being the fifty-one men still quartered in the locality. This position was to change very quickly, however. The convenience of deferring pension provision by placing men in the Invalid companies was partially dismantled by the halving of the complement of those companies from 150 men each to seventy-five. Though an attempt was made to dispose of the men by paying them one pound travelling money to permit them to return to their homes, the former Invalids petitioned the Lord Treasurer for re-admission to their Out-pensions and the Commissioners supported their appeal.²¹ Nineteen men were admitted to the Hospital as In-pensioners and thirty-five were re-allocated to vacancies in the companies. One hundred and seventy-three privates with two sergeants and three corporals were directed to be taken onto the Out-pension and the Board was instructed that no more soldiers were to be admitted to the Hospital's care or into the

²⁰ Archives of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea (hereafter cited as RHC), Board Minutes, HIST 51, from 24 February 1702/3, f. 2.

²¹ RHC, Board Minutes 3.3.1703 & 16.7.1703, HIST 51, ff. 1 & 2. This very early reference conflicts with Nielsen's statements in Out-pensioners Chapter 4 Section 2 that Invalids discharged from their companies were re-examined by the Commissioners. Such men were usually so broken down that any necessity to re-examine their eligibility for pension would have been entirely superfluous.

Invalid companies without a direction signed by the Captain-General, the Lord Treasurer or the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury.²²

In spite of the disappearance of the Chelsea admission books for the period of the War of the Spanish Succession, it is nonetheless important to get some idea of the numbers of invalids who potentially made up the body of Out-pensioners, because it was alleged at the end of the war that the numbers admitted to the pension had been grossly inflated to the benefit of those who had falsified the books. The system whereby soldiers' discharge certificates and recommendations to the Royal Hospital had first to be registered at the War Office provides a means of doing so, since, periodically, the Secretary-at-War forwarded to the Commissioners of the Hospital batches of this documentation in order to initiate examinations. He also acted as the conduit through which recommendations, often directly from the queen or from the Duke of Marlborough, were communicated to the Chelsea Board. From both sources these recommendations could either be a simple request to examine the pretensions of an individual and admit him if found qualified, or a notification that an individual who was already an Out-pensioner be promoted, usually from the basic pension of five pence to a sergeant's pension of nine pence or to the top scale as a corporal of Light Horse at one shilling and six pence per day. This system of recording candidates at the War Office does not appear to have been formalized until late 1704 or early 1705.

Before that time, during the first few years of the war, petitions for pension with recommendations were sent directly to the Captain-General, the Duke of Marlborough. The Blenheim Papers contain several such recommendations and petitions. Adam Colhoun besought the next vacant lieutenancy in an Invalid company and, pending its provision, a shilling a day on the Out-pension having 'served twenty years and in the last three years having been afflicted with a great deal

²² RHC, Board Minute, HIST 51, 4.9.1703

of sickness'.²³ Holcroft Blood recommended Richard Davenport who, aged twenty-two, had lost a leg after one year's service. The Captain-General annotated the paper 'Take care that he be put into Chelsea Hospital'. William Davies of Temple's Foot, almost blind, petitioned Marlborough in March 1704 for a place at Chelsea promising that if 'Ever I am Recovered Yr. Grace's Petitioner will immediately Returne to the Army & Pray to Your Grace's Health, wealth and Honor for Ever'.²⁴ Sergeant James Shipley, having already been accepted by Chelsea, petitioned that his wife be made a nurse there, citing in justification 'her Majesty's Gracious Bounty which is only sufficient to support yr poor Petitioner and his family being very poor' with which his commanding officer agreed, endorsing the petition 'I think the petition is very reasonable if His Grace thinks fit to order it.'²⁵

Nevertheless from 1705 it is possible roughly to reconstruct the Admissions Registers through the Secretary-at-War's Out-letters. In order to calculate accurately the financial burden that the Out-pension constituted however, it is necessary to know at what grade invalids entered the system or, in the case of promotions, at what grade they finally settled. The records of admissions that survive are insufficient to enable this to be calculated with exactness, though some calculations and computations of the various ranks and branches of service from which the pensioners came are available for some years, though not all.²⁶ The unrefined statistics that follow therefore are based upon the numbers of invalids that appear in the letters forwarding certificates to the Commissioners. These letters, after 1708, very often list the individuals concerned, usually give the rank of those who were above the simple Private Sentinel and normally state the regiments in which

²³ British Library, Blenheim Papers, Add. Ms 61,299, f. 4th January 1703.

²⁴ This plea for assistance shows all the characteristics described in T. Sokoll, 'Old Age in Poverty: The Record of Essex Pauper Letters, 1780-1834', p. 131 in T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, (eds) *Chronicling Poverty - the voices and strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997).

²⁵ BL, Blenheim Papers, Add. Ms 61,299, ff. 4 - 44, January 1703 to Autumn 1704.

²⁶ *Journals of the House of Commons* (hereafter cited as JHC) Vol. XVII, pp. 186-188.

they served. In the early years of the war, however, many of these details are not given and sometimes not even the names of those concerned or the numbers being dealt with; the Secretary's letters merely saying 'I send you the enclosed certificates of Persons that have been disabled in the Service ...'. There are also considerable gaps in the series. There are no referrals at all before late March 1705 and there are substantial gaps between late March and late June 1710; early February and late August 1711 and again between September and the end of November in that year. The whole of the record covering January to July 1712 is missing and the record ends completely after late November 1712. These are significant breaks, as it is inconceivable that no men would have been sent home wounded during these periods from any of the theatres of war and there must also have been men returning from distant parts after November 1712 - the garrison of Dunkirk for example - who were qualified and had been recommended.

Other problems in the interpretation of this material arise from the fact that it is not absolutely certain that all of those recommended were actually taken onto the pension, though it seems highly likely that many, probably the great majority, were. It seems safe to assume that most were only relatively recently wounded and their despatch to England must be indicative that it was not anticipated that they would quickly, or perhaps ever, return to a condition in which they could resume active soldiering. There is, however, no confirmation of this, as the lists never indicate how the individual had become a casualty. It is also impossible to know the numbers of those who, having been received into the Hospital's care, all of them initially as Out-pensioners, subsequently succumbed to their wounds or illnesses and who therefore ceased to be a charge upon the pension. Similarly, it is possible that a few did indeed recover sufficient health and vigour to return to the fray. Indeed, for a few, but only a very few, the Hospital acted as a provider of medical care and rest that was sufficient to rehabilitate them.

Even with so many caveats, it is possible to get some sort of estimate of the numbers involved and the rapid increase in candidates while the

war was in progress. It does not appear possible to make any calculation of those who, the war over, were eligible for the pension on the basis of expired service or superannuation rather than injury or disablement. The frenetic activity in the War Office in 1712, conducted by those who were still, because of the change in Government, getting used to the procedure and the volume of work, tends to indicate that many matters were deferred or were not properly attended to and that demobilization was achieved at a very fast pace. It is improbable that all of those who might legitimately have had a claim on the royal bounty were properly dealt with.

Nevertheless the statistics shown in Appendix 2-1 indicate that between 1705 and 1712 almost 4,000 men certainly lodged their certificates in the Secretary-at-War's office for onward transmission to Chelsea. This number clearly gave great concern to the government, which appears to have taken the view that it was unimaginable that so many recommendations could have been made. By August 1712, despite a parliamentary vote of £60,000 for the expenses of the Royal Hospital including the Out-pension and the Invalid companies, the Lord High Treasurer was concerned that this sum would be insufficient²⁷ and this conclusion prompted a recommendation that the sums paid in pensions to individuals be reduced, and that a review of all of those claiming Out-pension be undertaken in order to reduce the overall number.²⁸

His concerns had been confirmed by a report compiled by the Comptrollers of the Accounts of the Army and presented to the House of Commons on 14 April 1712.²⁹ This arose from questions posed by the Lord High Treasurer on taking office early in the previous September with regard to the financial situation of the Hospital and its dependents. The Comptrollers reported that it had become evident that with the great increase in disabled soldiers, the poundage and day's pay of the forces, the Hospital's only assured income, was insufficient, and that

²⁷ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f. 6v, 23.8.1712.

²⁸ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f. 7, 28.8.1712.

²⁹ JHC, Vol. XVII, pp. 186-188. The report had been prepared by 6 November 1711.

without additional funds those in need, 'many of whom are very moving objects of Compassion ... must be exposed to perish ...'. Existing funds to meet the Hospital's commitments, including the Out-pensioners, would only cover the expenses to April 1711 and a further £35,800 would be required to meet costs up to Christmas 1712.³⁰ Thereafter, if the business was to be carried on using only the poundage and the day's pay, it was certain that the Hospital would get even deeper into debt. Further details, which were contributed to the report by the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Hospital, indicated that reductions of six pence per day had already been made in the pensions paid to Gentlemen of the Horse Guards and Corporals of Horse and three pence from the pension of Light Horsemen (cavalry troopers). The number of men on the Out-pension at that time was 3,400 and the continual increase in disabled soldiers recommended to Chelsea had necessitated four applications, in March 1705, January 1706 and again in May 1706 and in September 1709, which had been allowed by the queen's warrants, to extend the quarters where these men were to be billeted to other villages south and west of London.

Financial pressure had been experienced from as early in the war as 1703, when an additional £2,050 had been acquired partly from the Exchequer and partly diverted from the funds intended for the Guards and Garrisons in England, and further amounts in excess of £15,000 had been scavenged from the same funds up to 1708. In 1710, parliament had been obliged to grant an additional £15,392 in response to the fact that the Hospital's excess of expenditure over its income then stood at more than £33,000.³¹

³⁰ Ibid, p. 186.

³¹ JHC, Vol. XVII, p. 188. The parlous condition of government finance in respect of the Army throughout the war is detailed in R.E. Scouller, *The Armies of Queen Anne* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 23-25. The latest examination of the Hospital's financial difficulties can be found in A. Graham, 'Military Contractors and the Money Markets, 1700-1715' in A. Graham & P. Walsh, (eds), *The British Fiscal-Military States, 1660-c.1783* (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 86-93.

At the root of the difficulties was the sovereign's desire to care for those who were disabled in her service and the unavoidable obligation set down in the Hospital Commissioners' instructions to provide accommodation for, and payments to, those who were found to be qualified for Her Majesty's bounty. This duty was laid down in the Hospital establishment of December 1709, which was still in force, though a new set of instructions had been drafted but not yet approved.³² The Commissioners, therefore, had no alternative but to maintain the provision, despite the fact that no effort had been made to ensure that resources were being regularly provided to cover the costs. Indeed, their burdens were constantly being augmented, as in February and March 1713 the Secretary-at-War instructed them to quarter and place on the Out-pension 'all such invalids of the regiments lately disbanded ... found duly qualify'd ...' including men returning from Spain,³³ and in May the War Office instructed the Commissioners that the Hospital was henceforth obliged to subsist men who had been discharged and were awaiting examination, because the regiments themselves did not have the funds with which to do so.³⁴ Theoretically, and in terms of procedure, discharged men continued to be the responsibility of their regiments until they were officially accepted or rejected by the Hospital. In consequence of these requirements, the Hospital found itself accumulating increasing debts, though no monies with which to pay them were forthcoming.

Considering the huge increase in the Army abroad, the poundage and day's pay of those troops should have been amply sufficient to discharge the Hospital's growing responsibilities, but although £23,200 per annum should have been remitted for its use, in fact a very small fraction of the day's pay had been received from the paymasters abroad amounting to only £13,569 in the seven years between 1703 and 1709. Nothing at all

³² TNA, Secretary-at-War Out-letter Books, WO4/14, ff. 166-167, SaW to Mr. Howe, 12.11.1712. Hereafter cited as SaW Out-letters.

³³ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 259, SaW to Gov. Hales, 18.2.1713 and SaW to Commissioners 6.3.1713.

³⁴ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 335, SaW to Chelsea Commissioners, 26.5.1713.

had been received in respect of the poundage of the forces which, taking into account all of the troops being paid for in the various theatres of operations, should have yielded £54,000 per annum; the forces in Flanders alone producing £23,000 of that total.³⁵ As Graham's study of the financing the armies in Flanders and Spain makes clear, it was entirely unrealistic to expect paymasters in those countries to remit funds back to Britain when they had had the utmost difficulty in acquiring them in the first place.³⁶

The position had become so serious that Out-pensioners had exhausted their credit with the inn-keepers, who were maintaining them in quarters, and some of them had been cast into prison for debt. Indeed, some of the publicans, who had given them credit, had become so impoverished that they had been obliged to leave their dwellings. Support was becoming more difficult to find, as there was apprehension that the Out-pension would be discontinued and that the large sums owing would be renegued upon.³⁷

The report adds further to our knowledge of the increase in the numbers of pensioners by indicating that by Christmas 1707 the total number was 1,004 and that in December of each of the years following up to Christmas 1710 the total numbers stood at 619, 1,683 and 2,765 men. By 24 August 1711, the total was 'near 3,300'. The decrease in the figure for 1708 is accounted for by the formation of new Invalid companies; 450 Out-pensioners having been required for the six companies formed in July of that year. It should also be noted that 833 men were withdrawn from the Out-pension for seven new companies in April 1711. Disregarding deaths therefore, the number of Out-pensioners by Christmas 1711 should have stood at a minimum of 4,500 not including the men in those Invalid companies which had existed since before the

³⁵ JHC, Vol. XVII, p. 188.

³⁶ A. Graham, *Corruption, Government and Party in Britain, 1702-1713* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

³⁷ JHC, Vol. XVII, p. 188. The optimistic view of firm belief in the government's credit with which Roseveare concludes his book was clearly not so obvious to those heavily in debt in 1713. Cf. H. Roseveare, *The Financial Revolution, 1660-1760* (London: Longman, 1991), p. 75.

war began. This figure matches up very well with the computation of those who registered their discharge certificates at the War Office as noted above, (Appendix 2-1) taking into account the gaps in those records.

Faced with this report and the warning it contained that the situation was likely to get worse because of further discharges of invalids and the reductions in the forces after the war was drawn to a close, it was proposed that a re-examination of all those presently on the Out-pension should be undertaken. Disbelief at the numbers involved was reinforced by concerns expressed by the Comptrollers of the Accounts of the Army that some of the certificates of recommendation that invalids brought to their examinations were possibly counterfeited, and that confirming endorsements from regimental surgeons rarely appeared on these papers. In respect of those whose pretensions rested partly on their length of service, it was thought necessary that the Commissary General of the Musters or his Deputy should likewise endorse the recommendation. It was further suggested that duplicates of discharge and recommendation certificates be sent to the regimental agents so that they should be able to attest to the signatures of the officers that appeared on the soldiers' copies of the documents.³⁸

The Commissioners of the Hospital duly set about organizing the review, which was to take place in three phases; Out-pensioners in quarters or on furlough within sixty miles of London were to present themselves on 6 October 1712. Those at a greater distance, but still in England, were to report on 13 October and those in Scotland, Ireland or beyond the seas on 10 November. Those who did not appear were to be struck off immediately unless they could prove that they were unavoidably detained by wounds or sickness and were unable to travel. The surgeon of the Hospital was instructed to recommend for striking off any who were not visibly disabled by wounds or other infirmities.³⁹ For unknown reasons this review was deferred until the following year,

³⁸ JHC, Vol. XVII, p. 187.

³⁹ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f.7, 28.8.1712.

but in early December notices appeared in the *London Gazette* instructing Out-pensioners that they were required to make themselves available during the following January and February.⁴⁰ Notices in the next two issues of the Gazette specified that the pensioners were to appear in order of precedence and rank – Gentlemen of the Troops of Horse Guards, Corporals of Horse and Sergeants of Dragoons on 5 and 7 January, Light Horse Men and Corporals of Dragoons on 9, 12 and 14, Sergeants of Foot on 16, 19 and 21, Corporals of Foot, Private Dragoons and Drummers on 23 and 26 and Private Sentinels of Infantry from 28 January until 27 February. These groupings, of course, reflecting the levels of pension at which the men were paid and thus, presumably, would allow the Commissioners readily to calculate how much money in each category was being saved in relation to how many men were being dismissed on each day.

Before the review started, however, another alteration was made in the method, and in early January it was announced that the men were required to present themselves in regimental order by precedence and seniority starting with the Household Cavalry followed by the Horse, Dragoons, Foot Guards and the Foot. The period of examination was extended to 31 March.⁴¹ No mention was made of any grades of artillerymen and such absence may be taken to indicate that by this date the Board of Ordnance had assumed responsibility for those men invalided in its employ.⁴²

At the same time as this review was under way, other expedients were suggested to lessen the number of pensioners. The Commissioners

⁴⁰ *London Gazette* (hereafter cited as LG) No. 5074, 2-6 December 1712. The notification was repeated in a slightly different form in Nos. 5075, 5076 and 5079.

⁴¹ LG No. 5083, 3-6 January 1712/13. LG No. 5089 further extended the period of examination until 7 April 1713 and No. 5101 of 10 March, implying that the process was nearing its end, abandoned the regimental order and called in any who had not hitherto attended. No. 5106 extended inspections until 9 April.

⁴² The Royal Regiment of Artillery was formed on 26 May 1716. Before that date Trains of Artillery were formed for the service of each part of the Army when it undertook a campaign abroad or within Great Britain.

recommended to the Lord High Treasurer in January 1713 that those fraudulently claiming pension should be sought out, arrested and presented before the Commissioners; informers making known such persons being rewarded with twenty shillings per miscreant.⁴³ The Treasurer countered this proposal by recommending one pound per informant not per person informed against, and declined to send Queen's Messengers to affect the requested arrests, merely referring the Hospital Governor to do what he thought best and legal. The Commissioners themselves also addressed the qualifications that discharged and recommended men must meet in order to be accepted for pension. They decided that 'only those definitely disabled by the loss of a limb or who shall visibly appear to be so disabled as to be incapable of subsisting themselves' should be eligible for the pension and that twenty years service, unless superannuated, should not be an automatic qualification.⁴⁴ The most significant change introduced at this time, however, was designed to reduce the overall cost of pension provision by imposing a uniform rate to be paid to every soldier rather than the varied sums according to rank and specific duty, which had been instituted in 1686. From June 1713 every Out-pensioner was to receive five pence per day.⁴⁵

Some records giving an over-view of the general re-examination of 1713 survive. Three thousand five hundred and seventy pensioners presented themselves on twenty-five days between 20 January and 18 April 1713. Seventeen hundred and eleven men were retained and eighteen hundred and fifty-nine men were dismissed.⁴⁶ These figures did not, of course, include those Out-pensioners retained within the dozen Invalid Companies that were still in existence, approximately

⁴³ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f.12, Commissioners to Lord Treasurer, 7.1.1713.

⁴⁴ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f.12v, 7.1.1713.

⁴⁵ Hutt, p. 84.

⁴⁶ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, ff. 12 - 16, Jan to April 1713. In a letter dated 6th December 1714 from the Chelsea Commissioners to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury these figures are given as 1,719 retained and 1,882 dismissed making a total of 3,601. BL, Add. Ms 61,299 f. 47, Blenheim Papers.

1,000 men if they had been kept up to strength. The Commissioners who sat to examine the men – the Earl of Clarendon; General Webb; the Hospital's Governor, Colonel Hales; Mr. Fox; and the Lieutenant-Governor with the Surgeon's assistance - could not have given very profound consideration to many of the cases which came before them, for on 17 March they dealt with no less than 310 men and only on five days did they see less than 100 men at each session.

In truth it would appear that the Commissioners were making up the rules and altering the qualifications as they proceeded in response to the perceived requirement to reduce the number of Out-pensioners to reasonable limits. Arbitrarily, they decided that for those who presented themselves for Out-pension who were not disabled by wounds, thirty years in the Army should be the qualifying period, though twenty years service had always been considered sufficient even as recently as January 1713.⁴⁷ As a gratuity, men who had been dismissed despite having been recommended and previously accepted, were to receive ten shillings to see them home, though this only applied to those who had served twenty-five years in the Army. Such a provision can have been of benefit to very few considering that the majority of those who had served during the late war would have been recruited for and during that conflict and it can only have been of advantage to those whose service extended back almost to the beginning of King William III's reign.⁴⁸ In order to ensure that no pensioners who had recently been dismissed should attempt to eke out their stay around London and thereby to run up bills that would eventually be submitted to the Hospital for payment, a notice was placed in the *London Gazette* warning those who had extended credit to the Out-pensioners 'either in Quarters or otherways' that they discontinue doing so as from 24 June and that the Hospital would not honour any such debts incurred after that date.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f.20, 23.6.1713 and TNA, List of Notes of Significant Decisions by the Board, WO 246/98, unfoliated.

⁴⁸ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f. 21, 2.7.1713.

⁴⁹ LG No. 5129, 13-16 June 1713.

All of this re-examination work, however, was completely nugatory, as the queen immediately gave verbal instructions⁵⁰ that resulted in all of the dismissed men being re-admitted to the Out-pension. The number of Out-pensioners was increased further by the 300 men reduced from the twelve extant Invalid companies and 400 additional men who had been prevented by distance from attending the examination, but who were nonetheless deemed to be qualified. Furthermore, between three and four thousand soldiers who returned from Spain and Portugal in 'miserable condition' and who were accepted onto the Out-pension 'till such time as they were cured of their wounds' swelled the total to 8,980.⁵¹ During the late summer of 1714, it had been intended to have another general examination to ascertain how many men had recovered from their injuries and how many had died in the meanwhile, with a view to reducing the burden and fixing the number on the Out-pension. Thereafter it was envisaged that no more should be admitted except to vacancies created by death. The procedure was even announced in the *London Gazette* in July 1714.⁵² Queen Anne's death and the calling-up of 1,200 Out-pensioners to form new Invalid companies, thereby temporarily taking them off the Out-pension, and the possibility that more such men would be needed, overturned the plan.

The frequent reversals of policy that took place in the last two years of the queen's reign caused much friction between the Commissioners, the Treasury and the War Office. The intention of the ministry, with which the Commissioners complied in 1713, was to reduce the number of those claiming pension by a very significant proportion. The dismissal of

⁵⁰ BL, Add. Ms 61,299 f. 50, Blenheim Papers, Mr. Howe, Paymaster General of the Guards, Garrisons of the Land Forces in Great Britain to Hospital Commissioners 17.12.1714. Note - it is only Mr. Howe who mentioned that these instructions were verbal and he asserted that the Queen had merely said that the possible qualifications of the dismissed men should be re-examined, not that all of them should be re-admitted.

⁵¹ BL, Add. Ms 61,299 f.47, Blenheim Papers, Commissioners to Lds Commissioners of Treasury 6.12.1714.

⁵² LG No. 5247 31 July – 3 August 1714, notice dated 10th July.

more than 1,800 men who had legitimately qualified for the bounty was a most drastic step, but one which appears to have been instituted on the grounds of political and financial necessity. Though there was some dispute concerning the exact purpose of the queen's verbal instructions, the Treasury's victory in having the Out-pension halved turned out to be pyrrhic, and indeed its efforts to manage the problem were proven to be premature because of its failure to take into account the fact that the demobilization of the forces abroad had not been completed. The reinstatement of the dismissed men and the adding to their number of a flood of new invalids from the Iberian theatre of war, who increased the total Out-pension to almost three times the size that it had been before the general re-examination of 1713, gave rise to a battle of wills between the Hospital and the government.

The precise motivation of the Commissioners and their servants in so overtly overturning the ministry's policy are nowhere explained in detail, but it is hard not to see in their actions a counter-attack to a policy that they believed to be fundamentally opposed to the spirit of the institution with whose management they were charged. The failing health of the monarch and the knowledge that the ministry, or many of its leading figures, would not long outlast the accession of the new king, must have given hope that efforts to re-assert the true role of the Hospital would not meet with rebuttal when the new administration was formed. On a lower level, however, the conflict exhibited a playing out of a struggle as to whether primacy in how the Hospital conducted its business should reside with its own Commissioners or the War Office.

As part of an enquiry from the Treasury into the state of the Out-pension mounted in late 1714, Mr. Howe, the Paymaster of the Guards and Garrisons at the War Office, queried the re-admission of the 1,882 dismissed men and the payment of the pension to the 1,200 pensioners who had been formed into new Invalid companies at the time of the queen's death. In respect of the latter, however, as the men were paid in arrears, his objection was inappropriate in that there could be no

question of their being owed up to the time when the companies were formed. He further complained that the Hospital's Secretary, James Duke Crispe, had omitted to produce a complete list of the Out-pensioners arranged regimentally including details of their qualifications and those who had recommended them; Crispe having informed the Pay Office that he was sending the usual list in accordance with the Commissioners' instructions. As the nominal list included the men newly-returned from Portugal and Spain as well as those reinstated and those reduced from old Invalid companies, and those recently withdrawn and formed into new Invalid companies, Howe considered that more detail was required. He also expressed unease that the Commissioners had signed a plain alphabetical nominal roll and had allowed blank pages within the document on which additional names could have been added after they had approved it.⁵³ His inference was evidently that careless, perhaps deliberately careless, administrative practice had given opportunity for the fraudulent addition of fictitious pensioners whose money might then be diverted into the pocket of the Secretary.⁵⁴

In response, the Commissioners replied that the large increase to almost 9,000 beneficiaries was justified by the qualifications of those presenting themselves and by the reduction of the Invalid companies whose personnel had already been accepted onto the pension. They stated that the warrant for the payment of these men had been made up in exactly the same way as previous warrants that had been drawn up by Mr Howe himself or his deputy and that any men whose names were marked with queries should not be paid until their pretensions had been confirmed. The warrant, however, had included all of the men who were likely to require payment so that the correct amount of money should be available when payment was approved. They stated that the blank pages not struck through at the end of the document should not be interpreted as being left with malicious intent to add fictional names

⁵³ BL, Egerton Papers Add. Ms 929, f. 156 Howe's Memorial to the Treasury, 20.11.1714.

⁵⁴ Hutt, p. 65.

to the list. The Commissioners also counter-attacked by complaining that Mr Howe, reserved to his own office the issuing of furloughs to Out-pensioners and the payment of monies due to those who had extended credit to the pensioners against letters of attorney empowering them to collect their clients' pensions whenever cash was made available. They considered it inappropriate that a War Office official should be so intimately involved in administrative practices that ought to have been in the hands of the Board's own staff.⁵⁵

The understanding of whatever malpractice may have transpired is greatly hampered by the disappearance of the relevant records. The first two entries in the record of meetings which started in March 1715 set in train a new re-examination of the pensioners and a requirement that Secretary Crispe place in the Commissioners' hands the documents relating to the 1,719 pensioners who were continued in pay after the 1713 re-examination.⁵⁶ Various issues of the *London Gazette* at this time contain mentions of letters and petitions being sent to the Hospital Governor, the Commissioners and the Secretary-at-War offering to make disclosure of 'indirect practices' which had been used in the Out-pension.⁵⁷ In addition, one Edward Mac-Manus laid serious accusations against Crispe and others in respect of pension claims by fraudsters impersonating soldiers whose fictitious names had been entered in the registers with the Secretary's connivance.⁵⁸ These charges were taken seriously and Crispe was required to stand bail in the sum of £2,000 to

⁵⁵ BL, Blenheim Papers Add. Ms 61,299, f. 47, Chelsea Commissioners to Treasury, 6.12.1714. In the continued dispute about this business the Commissioners published their letter in full in *The Post Boy*, No. 3082, 5-8 February 1715.

⁵⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 1.

⁵⁷ LG No. 5192, 19-23 January 1714 mentions allegations put forward by John Archdeacon and other Out-pensioners the recent re-examinations and dismissals. LG 5281, 27-30 November 1714 indicated that the king had ordered the Commissioners to enquire into abuses in the management of the Hospital and LG 5287, 18-21 December 1714 mentioned an anonymous letter sent to the Secretary of State relating to the Hospital.

⁵⁸ E. Mac-Manus, Petition to The King, the Privy Council and both Houses of Parliament regarding the Discovery of the Frauds relating to Chelsea Hospital, 1721.

appear before Westminster Assizes, while Mac-Manus, a Mr Archdeacon and various others were required to lodge recognizances of hundreds of pounds each against their appearances in court to prove the allegations that they had proffered.⁵⁹ Accusations and counter-accusations continued to be bandied about up to 1717, but no case was ever brought against Crispe. For his part, Mac-Manus alleged that Crispe and his associates fended off any prosecution that could be brought against them by the simple expedient of having Mac-Manus committed to prison on personal warrants for various offences and by subverting the Treasury Solicitor and other legal officers. Ultimately the allegations against Crispe could not be made good, but there was sufficient reason to suspect malpractice for the Commissioners to instruct their new Secretary on 5 June 1717, to explain to the ministry why Crispe should not benefit from the Act of Grace about to be promulgated in order to pardon Jacobite rebels and others who were under proscription.⁶⁰ The matter raised a great deal of concern and its details were thoroughly rehearsed in the first history of the new king's reign to be published.⁶¹ The outcome of the enquiry by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury was that 'His Majesty changed the Government of that Hospital ... and directed a new Commission to pass the Great Seal ...'. The Hospital Commissioners were henceforth to be the Lord President of the Privy Council, the Captain-General of the Forces, the First Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, the two Principal Secretaries of State for the time being, Lieutenant-Generals Erle and Lumley, the Secretary-at-War, the Comptrollers of the Army and the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of the Hospital.⁶² It is also very

⁵⁹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, ff. 3-14.

⁶⁰ TNA, Notes of the Board Meetings to be made up in the Minute Books, WO250/470, f. 20.

⁶¹ *Annals of King George containing not only the Affairs of Great Britain, but the General History of Europe during that Time*, (London: 1716), Vol. 1, pp. 329-340. This account favours the narrative of events and deficiencies put forward by Howe.

⁶² The new Commissioners who commenced their duties on 2 March 1715 were the Duke of Marlborough, the Earl of Halifax, Generals Lumley and Erle, Brigadier Stanwix, Colonel Chudleigh, Sir Philip Meadows and Messrs Walpole, Poultney and Bruce - Hutt, pp. 80-81.

noticeable that in the admissions registers which survive from 1715 – the earliest extant examples – no blank spaces are left which might be abused in the manner alleged, and that the examining Commissioners placed their initials immediately under the record of each day's examinations leaving no space for later entries.

The year 1714 marked a turning point in the history of the Out-pension. Henceforth, though irregularities did surface from time to time, it is possible to trace in detail the administrative methodology by which all aspects of the Royal Hospital's business were conducted. The increasing stability in the political life of the nation, which was a marked feature of the next twenty-five years, coupled to the absence of major European wars, allowed the Hospital an extended period in which to secure its place as a national institution - an opportunity it had been denied by the years of continuous conflict since its foundation.

Nielsen, Out-pensioners - Chapter 3 Section 3 - makes it clear that the usual business of the Hospital was not conducted by the full Board.

Chapter Three

On becoming a pensioner

It having been decided that a system of pensions should be established for old soldiers, it was necessary that a procedure should come into being to govern the process by which they were released from their regiments and presented themselves in London ready to be examined for pension. This chapter will examine the process of discharge and referral to the Hospital. It will also detail the faltering steps by which this process became established and the grave difficulties presented by the very large number of men so referred during the War of the Spanish Succession. It will examine the concept of qualification for the pension, how that was represented and the nature of the 'recommendations' that officers bestowed upon their men. It will follow the men's journey from the bosom of their regimental family up to the point when they were called in for examination by the Hospital's Commissioners.

It is impossible to know with precision how many soldiers on discharge from their regiments were not recommended to Chelsea. Evidently most soldiers discharged after a major war were simply released into civilian life with their arrears of pay and a small grant of subsistence to enable them to get back to their home parish or wherever else they may have wished to settle.¹ The large post-war reductions in the Army indicate this clearly, and although the Royal Hospital's responsibilities always increased with the arrival of peace, the new beneficiaries represented only a small fraction of those who had served in the late war and were then discharged.² It is less easy to establish what

¹ TNA, Warrants, WO26/14, f. 16 specified that in August 1712 infantrymen were to be paid fourteen days subsistence to get them home and three shillings for their swords and bayonets. They were to be permitted to take away their clothes, belts and knapsacks. Mounted troops were to receive six days full pay if they took their horses and saddles with them or twelve days pay without their mounts. They also received a small bounty to assist them. TNA, Secretary-at-War's Out-letter Books, WO4/14, f. 334, 25.5.1713. Hereafter SaW Out-letters.

² See Chapter 1 Notes 31 and 32.

proportion of those men discharged in years of peace was recommended to Chelsea. As we shall see, the Hospital received a steady stream of men discharged with recommendations from their regiments, and although adding these up would give a total per year, it would not assist in establishing how many out of all of those discharged were not recommended to the Hospital.

From time to time reductions were made in the size of the Army during peacetime, prompted either by re-organization or simply by parliament's unwillingness to vote sufficient funds to maintain the Army's numbers.³ When such an event occurred, it is logical to suppose that regiments would have taken the opportunity to discharge their oldest and least fit men, and that some of these would have been qualified for a pension. The numbers of men that needed to be shed at a reduction is, however, impossible to compute as it is commonly held that all regiments were under-strength and that the Army was almost never fully recruited. For the period before 1750 the Monthly Returns or the six-monthly Inspection Returns produced as a result of reviews have not survived. Clearly, if a regiment was ordered to impose a reduction of five men in each of its ten companies, but was at that time fifty, or more, men below its official regimental strength, then no actual reduction took place. The regiment would, in fact, be nearly complete and possibly up to establishment. It is also the case that, despite George I's standing order that captains were not to benefit from the dividend of the subsistence of two men per company if they did not keep their companies full, this stipulation does not seem to have had the desired effect in keeping regiments permanently up to establishment.⁴ The

³ A useful synopsis of the expansion and reduction of the Army between 1715 and 1732 appears in TNA, State Papers - Military 1731-32, SP41/7, f. 353. A similar document covering the period 1714 to 1749 inclusive appears in TNA, PRO30/8/75, f. 137. A systematic analysis of all of the Establishments for British troops that appear in WO24 between 1713 and 1755, pieces 70 to 314, has also been undertaken.

⁴ TNA, Establishment for the Garrisons of Minorca and Gibraltar, 1717, WO24/87. This document, and every Establishment issued thereafter, included a warrant in its last pages stipulating that only if the companies were kept 'compleat' would the captains be permitted to benefit from the subsistence of two men per company.

problem therefore in terms of assessing how many men might have been recommended to Chelsea at the time of a known reduction is that the number of men who might have had to be discharged to achieve the reduction cannot be known.

The following instances of large reductions that did not result in a commensurate number of recommendations to Chelsea may be cited. On 20 November 1729 a large reduction in the Dragoons, Foot Guards and the Marching Regiments in Great Britain was ordered 'to be put into Execution without any delay'.⁵ The eight regiments of dragoons were reduced by 1,776 men, the Foot Guards by 874 men and the eleven Marching Regiments by 2,596,⁶ yet in the following month only thirty-five dragoons, 241 Guardsmen and 170 Foot were recommended to pension.⁷

In October 1734 eight regiments of Foot were posted to England from Ireland. They were obliged to recruit an additional 2,240 NCO's and privates to bring them up to English numbers.⁸ When returned to Ireland in January 1736, they were ordered to make a reduction of more than 2,000 men. However, between February and March 1736 these regiments recommended only 273 men to Chelsea.⁹

What conclusions may be drawn from these examples? In 1729, it would appear that above 4,500 men were simply discharged as no longer required and not qualified. The case of the 'Irish' regiments seems to show the same pattern, but it is difficult to trace what happened to the majority of them after 1736 because in Ireland they had

⁵ TNA, State Papers - Military 1731-32, SP41/7, f. 353 gives the total figure as 5,246 taken from the Dragoons, The Foot Guards and the Marching Foot. TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/30, ff. 294-297 gives the precise instructions.

⁶ Comparison of TNA, Establishment for the Guards and Garrisons in Great Britain, 1729 - WO24/140 with 1730, WO24/145.

⁷ Analysis of examinations for pension from the database during December 1729.

⁸ TNA, Establishments – Eight Regiments from Ireland, 1734, WO24/166.

⁹ Analysis of the database for the eight regiments concerned.

no rights of pension from Chelsea. All of the regiments in the 1729 reduction, however, retained men who were by age, and many by wounds, injuries or ailments amply qualified for recommendation to Chelsea at the time of the reduction.¹⁰

This indicates that even when large numbers of men had to be dispensed with, officers preferred to keep old soldiers who were already trained and experienced, and that they were unwilling to discard men who were still fit enough for duty and who, moreover, were not themselves anxious to leave the regiment. Though such a theory might be condemned as sentimental, the release of soldiers only when they were definitely no longer capable of duty is a recurring trend within the record, and may bespeak not merely reluctance to lose a trained man, but also concern for the potential fortunes of a man after discharge. As Houlding has pointed out, regiments were stable communities during the first two decades of the Hanoverian dynasty.¹¹ Captains having an average of eight years service in command of their companies would genuinely have known their men and, in order to avoid inconvenience to themselves and their subordinates, would have been unlikely to dispense with them lightly.

The position with regard to discharges is somewhat clarified from 1750, the date at which some Monthly Returns, and, from 1753, twice-yearly Inspection Returns have survived.¹² Although they cover only the last five years of this study, but it is reasonable to assume that the discharges they exhibit are not abnormal and that for years of peace they show patterns that were usually repeated year on year.

¹⁰ In the three years after 1730 the 2nd Foot discharged 17 men of whom 7 would have been qualified for pension in 1729/30, - hereafter those qualified at the time of the reduction are shown in { }, the 3rd Foot 17 {7}, the 4th Foot 20 {15}, the 7th Foot 18 {14}, the 10th Foot 13 {7}, 11th Foot 21 {8}, 12th Foot 20 {11}, 13th Foot 13 {9}, 15th Foot 18 {11}, 16th Foot 19 {15} and 23rd Foot 21 {6}.

¹¹ Houlding, *Fit for Service* pp. 108-110.

¹² TNA, Catalogued as Inspection Returns but actually Monthly Returns and Inspection Returns, WO27/1, 2 & 3, covering the years 1750 to 1755.

Until after 1755, however, these sources are very fragmentary; most of the inspections being represented only by the spring or the autumn review, but not both. It is also clear that the figures for discharges and recommendations need to be added together because, for instance, in the autumn review of 1755 George Howard's Foot discharged ten men and recommended nineteen and in October 1754, the Scots Greys discharged five and recommended six.

The data from the Monthly Returns can be simply added up to give the total number of discharges for each regiment, but only very rarely do they state how many men were recommended to Chelsea. The disparity between discharges and recommendations may, however, be exemplified by the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Foot Guards in 1750, which respectively discharged seventy-eight, 110 and ninety men, but only had twenty-two, twenty-four and forty men examined for pension. Bocland's Foot discharged 108, but recommended only fifteen, one of whom was rejected.¹³

It is evident, therefore that the numbers discharged from some regiments were quite large, and yet the numbers receiving recommendations were small. In the majority of cases it may be assumed that those discharged were suffering from the same disablements as those who did receive recommendations, and that when captains released men, they had good reasons for doing so because they were expensive and time-consuming to replace; they would not therefore have been disposed of wantonly. So why were some men recommended to Chelsea and others were not?

The Monthly Returns occasionally disclose the reasons behind some discharges for offences, military or civilian, or that men were surrendered back to regiments from which they had deserted.¹⁴

¹³ Comparison of the information taken from Monthly Returns TNA, WO27/1 for 1750 and examinations recorded in WO116.

¹⁴ TNA, Monthly Returns for 1751, WO27/2.

However, the majority of discharges without recommendation have no causes or reasons attached to them.

Though the basic qualifications for pension in terms of injury or illness were plainly stated, it would appear that there was a fundamental underlying requirement that was never mentioned. It seems highly likely that men had to possess an exemplary disciplinary record in order to receive a recommendation. Evidence for this is sparse, but indications can be found. The courts martial records of the 1st Foot Guards indicate that the officers who convicted a man of a misdemeanour often pleaded for mercy when the culprit had long service. Lambert Scriven convicted of missing guards and having dirty kit (200 lashes) was successfully recommended to mercy as he had been '18 years in the regiment and never to a court martial before'. John Bellgrave received a similar plea for mercy after being convicted of missing a Field Day 'in regard he has an extraordinary good character having never been confined since he was in the Regiment'. David Vandry was similarly excused for the same offence having been eighteen years with the Regiment and 'never guilty of any such crime before'. Hugh Estridge with ten years service was likewise pardoned for missing a Guard. Conversely, Robert Smith and David Morgan were specifically recorded as whipped out of the regiment 'without the benefit of His Majesty's bounty'.¹⁵ These instances appear to indicate that officers were aware that any conviction on a man's record would deprive him of the benefit of Chelsea.

It is also remarkable that no men at all within the registers are noted as bearing the marks of flogging or were recorded as suffering from disabilities acknowledged to have been caused by that punishment.¹⁶

¹⁵ Grenadier Guards Regimental Archive, Courts Martial Book, 1748/9. Cases heard on 17 January; 3 February; 24 May; 3 June; 21 June 1749.

¹⁶ No regimental punishment book of a date that matches with the information contained in the database – 1715-1755 has yet been found. Such books do exist for periods later in the century and it would be instructive to make such a comparison. See, for instance, S. Baule & D. Hagist, 'The Regimental Punishment Book of the Boston Detachments of

Though not strictly a Punishment Book, the Gibraltar Garrison Orders¹⁷ record 100 men who were flogged between June 1728 and February 1739. It is possible that two men so punished did, in fact, receive Out-pensions, but their names are relatively common and, though they certainly belonged to regiments that were in garrison at Gibraltar, it is not certain that the recipients of the royal bounty were the same men as those who were flogged.¹⁸ The other ninety-eight men were certainly not recommended to Chelsea. A similar pattern of non-recommendation can be discerned in records of courts martial in Scotland.¹⁹

The continuance of good behaviour as an essential pre-requisite for re-admission to the Out-pension is made absolutely clear in the Militia Act of 1757. In mentioning sergeants appointed to Militia regiments 'out of the Pensioners on the establishment of Chelsea Hospital' it regulated that they were only to be returned to the Out-pension when their service ended, 'provided he brings a certificate of his good Behaviour under the hand of the Colonel or Commanding Officer of the Regiment or Battalion'.²⁰ The exemplary record that had secured the man a pension in the first place had therefore to be continued during his re-employment within the Militia.

Fragmentary though these pieces of evidence are, they provide a satisfactory explanation as to why some men received recommendations to the Royal Hospital and others, though likely to

the Royal Irish Regiment and the 65th Regiment, 1774-1775' *JSAHR*, Vol. 88, 2010, pp. 5-19.

¹⁷ TNA, Gibraltar Garrison Orders, 1728-1739, WO284/1, unfoliated.

¹⁸ TNA, Admissions Registers, WO116/2, 13.10.1730 John Abbott, Hayes' Foot (DB 830) and WO116/4, 28.1.1747 James Richey, Fuller's Foot (DB 15576).

¹⁹ H. McCorry, "'Besides, he was very drunk at the time ...'" Desertion and Discipline, North Britain, 1751 - 1753' *JSAHR*, Pt. 1 Vol. LXIX (1991) pp. 221-232, Pt. 2 Vol. LXX (1992) pp. 114-117, Pt. 3 Vol. LXX (1992) pp. 189-197, Pt. 4 Vol. LXXI (1993) pp. 42-50, Pt. 5 Vol. LXXII (1994) pp. 142-159.

²⁰ An Act for the better ordering of the Militia Forces ... 1757, 30 Geo. II c. 25, Para XIV.

have suffered the same injuries, ailments or wounds, did not.²¹ Such a stipulation of good behaviour matches up well with the concept of the 'deserving poor' in distinction to the undeserving, who were worthy of no support. Soldiers who received the pension deserved it because of their good behaviour while serving and they were expected to maintain that behaviour while receiving it. In a different context this chimes with the conformity of behaviour argument put forward by Boulton.²²

Nevertheless long-serving soldiers had to be released at some point and it is necessary to examine how that process happened. It was extremely rare for prospective pensioners to be accepted by the Commissioners without a personal examination, though this did happen occasionally. A dozen men were so accepted with a pension date of 14 May 1746 from Cumberland's army in Scotland,²³ as were several Private Gentlemen of the 4th (Scots) Troop of Horse Guards in 1722.²⁴ Thomas Harrison of Gore's Dragoons, wounded in the head and face at Saragozza in 1710, but not discharged until 1724, was ordered to be 'described' by his Colonel, being too ill to attend an examination. Lieutenant-Colonel George Benson duly obliged.²⁵ John Bayly 'some time ago discharged from St. Thomas's Hospital as incurable and ... in so bad a condition it is impractical to move him in order to his

²¹ I am grateful to Mr Stephen Wood for the suggestion that a good discipline requirement might provide a reason why some men were recommended and many more were not. The hypothesis was based on the stipulation attached to the Army Long Service and Good Conduct Medal introduced in 1830 that recipients must have an unblemished disciplinary record.

²² J. Boulton, 'Going on the Parish: The Parish Pension and its Meaning in the London Suburbs, 1640-1724', pp. 20 & 32 in T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, (eds) *Chronicling Poverty - the voices and strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1997)

²³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 14.5.1746, DB 14763 – John McLeod and the following eleven men from 1st and 21st Regiments of Foot.

²⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, DB 10841 – Alexander Campbell Snr and the following four men from 4th Troop of Horse Guards.

²⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 11.2.1724, DB 8341.

appearing at your Board ...' was pensioned after only three and a half years service without examination in April 1747.²⁶ On the occasion of the review of the Garrison companies of the castles in Scotland - Edinburgh, Stirling, Blackness and Dumbarton - in each of the years from 1751 to 1755, lists of those to be discharged including all the usual details were sent down by the Commander-in-Chief in Scotland, and the men were pensioned without examination.²⁷ Nevertheless, the vast majority, no matter what condition they were in, were obliged to make their way to London for examination.

Although there were many thousands of recommendations, none now exist. The form of discharge recommended by Thomas Simes in *The Military Guide* may be taken to be a standard example, long honed in service and containing all of the details, which legally and financially, were required. The man's name, rank and regiment were stated with his company and the length of time that he had served. The recipient was required to endorse the paper with his mark or name in confirmation that he had received his pay, all of his arrears of pay, his clothing 'and all other just demands from the time of his inlisting ... to this day of his discharge'. His age, height, eye, hair and complexion colour were given and his trade. All of these details constituted the standard set of information that was assembled about the recruit when he joined the regiment, and most were included in his attestation papers when the man's enlistment was confirmed before a Justice of the Peace.²⁸ Simes indicates that they were also transcribed into a regimental book of all the recruits received into the regiment or troop at the time of their arrival and they also appeared in the company books maintained by the man's captain.²⁹ The exact date of a man's joining was certainly recorded, because precise lengths of service appear in the

²⁶ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/43, f. 190 and WO116/4, 29.4.1747, DB 15792.

²⁷ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/48, ff. 356-357, 17.12.1751, WO4/49, ff. 1-2, 22.11.1752, WO4/49, ff. 315-316, 23.10.1753, WO4/50, ff. 53-55, 4.10.1754, WO4/50, ff. 493-495, 21.10.1755.

²⁸ T. Simes, *The Military Guide for Young Officers* 3rd Edition, (London: 1781), pp. 208-209. Hereafter cited as Simes, *Military Guide*.

²⁹ Simes, *Military Guide*, p. 226.

Chelsea records. Richard Blackburn of Jeffrey's Marines had served only twenty-seven months when pensioned in 1743;³⁰ Trooper Robert Murray of Ligonier's Horse had served less than a year when he was disabled at Dettingen,³¹ and Thomas Sudds blew his hand off cleaning his firelock after only six months service and was pensioned in July 1735.³² Private James Webb, however, had passed through three regiments in his forty-four years service and well earned his place as an In-pensioner of the Hospital when he was pensioned in 1727.³³

Although every man required a discharge certificate to prevent his being taken up as a deserter, it is almost as an aside that Simes added the instruction to the officer making out the paper that 'if the person discharged is intitled to his Majesty's royal bounty, it is to be mentioned in the discharge', but gave no other indications of what the Chelsea Commissioners required.³⁴ The bestowal of the benefit of the pension was a matter of judgement for the Commissioners, but, the qualifications having been met, the soldier's opportunity to be examined could not be denied him, so long as he had a perfect disciplinary record. There was no element of patronage about the examination, though there are very occasional examples of regimental recommendations being supported by extra-regimental officers. In an age when the gaining of any preferment usually depended upon the management of personal contacts and the reciprocal advantages which might accrue to both sides if some favour were granted directly or indirectly to the supplicant, this was a radical acknowledgement of indebtedness for good conduct and past services towards men drawn overwhelmingly from the lowest order of society.³⁵

³⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 9.11.1743, DB 11471.

³¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.3.1744, DB 11780.

³² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 25.7.1735, DB 4817.

³³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.12.1727, DB 6180.

³⁴ Simes, *Military Guide* pp. 172-173.

³⁵ Nielsen, *Out-pensioners*, Chapter 3 Section 6, indicates that soldiers 'applied' to Chelsea Hospital for pensions. However, it is clear that the process was one of recommendation and was controlled by the soldier's captain and not by the soldier himself.

However, this is not to say that injury, illness or wounds inevitably resulted in a man being pensioned. Part of the examination was undertaken by the surgeon of the Hospital, and his opinion had to confirm the disabling nature of the affliction. In essence it was either upon the assessment of the severity of the disability, or the evidence of superannuation and visible or certified incapacity for further duty, that the award of pension depended. It will be seen that not all of those recommended were, in fact, accepted, and it is clear that the view of the officers and regimental surgeons making the recommendations did not always coincide with the opinions of the Commissioners or their surgeon on the day of examination. Though Hudson states that Chelsea Hospital '... continued ... to focus on disability to work ...' as being the prime criterion for pension, this clearly was not so.³⁶ Its focus was the inability of the soldier to continue to serve in the active part of the Army. This is proven by the fact that the pension was insufficient to live on, and therefore the recipient had to work or receive other support in order to survive. This view is further reinforced by the fact that a large number of Out-pensioners were sent to do garrison duty - a more settled form of military service, but still work of a kind - in the Invalid Corps.

The generosity of Chelsea's provision did, nevertheless, sometimes lead officers astray. Perhaps because of their decrepit appearance, men from the Foot Guards regiments were sent before the Board who, on examination, declared that they were happy to continue serving and did not wish to be discharged. They were returned to their regiments. Robert Rainsford of the 1st Foot Guards chose to serve on when examined in January 1728³⁷ and John Pitcher declared himself willing to continue when he appeared on 20 April 1726.³⁸ As the Foot Guards were housed within London and discharged men were unlikely to have

³⁶ G.L. Hudson, 'Arguing Disability: Ex-Servicemen's Own Stories in Early Modern England, 1590-1790' in Bivins, R. & Pickstone, J.V. (eds), *Medicine, Madness and Social History – Essays in Honour of Roy Porter*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 108.

³⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 12.1.1728, DB 6083.

³⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 20.4.1726, DB 8115.

been separated from their normal quarters until called for examination, it cannot be the case that they had had time to ponder upon their prospects as pensioners and to decide to cling to the job that they knew, rather than take their chances in civilian life. Such a fear of the unknown may, however, have seized Joseph Clist of Whetham's Foot who was noted as 'thinks himself fit to serve on' at his examination on 2 November 1737.³⁹ Sergeant William Lamb of Hargrave's Foot declined to be taken in at his examination in March 1736 deciding to return to his regiment, but he desired the books to be kept open for him.⁴⁰

Officers also recommended men who were clearly unqualified. Horse Grenadier Bates Howard having served nine years but suffering from 'colds' due to sleeping out when guarding horses put out to the new grass in the spring of 1741 was ordered to return to his troop.⁴¹ Thomas Bateman discharged from Frazer's Marines with a broken collar bone after twelve years service in that regiment and the Foot Guards was returned as unqualified and having recovered from his injury.⁴² John Dargon, despite his sixty-six years, was rejected, though blinded in one eye on duty, as he had served only four years⁴³ and John Ainsworth's lameness was found unconvincing and he was sent back to Cholmondeley's Foot.⁴⁴

However, most recommendations were thoroughly justified and the soldiers qualified, often both by service and multiple injuries, wounds or ailments as shown by the fact that only 1,301 applications were rejected out of 25,026 in the period under consideration.

The text of the discharge given by Simes was not a filled-in example illustrating why the recipient was being released, but the wording includes the phrase '... is, for the reason below-mentioned, discharged

³⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.11.1737, DB 7140.

⁴⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 5.3.1736, DB 6358.

⁴¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 15.12.1741, DB 9967.

⁴² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.5.1742, DB 10193.

⁴³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 20.4.1722, DB 10571.

⁴⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 14.12.1744, DB 12677.

... he is discharged, having ... '. In the case of pressed men released in accordance with terms of limited service, the details would appear here, but it was much more common for this space to record the ailments, injuries or wounds which rendered the person concerned unfit to continue in service. It was from this information that the man's entry in the Admission Registers of the Royal Hospital was composed.⁴⁵ Though Simes presented a standard picture, it is unfortunate that no actual examples of discharges with recommendations appear to have survived, because some would surely throw light on the relationship between the officers and the soldiers they were recommending. Though the opportunity to be assessed for pension was an entitlement for those of good character, officers often mentioned factors that were not strictly necessary or relevant to the Commissioners' decision. In 1718 more than a hundred prospective pensioners were noted as being well recommended and some 'mightily' so, others 'extream' well recommended. Testimonials of the men's worth were forthcoming from regimental officers as well as from generals. Major-General John Pepper signed certificates for William Groves of Molesworth's Dragoons and spoke in his favour⁴⁶ and it was noted that Lord Harrington 'knows the service' of James Owens of Cope's Foot.⁴⁷ The Chelsea Registers therefore record some instances of information which were not the standard, clinical details of enlistment, service, disablement and discharge, and these notes must have derived either from the personal knowledge of the recommending officer or from a record of the soldier's performance written down by his captain, and passed on to subsequent captains of that company or troop, many years before the soldier reached the stage at which he was released from his regiment.

⁴⁵ These registers constitute the War Office Class WO116 in the United Kingdom National Archives. The documents in Class WO120 constitute a different set of records. They are arranged in regimental order, but they are not re-arranged duplicates of WO116. They are a sub-set of WO116.

⁴⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 13.2.1718, DB 20422.

⁴⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 5.2.1736, DB 5162.

Sergeant John Duncan of the Royal Scotch Fusiliers was 'greatly recommended for his bravery at Hochstett' (the battle of Blenheim) when he was retired thirty-six years later at the end of fifty years service.⁴⁸ Christopher Allen of Cornwallis's Foot was recorded as having had a 'Captain's Command' bestowed on him in the West Indies after gallant behaviour in the storming of two negro towns, but was released due to illness in 1736.⁴⁹ Trooper Hampton Saunders of Cobham's Horse received the only wound mentioned in his certificate 'in ye taking of ye Kettle Drums of ye Gens d'Armes at Hochstedt' when he appeared before the Board in 1726,⁵⁰ and Corporal of Horse Sylvanus Hyde serving with the same regiment 'took ye Standard of ye Rising Sun and kettle drums ...' in the same battle where he was 'a volunteer', presumably a Gentleman Volunteer.⁵¹ His valour was not forgotten by the officers who recorded it for his, and the Commissioners' benefit, in 1733, though by the time he was discharged, the regiment had been commanded by three successive colonels in addition to the one under whom Hyde had distinguished himself in 1704. Private James Couden⁵² of the 3rd Foot Guards was noted as being wounded whilst bringing in his wounded colonel from the combat at Machin, and George Wardner,⁵³ discharged from Pocock's Foot in 1722, had 'help't to carry off ye Duke of Grafton when kill'd at ye siege of Cork' in 1690 while serving in a different regiment before he re-enlisted in 1701.⁵⁴

In addition to the mention of good conduct in the recommendations officers made out for their men, they were also prepared to vouch for them in person if the Board was dubious about their injuries or how they had acquired them. Augustin Grimolt's injuries were attested to by Lieutenant-Colonel Elrington of Pearce's Foot as being received

⁴⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 7.11.1740, DB 9529.

⁴⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.2.1736, DB 5328.

⁵⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 6.5.1726, DB 8185.

⁵¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 22.10.1733, DB 1893.

⁵² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 4.12.1729, DB 2552.

⁵³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 9.5.1722, DB 10615.

⁵⁴ D. Chandler, *Marlborough as a Military Commander* (London: Batsford Limited, 1973), p. 41.

when Captain Newton was killed at Gibraltar in 1729.⁵⁵ John Viol's falling sickness was confirmed by his colonel in 1735.⁵⁶ Though the signature on Private Nicholson's certificate was queried, Major Milbourne was very ready to give him another one and confirm his entitlement,⁵⁷ and Robert Simson's deafness attributed to 'colds in Scotland' being regarded with some doubt, and his pension being deferred pending enquiries, General Evans consulted Major Heart and Simson was duly accepted on the pension despite having only served for two years.⁵⁸ Trumpeter John Eller was discharged on the Duke of Cumberland's orders⁵⁹ being afflicted with 'rheumatism in the head' and His Royal Highness's wishes were attended to in respect of several privates from both of the Foot Guards regiments that he commanded.

Though registration at the War Office of discharged soldiers newly-arrived in London with recommendations to Chelsea constituted the initiation of the process that culminated in examination, this procedure seems only to have become fixed from about 1705. Placing soldiers on the examination waiting list, however, did not mean that the War Office issued such men with billets for quarters. The maimed soldiers and sailors funds maintained within some counties were the first assistance to which soldiers could resort on arrival back in England.⁶⁰ These rate contributions were supposed to answer this purpose and at least to provide enough to move soldiers on from wherever they were landed. They were no more popular than any other tax, and the eastern division of Essex, for instance, was £315 in arrears in 1694. The division had,

⁵⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 9.12.1730, DB 892.

⁵⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 11.3.1735, DB 4608.

⁵⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.12.1729, DB 2240.

⁵⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.1.1729, DB 4172.

⁵⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 2.6.1746, DB 14503.

⁶⁰ Hudson states that the legislation providing for these funds became defunct in 1679. They were, however, maintained well into the eighteenth century - see Chapter 9. G.L. Hudson, 'Disabled Veterans and the State in Early Modern England' in Gerber, D.A., (ed), *Disabled Veterans in History*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), pp. 117-144.

however, paid out more than £115 in the four years up to January 1695.⁶¹ Between 1705 and 1709 no less than £2,049 in charitable pensions to local people and to servicemen passing through the area had been expended. John Sparrow, the Treasurer was awarded sixty pounds for his services, which had been 'more than ordinary troublesome ... by reason of the fforeign Warr'.⁶²

During the War of the Spanish Succession, the predicament of disabled soldiers discharged by their regiments in Flanders or the Iberian Peninsula was often difficult. Men invalided out of the service might find themselves put ashore almost anywhere in southern England and, it appears, that many of them received minimal help to get them to London. In 1705 a complaint was received at the War Office regarding invalids from Portugal who had been landed at Penryn and Falmouth in Cornwall and who, for want of other provision, 'were begging in the streets and becoming a burden'. The Secretary-at-War promised to reimburse the agent of the Commissioners for Sick and Wounded Seamen at Falmouth for the subsistence that he requested that they be paid in order to allow them to move on.⁶³ In late 1712 it was only at the request of Admiral Sir Charles Wager that forty men from the 3rd Foot Guards were taken into the hospital at Deal 'who would otherwise have perished upon the Beach' when they were unceremoniously dumped on their return from Dunkirk.⁶⁴ During the next major European war the same type of problem recurred. The Court of Common Council of Harwich resolved that the town's MPs should lay before parliament its complaint that 'large numbers of soldiers, soldiers' wives and children are landed from His Majesty's paquet boat from Holland and many of

⁶¹ Essex Record Office Account of the Treasurer of the Eastern Division ... 1691 to 1694/'95, D/DH/VI D. In the next four years £121 were paid out to soldiers and sailors.

⁶² Essex Record Office Account of the Treasurer of the Eastern Division ... 1705-1709, D/DGd 03.

⁶³ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/4, f. 20 SaW to Commissioners of Sick & Wounded Seamen, 23.10.1705.

⁶⁴ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, SaW to Commissioners for Sick and Wounded Seamen, f. 116, 2.10.1712. The S&W Commissioners were requested 'to keep a separate account as has formerly been done' so that they could be reimbursed.

them, by reason of sickness and other indigencys of nature, have and may become a charge on this Corporation, in respect of granting them proper support in the aiding and conveying them onwards on their journeys ...'. The councillors were of opinion that such charges should be borne out of Army accounts or other public monies.⁶⁵ Instructions regarding the conducting of invalids from the port of their disembarkation in Great Britain to London are rare, and it must be assumed that *ad hoc* arrangements were the norm. In December 1747, however, the War Office made a particular effort in respect of 163 invalids and one hundred other men embarked on the *Constant Jane* Transport bound for Gravesend, and sent detailed instructions for their reception and onward transport to await examination by the Hospital.⁶⁶

The problem of the accumulation of many disabled soldiers in the environs of Chelsea was addressed in March 1705 by the Commissioners who advised the Secretary-at-War that they had appointed 'a person to take care of the quartering of the invalids and paying their quarters at [a salary of] two shillings per day ... in regard of the remoteness of their quarters and the great trouble he will have in paying their severall landlords.'⁶⁷ This official was Mr Benedict Ithell, one of the Deputy Treasurers, who was designated the Quartermaster of the invalids. His work was made especially troublesome by the shortage of money available to discharge his duties and, though Ithell secured quarters for the invalids, in effect, they lived on credit and depended on the goodwill and patience of the public house keepers of

⁶⁵ Essex Record Office, Chelmsford, T/P 162/9 typescript transcription of Common Council Resolutions. Their complaint was noted as Thomas Orlibar, an official working for the Commissioners for Sick and Wounded Seamen was instructed to take care of soldiers landed from the Harwich packet and his employers were instructed to apply for money warrants to reimburse him. TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/41, f. 21 21 October 1745. The supervision of this hospital later fell to Mr John Holden, surgeon, who was instructed to report the date when the last soldier was forwarded to London – on which date his salary would cease – in October 1749. TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/46, f. 381.

⁶⁶ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/44, ff. 190-191, 6 December 1747.

⁶⁷ Hutt, p. 220.

Westminster, Chelsea and the villages to the south and west of the Hospital, who trusted them in expectation of eventual payment.

The difficulties of quartering and paying for quarters persisted throughout the Spanish war and the Hospital's Governor advised the Secretary-at-War in November of the 'miserable condition' of the invalids sent home from abroad and their arrival without subsistence, pension money or quarters assigned them.⁶⁸ The absence of money, however, led to the issue being passed to and fro between the War Office and the Hospital, despite public acknowledgement of the scandal and the distress of the men who were suffering. Secretary-at-War Wyndham forwarded to the Board a petition from destitute soldiers which had been sent to the queen, who commiserated with them in their 'Deplorable Circumstances ... being sensible of the prejudice which may be occasion'd to Her service by suffering such Objects of her Royal Favour & Charity to be neglected and become a further burden as well as an Offence to the Town ...'.⁶⁹ In November 1712, Ithell received 'a considerable sum of money' to pay off some of the quarters and he was provided with an escort from the 1st Troop of Horse Grenadier Guards to make sure that he and the money arrived safely in Kingston and parts adjacent in Surrey.⁷⁰

It seems that Ithell was responsible for arranging and paying for quarters for all categories of soldier having any connection with the Hospital. Disabled men awaiting examination, approved Out-pensioners who had not been granted furloughs to permit them to go home and men of the Invalid Companies, which had been formed from the Out-pensioners, but which had not been sent to any distant garrison and were still quartered in the Thames-side villages, all fell within his responsibilities. The problem of quarters was compounded, partially by an apparent presumption on the part of the Hospital authorities that all pensioners would remain in close proximity to Chelsea in order the more easily to

⁶⁸ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/12, f. 326, 5.11.1711.

⁶⁹ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 135, 16.10.1712.

⁷⁰ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 168, SaW to Lord Cholmondeley, 14.11.1712.

collect their money, and partially by the inability of those who had been accepted on the pension to pay off their creditors and return home, because no money with which to do so had been paid to them. In these early days, the precise legal status of the Out-pensioners seems to have been uncertain and the continuing connection between discharged soldiers and the crown, as their former employer, seems to have been taken to mean that the men were still in service and that a furlough – a leave pass – had to be given to them in order to allow them to proceed home.

The very difficult administrative and financial situation that remained with regard to the Hospital after the conclusion of the peace in April 1713 was addressed in the late summer. By August it was possible for the Treasury to find funds for Chelsea, and announcements appeared in the *London Gazette* promising payment not only for the quarters of Invalid companies for the year from mid-June 1712, but also 'to all persons on whom any other Invalid Out-pensioners ... were Quarter'd'. The landlords of *The Goat* at Hammersmith, *The Red Lyon* at Brentford and *The Castle* at Kingston must have been greatly relieved, as were all other creditors in a swathe of parishes from Acton and Ealing, through Wandsworth and Battersea to Southwark and Rotherhithe.⁷¹ Nevertheless these payments did not bring to a close the Hospital's responsibility for quartering those who hoped to become dependent upon it.

The clearance of debts in the high summer was only a very temporary relief of the problem, however, because on 26 May 1713 the War Office had advised the Commissioners that the rapid disbanding of the regiments meant that there were insufficient regimental funds with which to subsist their invalids. The letter recommended that the Hospital should pension these men or dismiss them as quickly as possible.⁷² Such a course of action may have reduced the waiting population in the villages, but it still left significant outstanding bills

⁷¹ London Gazette No. 5147, 15-18 August 1713.

⁷² TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 335 SaW to Commissioners.

against the Hospital's account either for future pension or for accommodation. The practice seemed to suggest that the Commissioners were responsible for invalids awaiting examination from the moment they arrived in London, and indicated that no thought had been given as to where financial responsibility lay for men whose regiments had ceased to exist. Placing the responsibility on the Hospital was a temporary expedient, the necessity for which disappeared quite quickly, but the burden of subsisting discharged men out of regimental funds remained for those regiments that were not broken at the end of the war, and it was one that some colonels were loath to honour.

Having received their discharge certificate endorsed with a recommendation to the royal bounty, the procedure, in 1715, was for the soldier to report to the War Office 'to be entered there as Usual', and when a sufficient list had developed a copy would be sent to the Hospital for an examination day to be fixed.⁷³ In November of that year, however, Chelsea's Secretary advised the War Office that this procedure was not required and that the 'invalid soldiers' should report directly to the Hospital where they would be registered for eventual examination and their 'pretensions' to pension be looked into.⁷⁴ Though direct-reporting to the Hospital may have been preferable to the Chelsea Secretary, it ignored the fact that the new arrivals had to be provided with billets for quarters, which according to later practice, only the Secretary-at-War could issue.

Nevertheless some system of local billeting under the control of the Hospital remained in operation for several years, as the Secretary called in the constables of Fulham, Lambeth and Lambeth Wells in May 1716 'in order to adjust the payments of the Billets of the Out Pensioners of your Parish'.⁷⁵ The use of the phrase Out-pensioners seems misleading in that the accommodation was almost certainly required for those awaiting

⁷³ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, Kingsmill Eyre to SaW, 29.1.1715/6.

⁷⁴ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, 27.11.1716.

⁷⁵ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, Kingsmill Eyre to John Burton, WO246/93; Kingsmill Eyre to Richard Arnold, War Office, 16.5.1716.

examination for pension. The absence of billeting control by the War Office meant that the Hospital's arrangements could easily be upset, and in 1717 the Secretary was obliged to request that the War Office remove companies of the Foot Guards from quarters in Chelsea parish, as Invalids discharged from garrisons and waiting to be received back onto the pension were having to sleep in the fields for want of accommodation. He reminded the clerk that the parish was usually kept clear of active troops for this very reason.⁷⁶

Chelsea's responsibility for allocating quarters continued for almost a decade until November 1726. After that date responsibility for quartering passed back to the War Office and such orders become commonplace in the Out-letter books.

From late 1726 therefore, men arriving in London with pretensions to the king's bounty were given quarters pending their examinations in the most convenient villages on the outskirts of the capital, usually in accordance with the direction from which they had come. John Brisbane and John Bennett from the Independent Garrison Company of Edinburgh Castle were given northern billets at Kentish Town in August 1730,⁷⁷ while a large party of fifty men from Egerton's Foot was provided with a marching route from Bristol in October which directed them into quarters in Hammersmith and Fulham to the west of the city.⁷⁸ Men were also sent to Knightsbridge and Kensington villages to wait for the Commissioners to sit, and the War Office maintained a tally of the numbers of discharged men and the quarters they occupied. This allowed the clerks to assess when a sufficient number had arrived to make it necessary for the Commissioners to sit and, of course, so that they could be called in to a Board meeting when required. It also prevented the overloading of available billets in any particular area. More men discharged from Egerton's Regiment in July of the following

⁷⁶ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO 246/93, Kingsmill Eyre to Secretary-at-War, 11.7.1717.

⁷⁷ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/30, f. 50.

⁷⁸ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/30, f. 69.

year were positioned in Hampstead, Highgate and Kentish Town, despite the fact that they approached the city from Bristol.⁷⁹

The occasional nature of the Commissioners' meetings meant that men having received quarters pending examination might remain there for a considerable time. The dates of the examinations are shown in Table 3-1 and it is noteworthy that, in peacetime at least, they were neither frequent nor evenly spaced throughout the year. Men presenting themselves before the War Office clerks requesting quarters the day after an examination therefore simply waited until the next sitting of the Board. Alabaster Hendley of the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards,⁸⁰ who arrived on 11 January, had to wait until 11 March 1740 before being examined and pensioned, and Sergeant William Weir of Kerr's Dragoons waited a similar two-month period between August and October 1736.⁸¹ This was of no particular disadvantage to them, but it was a matter of some concern to their regiments whose agents were obliged to subsist them out of the Non-Effective Fund until the next examination. This responsibility had reverted to the regiments by about 1717 having, as we have seen, been imposed on the Hospital at the end of the War of Spanish Succession. That expedient was an ill precedent which some colonels remembered and it was, perhaps, what lay behind the instructions some of them gave to their agents not to provide subsistence for their discharged men.

When such provision was not made, men were obliged to live on credit and were unable to clear their quarters after their examinations. This does not seem to have been a frequent occurrence, but it arose from time to time. The Chelsea Secretary was instructed by the Board to write to the agents of Murray's and George Grove's Regiments of Foot in November 1727 as their former soldiers had received nothing from the

⁷⁹ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/30, f. 181.

⁸⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 11.3.1740, DB 7705.

⁸¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 5.10.1736, DB 6645.

agents.⁸² In the following March, Mr Walmesley, agent to Newton's Foot had to be reminded to subsist Mark Baker and Edward Kitwalider and Mr. Strudwick similarly neglected discharged men from Clayton's Foot.⁸³ Again in 1729, Randolph Hutcheson⁸⁴ and Edward Smith⁸⁵ of Clayton's Foot, newly-returned from Gibraltar, found that this injunction was observed more in the breach than the execution, as the Chelsea Secretary successfully sought redress on their behalf, informing the War Office that they were in 'miserable starved condition' having been refused subsistence by Strudwick, seemingly on his colonel's orders.⁸⁶ This spate of incidents of discharged men being abandoned by their regiments in the interests of retaining the monies in the Non-Effective funds to increase the officers' annual dividend, led to a Standing Order being issued by the Secretary-at-War to all regimental agents reminding them of their responsibilities.⁸⁷ The requirement to subsist such men was made absolutely clear in the *Warrant for Regulating the Non-Effective Fund of the Several Regiments of Infantry* in 1765.⁸⁸

The Secretary-at-War's Marching Orders,⁸⁹ which provided for the quartering of invalids in 'that part of Chelsea extending from Pimlico House to the Church' and in many other villages to the north and west of London, detail numerous instances of men from the same regiment arriving at the War Office several days apart in rapid succession. This indicates that they were individually discharged on a random basis and that regiments did not, usually, gather together their ineffective men

⁸² TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 83 verso, 7.11.1727. The men concerned were Henry Cant and Joseph Beard (DB 6312 & 6314) of 37th Foot and William Gardner (DB 6279) of 19th Foot.

⁸³ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/29, ff. 173 & 178.

⁸⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 13.11.1729, DB 2616.

⁸⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 13.11.1729, DB 2617.

⁸⁶ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, Kingsmill Eyre to Secretary-at-War, 14.11.1729.

⁸⁷ The Secretary-at-War's letter, but sent only to Strudwick not to any other agents, is dated 18.11.29 (TNA, WO4/30, 18.11.1729). The problem did not go away, however, Dragoons George Whitacre (DB 11505) and John Turner (DB 11503) complained in December 1743 that they had not received their 'Hospital Money'. (TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 135.)

⁸⁸ Simes, *Military Guide*, p. 219.

⁸⁹ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/31 f. 217.

and discharge them in groups. Over the eight weeks between mid-September and mid-November 1735, Middleton's Foot discharged its serjeant-major who was given quarters on 17 October, two privates quartered on 3 November, one private on 22 November and another on 2 December, each of these individuals having to march from Scotland to London, a journey which took about a month.⁹⁰ In January 1737, Sabine's Royal Welsh Fusiliers discharged three men who arrived in London on 7, 14 and 22 January having marched likewise from Scotland. Occasionally larger groups were discharged together and required a Marching Order to get them from wherever they were stationed to London and into quarters. Thomas Howard's Foot discharged four sergeants, four corporals and twenty-two privates from Abingdon in Oxfordshire and required a route with a quartering order to get them to Chelsea in late December 1735,⁹¹ though the officers who discharged sixty men from Hargrave's Foot in January 1736 appear to have dispensed with this formality.⁹²

The decisions to discharge soldiers were made primarily by the captains of the companies in which the men had served, presumably after consultation with the surgeons of the regiments. As each soldier was accounted for by his captain, it was ultimately at the discretion of the latter whether or not the man should be released, and if the captain did so decide he also implicitly accepted that the individual concerned would have to be replaced. The decision to discharge therefore gave rise to two acknowledgements of future expenditure; one in respect of subsistence for the soldier leaving the company until the day of his examination by Chelsea, and the other for the monies involved in recruiting his replacement, both of which charges came from the same fund. In these circumstances therefore, the decision to discharge was not taken lightly and, as we shall see, in the first half of the eighteenth century, soldiers were retained in the ranks for as long as possible. The individual nature of the decisions to discharge, and the fact that the

⁹⁰ TNA, Marching Orders WO5/32, ff. 97 - 116.

⁹¹ TNA, Marching Orders WO5/32, f. 124.

⁹² *Ibid.* f. 164. Hargrave's Foot was on its way from Ireland to Minorca at the time.

released men would commence their journeys to London from wherever their company or detachment was quartered, accounts for their uncoordinated arrivals at the War Office as they wandered in from the country having made as rapid a march as their physical condition permitted from their various points of departure.

Men turned up at the War Office individually or in small groups from regiments based all over Great Britain and the colonies on an almost weekly basis. During 1737 thirty-five individuals and thirty groups of two or more men from twenty-two regiments of Foot, one Scottish Garrison Company and eight mounted regiments arrived on fifty-four different days. In the following year, over thirty-eight days twenty groups and twenty-five individuals arrived from fifteen Foot regiments, one Scottish Garrison Company and five regiments of Dragoons or Horse.⁹³ Men arrived therefore from all over Great Britain and, less often, from Minorca, Gibraltar or the Americas and trickled into the War Office requesting quarters wherein to await their examinations by the Board of the Lords and Other Commissioners of His Majesty's Royal Hospital. The War Office kept track of them all.

The irregular sitting of the Commissioners often caused problems, and the Chelsea Secretary was obliged to initiate the process of calling a Board from time to time, especially during the summer when members were likely to be out of London. One hundred certificates had accumulated in his office by mid-August 1730 and the Hospital's Governor felt it necessary to invite the Secretary-at-War and the Paymaster General to constitute a Board with him to clear them.⁹⁴ Boards took place several times a year (Table 3-1) and usually large numbers of invalids were processed on each occasion.

⁹³ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/32 and WO5/33.

⁹⁴ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, Kingsmill Eyre to Secretary-at-War, 15.8.1730.

The meetings took place at the Horse Guards building in Whitehall and not within the Hospital. This was an unsatisfactory location as, even as early as 1717, their Lordships were complaining that the chamber was cramped '... not having room at times of Exam but by crowding in amongst the Soldiers and the building being about to be pulled down ...' as it was in a poor state of repair.⁹⁵ It was suggested that the room previously used by the lottery would be a more suitable location, but this does not seem to have been made available and examinations continued in the Great Room at the Horse Guards until the middle of 1739. During April of that year the Chelsea Secretary had recommended as a replacement the fitting up of a privately-owned room in Scotland Yard, at the cost of two hundred pounds, for which an annual rent of twenty-five pounds would be payable. Approval was given by the War Office and a warrant to cover the costs was issued.⁹⁶ Disputes with their landlord, a Mr Smith, prompted the Board to authorize its Secretary to negotiate with the War Office about 'proper accommodation ... in a Public Building to be erected at Horse Guards'⁹⁷ but Smith's room remained the Commissioners' place of business until at least 1744.⁹⁸ In March 1740 it was being referred to as the Hospital Chamber in Killigrew Court, Whitehall.⁹⁹

The process for the organization of an examination was made formal in November 1716 when the Commissioners complained that papers and lists of names were being sent in 'confusedly'. They ordered that henceforth the Secretary prepare lists of attendees in advance of meetings and that only those men listed would be considered.¹⁰⁰ The manner of compilation of the Admission Registers indicates that the invalids who were to be examined on a particular day were selected in

⁹⁵ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, Lord Lincoln to Viscount Stanhope, 20.7.1717.

⁹⁶ TNA, Royal Hospital Miscellanea Book, unfoliated, WO247/2, Kingsmill Eyre to Secretary-at-War undated, but probably April 1739 and approval and warrant, 9.5.1739.

⁹⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 131 verso.

⁹⁸ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 134 verso.

⁹⁹ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 215.

¹⁰⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 36.

advance and their names compiled and ordered before the meeting that they were supposed to attend. The registers generally show that the men were marshalled by troop or regiment and that the contingents from each branch of the service were examined in order of precedence – Horse Guards, Horse Grenadier Guards, Horse, Dragoon Guards (after 1746), Dragoons, Foot Guards, Foot and Marines – and in seniority by regiment. Not every list for an examination day is quite so precisely arranged, but most of them conform more or less to this pattern from the early 1720s. It would appear that a clerk from the Hospital was despatched to a number of public houses where discharged men were lodged and that he advised the residents when they should present themselves and recorded the names of all those, in their regimental groupings, who were directed to a particular sitting. Failure to report for examination was not a frequent occurrence, but George Bailie of Byng's Marines¹⁰¹ was annotated as 'did not appear' on 21 August 1744, as was Dragoon Oliver Ralston¹⁰² of the Inniskilling Regiment on 26 November. Neither of them were subsequently examined, so they either abandoned their pretensions or died in quarters. Ralph Dishley of Cholmondeley's Foot was noted as 'Sick' on 28 November 1745,¹⁰³ though he was pensioned when he had recovered sufficiently from his head and foot wounds to appear on 16 May 1746. Private Charles Moor¹⁰⁴ of the Coldstream Guards having lost his left arm at Fontenoy did not appear on 12 February 1746, but he was pensioned two days later. The examination of the invalids was always the first item of business that the Commissioners attended to and the Minute Books record that they went on to consider other matters as time allowed.

There is some evidence to suggest that during the War of the Austrian Succession the process of examination for each batch of discharged men took place over two days and that the Hospital's surgeon or his deputy looked them over on the day following their presentation to the Commissioners. This procedure is indicated by the claim of Mr.

¹⁰¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 21.8.1744, DB 12304.

¹⁰² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 26.11.1744, DB 12472.

¹⁰³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.11.1745, DB 13703.

¹⁰⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 14.2.1746, DB 13995.

Alexander Read or Reid, the Deputy Surgeon, who petitioned in 1743 for an additional £50 for 'his Extraordinary Services for four years past after Board days to examine invalids in order to their being sent to Garrison ... and likewise visiting them in the Hospital & places of confinement'.¹⁰⁵ It is not to be wondered at that men awaiting examination should have required medical treatment, as the condition of many of them was unlikely to have improved on their journey to London and, unless they had received charitable medical aid from the towns through which they had passed, they may well have arrived in poor condition.

Details of the thoroughness of the examination were disclosed to Parliament in 1732 during a debate on a supply motion to allow £25,348 in addition to the Hospital's normal revenue for the Out-pensioners. In response to a suggestion that some discharged men were improperly received and were not appropriate objects of charity, Sir William Strickland, the Secretary-at-War, asserted that 'We have been so cautious, that we have made the fellows strip to the skin, that we might examine them the more narrowly, and might be better able to judge whether they were actually disabled and unfit for any farther service ...' and, he went on '... after such a strict inquiry, we could not in conscience, we could not in humanity, refuse to admit them.'¹⁰⁶

QUALIFICATIONS

However pathetic the condition of the discharged men who presented themselves before the commissioners, they had to exhibit disabilities, ailments or proven length of service to qualify for the royal bounty in addition to their good characters. We have seen that the regulations of 1685 specified that those who had been 'disabled by wounds in ffight or other accidents' or 'as having served the Crown 20 years ... [and] are

¹⁰⁵ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 131 verso.

¹⁰⁶ W. Cobbett, *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England* (London: Hansard, Vol. VIII 1722-1732, 1811), Columns 930-936. I am grateful to Dr Glenn Stepler for drawing this reference to my attention.

become unfit for service' were duly qualified.¹⁰⁷ These terms were repeated exactly on 27 August 1689 and by Queen Anne's instructions on 13 August 1709. The regulations of 12 December 1712, however, specified that admittance on the basis of superannuation after twenty years required that the man's service must be consecutive and 'without any intermission' and it may have been on this basis that many men were dismissed from the pension in the general re-examination of late winter 1713.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, even after that exercise, the desire to reduce the number of pensioners prompted a ruling that thirty years should be the qualifying period for superannuation if the soldier had received no wounds during his service.¹⁰⁹ The Letters Patent, Establishments and Instructions issued after the accession of George I do not mention the qualifications in terms of injuries, ailments or length of service, but it is clear that a return was made to twenty years as the minimum period for pension on the grounds of superannuation.¹¹⁰ This minimum period, and the expectation that it would be accompanied by additional justification for pension, was re-asserted in 1738 when the Commissioners received the king's approval for their own declaration of what they considered to be correct.

*The Commissioners ... having observed that many Invalid soldiers make pretentions to the Pension on the merit of twenty years service in the Army although not disabled thereby, 'Tis their Opinion that no persons serving in Great Britain or Ireland are properly entitled to the said Pensions Except such as are by age or wounds or by Distempers contracted in the Service become disabled from doing Duty.*¹¹¹

In order to be sure that the men presenting themselves for examination before the Commissioners were indeed those whose names appeared

¹⁰⁷ Hutt, p. 146 citing the Establishment and Regulations ... of 1 January 1686.

¹⁰⁸ Hutt, pp. 185, 225 & 230.

¹⁰⁹ RHC, Minute Book, Adm 67, f. 20, 23 June 1713.

¹¹⁰ Hutt, pp. 233-234.

¹¹¹ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/34, ff. 605-606, 1.11.1738.

on their discharge certificates, duplicates of those documents were to be sent to the regimental agent and he was instructed to accompany the soldiers in order to vouch for them. This could not have been an entirely satisfactory process, as the agent was most unlikely to have personal knowledge of any of the men, and he could therefore only vouch for the authenticity of the soldiers' documents when compared with his copies. It seems likely that exact copies of certificates were not sent to the agents and that an annotated list of men sufficed for this purpose. An officer of each regiment was also required to attend, presumably after due notification, though no letters requesting the attendance of these representatives appear in the War Office or the Hospital's Out-letter books. In peacetime, duty in London was unlikely to be unpopular and in wartime regiments at home would similarly have little difficulty in complying with the requirement. Contingents of invalids from Minorca or Gibraltar would probably have been returned to Great Britain under the care of the officer leading the recruiting party intended to find their replacements. After 1740, regiments stationed abroad sending relatively recently wounded men back to England may have sent an officer to conduct them home, and his duty would not have been completed until he had finally disposed of his party. Alternatively, the duty might have fallen on an officer of the additional companies that were raised for each of the Foot regiments serving in Flanders from mid-1744 and which remained in Great Britain acting as a form of regimental depot.¹¹² Nevertheless, for those officers who did return from abroad, the distractions of London, or the call of home, proved too strong for some, and, in August 1743, the Board felt itself neglected by this want of attendance. Complaining of frequent absences of agents and officers, it ordered that regimental contingents, which were unaccompanied on examination day, should be postponed to the end of the day, and possibly deferred to another day. The sanctions were intended to operate by increasing the period under

¹¹² TNA, Establishment for Two Additional Companies to be raised for the Twenty-one Battalions of Foot serving in Flanders, 25.6.1744, WO24/231.

which the regiments would have to subsist their invalids from their Non-Effective Funds.¹¹³

The processes described above got the soldier out of his regiment and lodged in London awaiting his examination. The question remains, however, why were men discharged, what caused them to be no longer fit for service and what variety of wounds, ailments and injuries did they exhibit to the Commissioners? These questions will be dealt with in the next two chapters.

¹¹³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 134.

Chapter 4

The end of service

The next two chapters will focus on why soldiers were discharged from their regiments. This chapter will deal in general terms with that question and will examine the part played in the process by the length of time which a soldier was likely to serve and his age on leaving his regiment. It will also describe the administrative process of discharge.

The reasons for the discharge of soldiers are complex. It is often difficult in respect of those discharged during peacetime to ascertain from the information given in the Chelsea records a single, precise cause for discharge, as it is frequently the case that combinations of injuries or ailments are cited. Some of these are attributable to the unavoidable circumstances of serving as a soldier - the wear and tear which performing a soldier's duties exerted on the body and which were inescapable given the conditions in which that duty was performed - while others may simply be attributable to old age, or may have originated in a 'normal' medical complaint, which was exacerbated by duty. These combinations of reasons for discharge also exhibit complaints that were caused by battle injuries alongside ailments or disabilities acquired during peacetime service. However, injuries that were the equivalent of battle wounds, were received in peacetime in Great Britain in the performance of operations against smugglers or rioters, so gunshot wounds, cuts and stab injuries were not exclusively received on the battlefield.

Mounted troops in particular suffered from the very act of riding and managing horses and the various strains and accidents to which those activities gave rise. It is rarely possible to specify in the case of injuries suffered years before whether the incident

happened in combat or off the battlefield.¹ It is noticeable, however, that a large proportion of injuries were directly caused by contact with and use of horses, and the majority of those cited relate to duty off the battlefield. The mere act of riding a horse on routine or ceremonial duties in an urban area presented plenty of opportunity for the animal to be spooked by hustle and bustle or to slip or stumble on uneven, slippery, rubbish-strewn and ill-kept cobbled streets. However well-schooled horses might be, these incidents were never entirely absent from the life of a horseman no matter how experienced the rider or the horse.

During wars or rebellions, soldiers were discharged as a direct and immediate consequence of the receipt of wounds that were severe enough to disable the man outright. It is clear, however, that many minor wounds, leading to temporary disablement, were received, treated and rectified so that the man was capable of returning to duty. The words used to describe wounds were sometimes at variance with modern usage. George Meldrum of Portmore's Dragoons was said to have had his right hand 'quite disabled' at Sherrifmuir in 1716 and in the context of these records, 'quite' means completely, and yet he was pensioned from an infantry regiment sixteen years later.² The longer term consequences of such wounds may have exhibited themselves at a later date and contributed to eventual disablement, but it is only rarely possible to discern direct linkage between a wound received several or many years before, and the stated cause of discharge at the time that the man presented himself before the Hospital Commissioners. It is clear that part of the process of justifying the man for discharge and recommendation to pension, and thereby emphasizing his entitlement to the royal bounty, was to cite wounds received in the course of his service, whether or not they

¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 26.11.1744, DB 12466. Unusually, Dragoon Thomas Nicholson's entry specifies that his injuries resulted from his horse being shot under him in combat, though without mentioning the particular action.

² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 29.9.1732, DB 1530.

were directly a contributory cause of the soldier's discharge. Some, perhaps many, of them would have been, but they also served as honourable marks of distinction which proved and confirmed service and the suffering that often went with it.³ It is incorrect therefore to read the texts giving the causes or justifications for discharge as if they record injuries that were, at the time of discharge, actually causing pain or contributing to the incapacity of the man to do duty. Some of them undoubtedly were, but it is unlikely that all were and it is impossible to judge in many cases whether they were the primary reason for discharge or not.

It is common therefore to find in the Registers reference to injuries that were years or even decades old. Private Richard Potts⁴ of Kane's Foot cited a wound received at Steenkirk in 1692 when pensioned on 10 May 1732 and John Gumley⁵ mentioned being cut in the neck at the Battle of Aughrim in 1690 when examined in February 1731. In both of these cases, and many besides, the men's service was calculated from when they last joined the Army and not from when they had first enlisted; Gumley having rejoined in 1702 and Potts in 1708. Clarification on this point had been delivered to the Commissioners in December 1712 when the Secretary-at-War wrote that Her Majesty's intention was that twenty years service was not a qualification for pension 'unless it be without Discontinuance.'⁶ Even so, it is unusual to find that any soldier could undertake two decades or more of service without being wounded or subject to injury, though some managed it.⁷ On

³ Wounds as 'badges of bravery' are mentioned by M. Lincoln, *The Medical Profession and Representations of the Navy, 1750-1815*, p. 219 in G.L. Hudson, (ed.), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* (New York: Rodopi, 2007).

⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.5.1732, DB 1436.

⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 23.2.1731, DB 1081.

⁶ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/14, f. 200.

⁷ John Turner of the Scots Greys had served unscathed for 22 years (TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 13.12.1718, DB 20521), Pte Sells who enlisted in Trelawny's 4th Foot in 1686 had 'no wounds about him' when pensioned in 1721, (WO116/1, 21.7.1721, DB

the evidence of these citations therefore, service could be a good deal longer than the years stated at the time of examination and, though cumulative service was not formally taken into account when approving men for pension, the mention of wounds sustained in conflicts prior to the man's recorded date of enlistment acted as an indicator that he had done more than was implied by the statement of his years of service. The Commissioners themselves, many of them military men, could not have been unaware of the dates, or at least the years, of particular engagements and that they preceded the stated date of entry into the Army of the man before them. This reflects neatly Mandler's conjecture that it seems logical to assume that, in certain respects, the poor understood the rich better than the rich understood the poor, because it was clearly in the former's interest to be able to play on the susceptibilities of the latter.⁸

Occasionally previous service was indicated, as in the case of William Sanger of the 2nd (Coldstream) Regiment of Foot Guards who was pensioned in 1729 having re-enlisted in 1706, but was recorded as having 'served ten years in King William's Time'.⁹ Daniel Grant of William Handasyde's Foot was taken back into the service at age 46 and managed to serve ten more years until he became unfit by colds and fevers in 1744. It was noted, however, that he had previously served twelve years in General Collier's Regiment during the War of the Spanish Succession.¹⁰ Sam Short had served twenty-five years from 1719, but also 'served the last

21162), Robert Watson of the Royal Irish Regiment got through 40 years without a scratch. (WO116/2, 8.8.1728, DB 5604).

⁸ Cited in the Introduction to T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, (eds) *Chronicling Poverty - the voices and strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997), p. 2.

⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 3.12.1729, DB 2463.

¹⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.12.1744, DB 12649. It is not clear whether this was Collier's 2nd Foot in the British Army or Collier's Scots-Dutch Regiment in the service of the Netherlands.

war in Flanders'.¹¹ In his case no other qualification for pension was offered.

The long-term results of wounds, accidents or disablements were not the only distinguishing marks set down in the Registers. The presence of scars relating to slight injuries, which could not have been of any significance in terms of the man's ability to continue to serve, were recorded, as well as other physical attributes having nothing to do with service or injury. These were noted with the evident purpose of identifying the individual in later years when he came to collect his pension or to prove that he was still alive at the periodic re-examinations and, so far as possible, to try to prevent impersonation.

Drummer Robert Lugg of the 3rd Foot Guards was noted as having a scar near the corner of his right eye from birth.¹² Charles Summers was described as having a red stain on his forehead, presumably a birth-mark.¹³ Private Forrest¹⁴ had 'a remarkable boney face', James Miller¹⁵ a hair lip and Thomas Strong of Tyrrell's Dragoons stuttered.¹⁶ William Muckleroy had been born with six fingers and toes on each hand and foot¹⁷ and Thomas Harris of the Buffs had pied hair, presumably as a result of a birth-mark on his head.¹⁸ Other distinguishing characteristics were also recorded, though their continued usefulness as unalterable identifiers might be doubted. John Fox¹⁹, pensioned from the 2nd Troop of Horse Guards aged 70 in 1722, was 'a large, fat, fair man'; James Bassière²⁰ of the 1st Troop 'a thin Frenchman, his eyebrows hang much over his eyes'. Dragoon Jonathan Stevenson's red hair

¹¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 14.12.1744, DB 12685.

¹² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 11.2.1724, DB 8330.

¹³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 14.12.1726, DB 8018.

¹⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 10.8.1727, DB 7854.

¹⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 23.10.1723, DB 9248.

¹⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 19.1.1719, DB 20592.

¹⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.7.1738, DB 7349.

¹⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 15.6.1731, DB 1161.

¹⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 2.7.1722, DB 10658.

²⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 13.7.1722, DB 10736.

would, presumably, not have remained that colour for long past his fifty-fifth year²¹ nor would Jonathan Byron's 'handsome brown hair' similarly last, though he may have remained 'a well looking man'.²² The sole comment that Sergeant Henry Berkeley of the Horse Grenadiers was 'a middle sized old man' was surely not a fool proof method of accurate identification amongst his fellow pensioners,²³ though the fact that Robert Rippon of Evans's Dragoons had been born with only one joint on each of his fingers would always have been an indisputable identifier.²⁴ Nevertheless, these potential identifiers do indicate the means by which the Hospital attempted to counter impersonation and its concern that only those who were genuine pensioners should receive the royal bounty.

The fact that many men cite combinations of reasons for discharge makes it impossible to provide a neat, easily reconcilable, statistically perfect calculation of what brought them to this point, but the details of their wounds, injuries and ailments will be examined in the next chapter.

Whatever the stipulations given to recruiting officers later in the century, it is clear that neither during the Spanish War nor afterwards was youth a prime consideration in choosing recruits. However, before attention is turned to the cited causes of discharge, it is necessary to examine the general circumstances in terms of age and length of service that underlay the captain's decision to part with one of his soldiers.

We have previously commented upon Bennett Cuthbertson's remark that the wise officer should not believe the age that a new recruit might give on enlistment without satisfying himself to the best of his ability that it was, in fact, realistic. Nevertheless, *faute*

²¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 6.12.1722, DB 10880.

²² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 6.12.1722, DB 10853.

²³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 12.7.1722, DB 10679.

²⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 7.4.1732, DB 1400.

de mieux, we have to accept what the Admission Registers tell us. Similarly, length of service is possibly complicated by two factors. One, which has already been remarked upon, was the requirement for qualifying service to be continuous, and the other was the possible false declaration of these years in the man's discharge certificate. Naturally, no provable instances of this practice can be discerned, but Sergeant Roger Lamb mentioned it in his memoirs as being perpetrated in the 1780s and it is not impossible that the practice was of long standing.²⁵ As with errors in statements of age, intentional or otherwise, the researcher cannot best-guess the Chelsea Registers and any data given must be accepted as accurate.

The tables accompanying this chapter have been compiled from the 'length of service' (Tables 4-1 to 4-4) and 'age at discharge' (Tables 4-5 to 4-8) data provided in the Hospital's admissions registers. All records have been used regardless of whether the man was eventually pensioned or not, as they represent a snapshot of the factors under consideration. In every year there were always a few men for whom one or the other or both of these pieces of information was not given. Occasionally it is stated that a man was unable to give his age owing to mental derangement, but his captain had been able to provide the number of years that he had served. In other cases the information is missing for unknown reasons.

The data have been divided into three groups for comparison within each of the factors. Length of service has been plotted for those who served between one and nineteen years inclusive, between twenty and twenty-nine years inclusive and for those having served thirty years or more. Age at discharge has been grouped for those who were thirty-nine or younger at discharge,

²⁵ D.N. Hagist, 'Unpublished Writings of Roger Lamb, soldier in the American War of Independence', Part 2, *JSAGR*, Vol. 90 (2012), p. 79.

those aged between forty and fifty-nine, and those who had reached the age of sixty, or who served beyond that age. The instances falling within each of these groupings has been calculated as a percentage of all those for whom, in each year and within each branch of service, this data is available. These percentages are presented in the columns A, B and C within the tables, which also include a column T indicating the total for whom this data appears in the records in each year. Column T does not, of course, represent those men who presented themselves, of whom most were pensioned, without having stated their age or length of service.

Table 4-1

CAVALRY - Length of Service

The table below shows the length of service of all the cavalry at their time of discharge. The data is presented in percentages. Column A gives those who served 19 years or less; Column B those who served between 20 and 29 years inclusive and Column C those who served 30 years or more. Column X is the sum of columns B and C and therefore represents the combined total percentages of those who served more than 20 years and those who served 30 years or more. Column T gives the total number of cavalry examined in that year. This will normally be the same in the tables of both Length of Service and Age at Discharge, but in a few cases service is given but no age, or vice versa.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	51.2	42.3	6.4	48.7	78
1717	36.3	50.0	15.9	65.9	44
1718	28.7	57.5	13.6	71.1	73
1719	35.6	49.4	16.0	65.4	85
1720	30.3	48.2	21.4	69.6	56
1721	34.0	59.0	6.8	65.8	44
1722	10.4	38.4	50.4	88.8	125
1723	38.8	44.7	16.4	61.1	67
1724	27.4	56.4	16.1	72.5	62
1725	40.4	42.8	16.6	59.4	42
1726	32.7	49.0	18.1	67.1	55
1727	25.0	50.0	25.0	75.0	60
1728	25.0	61.6	13.3	74.9	112
1729	20.7	60.3	18.8	79.1	154
1730	23.7	65.4	10.7	76.1	139
1731	26.6	53.3	20.0	73.3	60
1732	30.9	49.0	20.0	69.0	55
1733	32.6	46.3	21.0	66.3	95
1734	42.3	29.7	27.9	57.6	111
1735	46.4	33.9	19.6	53.5	56
1736	45.8	40.0	14.1	54.1	85
1737	46.6	31.4	21.9	53.3	105
1738	43.6	45.4	10.9	56.3	55
1739	57.1	30.3	12.5	42.8	56
1740	42.5	40.0	17.5	57.5	40
1741	41.1	34.1	24.7	58.8	85
1742	35.1	37.2	27.6	64.8	94
1743	47.6	37.6	14.6	52.2	130
1744	58.1	30.2	11.5	41.7	208
1745	61.0	27.9	11.0	38.9	118
1746	57.5	32.5	9.8	42.3	224
1747	71.1	22.8	5.9	28.7	201
1748	38.5	55.3	5.8	61.1	412

1749	35.1	59.2	5.5	64.7	162
1750	51.8	48.1	0	48.1	27
1751	42.8	52.3	4.7	57.0	42
1752	40.7	57.4	1.8	59.2	54
1753	38.4	52.3	9.2	61.5	65
1754	45.0	49.2	5.6	0	71
1755	58.4	28.3	13.2	0	53

Table 4-2

FOOT GUARDS - Length of Service

The table below shows the length of service of all the Foot Guards at their time of discharge. The data is presented in percentages. Column A gives those who served 19 years or less; Column B those who served between 20 and 29 years inclusive and Column C those who served 30 years or more. Column X is the sum of columns B and C and therefore represents the combined total percentages of those who served more than 20 years and those who served 30 years or more. Column T gives the total number of Guardsmen examined in that year.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	27.2	65.9	6.8	72.7	44
1717	32.8	55.7	11.4	67.1	149
1718	31.9	61.7	6.3	68.0	47
1719	23.3	50.0	26.6	76.6	30
1720	27.7	44.4	27.7	72.1	18
1721	23.8	56.6	19.4	76.0	113
1722	14.0	54.2	32.3	86.5	71
1723	26.3	48.8	25.5	74.3	129
1724	21.8	57.8	20.3	78.1	210
1725	24.5	59.0	16.3	75.3	110
1726	20.5	52.3	27.1	79.4	107
1727	17.9	52.5	29.4	81.9	78
1728	22.5	54.1	23.3	77.4	120
1729	18.7	67.5	13.7	81.2	321
1730	28.0	64.4	7.4	71.8	121
1731	28.7	57.5	13.6	71.1	66
1732	36.7	48.5	14.7	63.2	68
1733	38.9	49.1	11.8	60.9	59
1734	49.4	40.6	9.8	50.4	91
1735	41.4	45.7	12.8	58.5	70
1736	34.9	51.4	13.6	65.0	249
1737	35.2	43.5	21.1	64.6	85
1738	51.6	35.9	12.3	48.2	89
1739	52.7	31.0	16.2	47.2	74
1740	50.7	40.8	8.4	49.2	71
1741	44.2	35.7	20.0	55.7	95
1742	44.6	47.3	8.0	55.3	112
1743	51.2	26.8	21.9	48.7	82
1744	46.7	40.9	12.3	53.2	154
1745	69.9	26.5	3.4	29.9	143
1746	65.3	37.1	8.0	45.1	87
1747	51.6	34.9	13.3	48.2	209

1748	53.5	40.7	5.7	46.2	469
1749	44.6	51.6	3.6	55.2	383
1750	58.0	41.9	0	41.9	81
1751	74.3	24.3	1.2	25.7	82
1752	69.8	29.2	0.9	30.1	106
1753	74.3	23.9	1.7	25.6	117
1754	73.4	24.2	2.3	0	128
1755	80.0	17.9	1.2	0	78

Table 4-3

MARCHING FOOT - Length of Service

The table below shows the length of service of all the Marching Foot at their time of discharge. The data is presented in percentages. Column A gives those who served 19 years or less; Column B those who served between 20 and 29 years inclusive and Column C those who served 30 years or more. Column X is the sum of columns B and C and therefore represents the combined total percentages of those who served more than 20 years and those who served 30 years or more. Column T gives the total number of Marching Foot examined in that year.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	52.8	39.3	7.8	47.1	179
1717	36.6	51.6	11.6	63.2	120
1718	46.9	45.1	7.8	52.9	166
1719	35.2	57.2	7.5	64.7	159
1720	43.0	33.3	22.5	55.8	91
1721	52.3	33.6	13.0	46.6	107
1722	27.3	50.6	21.4	72.0	219
1723	27.2	51.7	20.0	71.7	143
1724	27.1	53.3	19.4	72.7	118
1725	39.7	48.8	11.3	60.1	88
1726	23.9	53.7	22.3	76.0	121
1727	14.0	63.8	22.0	85.8	299
1728	18.0	65.3	16.6	81.9	450
1729	12.5	77.0	10.3	87.3	702
1730	14.8	72.6	12.5	85.1	472
1731	27.4	66.0	6.5	72.5	153
1732	16.3	62.7	20.9	83.6	177
1733	22.9	55.9	21.0	76.9	209
1734	29.1	50.3	20.4	70.7	137
1735	13.9	43.0	43.0	86.0	230
1736	15.0	61.4	23.5	84.9	625
1737	18.9	53.6	27.4	81.0	222
1738	20.1	44.5	35.3	79.8	164
1739	19.3	45.1	35.4	80.5	124
1740	24.7	36.8	38.4	75.2	182
1741	34.7	41.3	23.9	65.2	213
1742	42.1	33.3	24.4	57.7	237
1743	37.9	33.4	28.6	62.0	332
1744	44.7	34.2	21.0	55.2	709
1745	72.4	19.1	8.4	27.5	772
1746	72.2	19.5	8.1	27.6	981
1747	74.4	18.9	6.5	25.4	732
1748	63.7	27.6	8.6	36.2	1295

1749	35.1	50.6	14.1	64.7	1662
1750	38.0	53.8	9.1	62.9	197
1751	58.4	33.6	7.9	41.5	101
1752	61.7	31.6	6.5	38.1	183
1753	60.3	35.0	4.6	39.6	194
1754	65.8	29.8	4.3	34.1	255
1755	48.1	46.6	5.1	51.7	193

Table 4-4

MARINE REGIMENTS - Length of Service

The table below shows the length of service of all the Marines at their time of discharge. The data is presented in percentages. Column A gives those who served 19 years or less; Column B those who served between 20 and 29 years inclusive and Column C those who served 30 years or more. Column T gives the total number of Marines examined in that year. Column X is omitted in this Table.

	A	B	C	T
1741	96.1	3.8	0	26
1742	82.5	15.1	2.3	86
1743	83.8	12.8	3.8	78
1744	83.9	13.7	2.2	88
1745	85.2	10.2	4.5	88
1746	86.3	9.5	4.0	148
1747	89.5	5.9	4.4	134
1748	79.4	15.9	4.5	460
1749	67.3	29.7	2.9	104
1750	90.4	9.5	0	42
1751	100	0	0	5

LENGTH OF SERVICE

Systematic examination of the statistics given in the tables will show that for the cavalry the percentage of men discharged within the minimum service group was, with the exception of only two years – in 1716 and 1739 – consistently below 50% until after the intervention in Flanders and Germany during the War of the Austrian Succession. This was also largely the case within the Foot Guards regiments until 1737 when, for unfathomable reasons and

against admittedly small samples, there is a rise in the disposal of short-service men in the lead-up to the Austrian war. With more consistency, this reluctance to discharge short-service soldiers is shown in the Marching Foot, which, apart from 1716 and 1721, presents generally low percentages within this column until two years into the European war.

Reluctance to discharge continues to show itself in the cavalry after the renewal of war and proportions noticeably above 50% only appear in Column A between 1744 and 1747. Another high point is evident in 1755, though the reason for this cannot convincingly be predicated upon anticipation of the renewed war – the Seven Years War – that would commence in the following year. From 1743 the Foot Guards show a pretty consistent pattern of discharging more men from the below nineteen years service group. During the war this reflects the terrible casualties suffered by the Guards Brigade at Fontenoy in particular, and the fact that the Guards, unlike any other part of the Army, had the luxury of being able to select its younger, fitter men, who were likely to have served less time, for the battalions which went overseas to fight, leaving at home for guard duties its older, longer serving personnel. It is also clear that the Foot Guards had disposed of their long-service men by the end of the war, and the balance between column A and column B takes on a very different pattern to that shown by the other branches of service for the remainder of the period under consideration.

The Marching Foot show high discharges among short-service men in the last four years of the war and throughout the early 1750s. This probably reflects the re-distribution of the length of service demographic that had been brought about by the recruitment of the Army with new men during the war, though if this is the reason, it is not as marked as the trend that we have observed within the Guards.

Having looked at those discharged before they had completed the notional minimum to qualify for pension, we should turn to men of longer service, bearing in mind particularly, that the majority of the survey period was one of rarely disturbed peace. In order to highlight the length of service data, the columns B and C have been combined into column X, which indicates the percentages of men who served more than the notional twenty-year minimum and far beyond that point. One might, nevertheless always expect Column B regularly to throw up percentages higher than 50% because it may be thought that service of more than thirty years would be unlikely. In fact, this is far from being the case. For the cavalry only fourteen years show a column B figure of 50% or more. For the Foot Guards this proportion accounts for sixteen years and for the Marching Foot eighteen years.

Examination of column X, however, indicates the remarkable percentages of men who had service of more than twenty years and beyond thirty years. Among the cavalry, in thirty-three out of the forty years surveyed, more men were discharged having served over twenty years than had served less. In the Foot Guards, the percentages with long service predominate in twenty-nine of the survey years and this proportion is exceeded by one year in the Marching Foot which shows thirty years in which long service discharges hold the majority. What is also striking about column C is that in most years up to the start of the Austrian war, those having served thirty years or more provide at least 10% and quite often above 20% of the whole annual sample in the cavalry. In the Foot Guards the percentages vary more, but before 1744 are rarely below 10% and in the Marching Foot before the war are rarely below 14%. Although many men served up to and beyond the minimal pension period, significant numbers served considerably beyond that length of time.

The Regiments of Marines raised for the War of Jenkin's Ear, and continued into the Austrian Succession War, illustrate a skewed

view of the short-service phenomenon as, with the exception of their cadres, they did not exist long enough to serve for the notional minimal pension period. Of course, the men who formed their cadres may well have been approaching twenty years of service before they were drafted into these new regiments, and they are represented in Columns B and C of the Tables.²⁶ The percentages presented here naturally match closely the proportions of those who had experienced any service before joining the Marine regiments and those who had not. They are thus inevitable and the reader should be wary of drawing too many conclusions about the toll which Marine service took. This is particularly so when it is considered that each of the ten regiments had an establishment of 1,110 NCOs, musicians and privates²⁷ and that with casualty replacements, probably 15,000 men or more passed through the Corps during its existence. Nevertheless it only produced 1,254 men to present before the Commissioners.

It is tempting to hypothesize that were one specifically to examine the new-raised regiments of Foot in this war, it seems likely that they would show similar proportions of discharges with regard to length of service as the Marines, but whereas the latter were quickly sent on active duty and remained so employed for most of the war, many of the new-raised regiments did not see active service and therefore, other than accidents and illness, were unlikely to recommend many men to the Hospital. This

²⁶ Cadres comprising one third of the privates for each of the original six Marine regiments, 234 men each, were found by drafting men from old regiments of Foot. Eighteen Foot regiments contributed 78 men each. C.T. Atkinson, 'Jenkins' Ear, The Austrian Succession War and the 'Forty-Five', *JSAHR*, Vol. 22 (1943/44), pp. 286-287.

²⁷ TNA, Establishment for the Six Regiments of Marines, 25.10.1739, WO24/187. A further four regiments of Marines were added to the Corps in the following year – WO24/198, 25.12.1740. The regiments remained on this establishment until disbanded in 1748, though War Office Establishments only exist for the regiments to 1746 - WO24/209, 219, 227, 237, 266, 276 – as control of the Corps had been passed by Warrant to the Admiralty on 28th February 1747 – TNA, Audit Office Warrants, AO15/45.

circumstance was further reinforced by the retention of many of these regiments in Ireland, from which kingdom they had no right of discharge to Chelsea.

AGE AT DISCHARGE

When dealing with the British Army of the eighteenth century it is necessary to remind oneself that almost none of the assumptions, that might now be considered normal in relation to military forces, applied to it. There were, for instance neither minimum nor maximum ages of enlistment. Nor was there an accepted age at which soldiers were deemed to be too old to function efficiently. These two considerations mean that the age profile of the Army appears, to modern eyes, peculiar in terms of the perceptions of fitness and capability that would be considered the norm in the twenty-first century. For many soldiers the Army was genuinely a job for life, the termination of which might literally be death in combat or reduction to a state of incapacity through the various factors that we have already examined, which brought about a decision on the part of the man's captain that his services should be dispensed with. The employment agreement between the soldier and his captain may be encapsulated by stating that as long as the former was capable of performing what was asked of him to a level of effectiveness that was acceptable to the latter, he would be retained in the regiment. There was no notional age of retirement in any career in the early eighteenth century and only the developing middle class of professional men, who may have been able to accumulate wealth during their working lives, had the potential luxury of stepping back from the world of work. Susannah Ottaway places the growth of Friendly Societies and the notion of retirement well towards the end of the century and the

rise of pensions provided by employers did not commence until the 1830s.²⁸

For the labouring poor, of whom soldiers were a part, it was of the utmost importance that they continued to work for as long as possible in an employment that was generally stable and not subject to the fluctuations of trade cycles or the meteorological variations that could bring ruin to those engaged in agriculture.²⁹ What we see from the following statistics is an institution which, except in wartime, retained men well into middle age and to a significant extent into old age. The division of the age ranges in Tables 4-5, 6, 7 & 8 has been formulated to exhibit a notional allowance of twenty years in order to qualify for pension within column A, ie. a hypothetical enlistment age of nineteen, and column C is in accordance with Ottaway's categorization of the common recognition of old age as starting from the sixtieth year.³⁰

Table 4-5

CAVALRY - Age at discharge

Age at examination / discharge presented in percentages of those who were discharged at the age of 39 or younger (Column A), those discharged between the ages of 40 and 59 years, both inclusive, (Column B) and those who had served up to their 60th year or beyond (Column C). Column X is the sum of B and C. Column T is the total number of cavalrymen examined in that year.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	27.5	53.7	18.7	72.4	80
1717	22.2	60.0	17.7	77.7	45
1718	6.8	83.5	9.5	93.0	73

²⁸ S.R. Ottaway, *The Decline of Life - Old Age in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) pp. 75 & 82. Hereafter cited as Ottaway, *Decline*.

²⁹ The seasonality and intermittent nature of work is well described by K. Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities - Economic Lives in early Modern Britain, 1470-1750* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 2000), p. 311.

³⁰ Ottaway, *Decline*, Chapter 1.

1719	11.6	72.0	16.2	88.2	86
1720	10.9	63.6	21.8	85.4	55
1721	6.8	84.0	9.0	93.0	44
1722	0.8	48.3	50.8	99.1	124
1723	7.4	73.1	19.4	92.5	67
1724	8.1	68.8	22.9	91.7	61
1725	2.5	70.0	27.5	97.5	40
1726	3.7	64.8	31.4	96.2	54
1727	5.0	66.0	28.3	94.3	60
1728	9.8	66.9	23.2	90.1	112
1729	8.4	64.2	27.2	91.4	154
1730	8.6	84.0	7.2	91.2	138
1731	13.3	66.6	20.0	86.6	60
1732	10.9	74.5	14.5	89.0	55
1733	14.7	70.5	14.7	85.2	95
1734	12.6	58.5	28.8	87.3	111
1735	21.4	66.0	12.5	78.5	56
1736	17.6	76.4	5.8	82.2	85
1737	18.0	70.4	11.4	81.8	105
1738	25.4	54.5	20.0	74.5	55
1739	23.6	67.2	9.0	76.2	55
1740	22.5	70.0	7.5	77.5	40
1741	11.7	68.2	20.0	88.2	85
1742	12.7	64.8	22.3	87.1	94
1743	31.5	60.0	8.4	68.4	130
1744	37.9	53.3	8.6	61.9	208
1745	46.6	48.3	5.0	53.3	118
1746	42.8	53.1	4.0	57.1	224
1747	51.7	45.7	2.4	48.1	201
1748	24.0	72.8	3.1	75.9	412
1749	17.2	79.6	3.0	82.6	162
1750	37.0	62.9	0	62.9	27
1751	14.2	83.3	2.3	85.6	42
1752	18.5	81.4	0	81.4	54
1753	15.1	81.8	3.0	84.8	66
1754	27.1	70.0	2.8	72.8	70
1755	45.2	47.1	7.5	44.6	53

Table 4-6

FOOT GUARDS - Age at Discharge

Age at examination/discharge presented in percentages of those who were discharged at the age of 39 or younger (Column A), those discharged between the ages of 40 and 59 years, both inclusive, (Column B) and those who had served up to their 60th year or beyond (Column C). Column X is the sum of B and C. Column T is the total number of Guardsmen examined in that year.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	9.0	75.0	15.9	90.9	44
1717	14.0	77.8	8.0	85.8	149
1718	15.2	73.9	10.8	84.7	46
1719	10.0	76.6	13.3	89.9	30
1720	22.2	66.6	11.1	77.7	18
1721	13.1	76.3	10.5	86.8	114
1722	12.6	69.0	18.3	87.3	71
1723	8.5	65.8	25.5	91.3	129
1724	9.4	73.9	16.5	90.4	211
1725	11.8	74.5	13.6	88.1	110
1726	11.1	70.3	18.5	88.8	108
1727	10.3	74.0	15.5	89.5	77
1728	10.8	76.6	12.5	89.1	120
1729	6.25	80.9	12.8	93.7	322
1730	8.2	83.4	8.2	91.6	121
1731	12.3	75.3	12.3	87.6	65
1732	19.1	63.2	17.6	80.8	68
1733	18.6	72.8	8.4	81.2	59
1734	24.7	64.0	11.2	75.2	89
1735	10.0	77.1	12.8	89.9	70
1736	16.9	75.4	7.6	83.0	248
1737	17.6	65.8	16.4	82.2	85
1738	28.0	64.0	7.8	71.8	89
1739	20.2	72.9	6.7	79.6	74
1740	23.9	71.8	4.2	76.0	71
1741	18.0	74.4	7.4	81.8	94
1742	13.3	80.3	6.2	86.5	112
1743	39.0	52.4	8.5	60.9	82
1744	25.9	66.8	7.1	73.9	154
1745	51.7	47.5	0.6	48.1	143
1746	43.6	49.4	6.8	56.2	87
1747	33.0	60.2	6.6	66.8	209
1748	36.8	60.5	2.5	63.0	469
1749	23.7	75.7	0.5	76.2	383
1750	37.0	60.4	2.4	62.8	81
1751	59.0	40.9	0	40.9	83

1752	51.4	48.5	0	48.5	105
1753	49.1	50.0	0.8	50.8	118
1754	57.0	42.1	0.7	42.8	128
1755	56.4	42.3	1.2	43.5	78

Table 4-7

MARCHING FOOT - Age at Discharge

Age at examination/ discharge presented in percentages of those who were discharged at the age of 39 or younger (Column A), those discharged between the ages of 40 and 59 years, both inclusive, (Column B) and those who had served up to their 60th year or beyond (Column C). Column X is the sum of B and C. Column T is the total number of Marching Foot examined in that year.

	A	B	C	X	T
1716	26.3	48.3	25.2	73.5	182
1717	16.1	63.5	20.3	83.8	118
1718	17.2	76.5	6.1	82.6	162
1719	11.8	76.2	10.0	86.2	160
1720	19.3	63.4	17.2	80.6	93
1721	16.0	70.7	13.2	83.9	106
1722	6.9	79.2	13.3	92.5	217
1723	7.0	65.4	26.7	92.1	142
1724	11.9	66.6	21.3	87.9	117
1725	12.3	69.6	17.9	87.5	89
1726	10.0	65.0	25.0	90.0	120
1727	5.6	77.2	17.0	94.0	299
1728	7.1	74.6	19.2	93.8	450
1729	7.1	83.1	9.7	92.8	701
1730	9.9	80.7	9.3	90.0	472
1731	14.3	77.7	7.1	84.8	152
1732	6.8	73.2	19.8	93.0	176
1733	10.0	75.0	14.9	89.9	208
1734	15.3	70.0	14.5	84.5	137
1735	7.3	65.6	26.9	92.5	230
1736	7.2	80.8	12.0	92.8	625
1737	7.1	79.3	13.4	92.6	223
1738	7.8	78.1	13.9	92.0	165
1739	5.6	78.2	16.1	94.3	124
1740	13.1	61.5	25.2	86.7	182
1741	21.6	58.4	19.8	78.2	212
1742	28.1	51.6	20.1	71.7	238
1743	22.3	48.5	29.1	77.6	340
1744	28.7	54.9	16.3	71.2	710
1745	55.3	38.3	6.2	44.5	769
1746	50.0	43.2	6.7	49.9	981
1747	52.0	42.4	6.4	48.8	732

1748	39.6	54.9	5.4	60.3	1295
1749	15.6	73.7	10.5	84.2	1662
1750	21.8	65.9	10.6	76.5	197
1751	37.6	58.4	4.9	63.3	101
1752	33.8	61.7	4.3	66.0	183
1753	30.2	65.1	4.6	69.7	195
1754	29.0	69.0	1.9	70.9	255
1755	31.6	61.6	6.7	68.3	193

Table 4-8

MARINE REGIMENTS - Age at Discharge

Age at examination/ discharge presented in percentages of those who were discharged at the age of 39 or younger (Column A), those discharged between the ages of 40 and 59 years, both inclusive, (Column B) and those who had served up to their 60th year or beyond (Column C). Column T is the total number of Marching Foot examined in that year. Column X is omitted as irrelevant in this analysis.

	A	B	C	T
1741	80.7	19.2	0	26
1742	54.6	43.0	2.3	86
1743	62.3	35.0	2.5	77
1744	65.5	29.8	4.5	87
1745	56.8	36.3	6.8	88
1746	53.0	40.1	6.8	147
1747	59.7	36.5	3.7	134
1748	53.4	43.6	2.8	458
1749	46.5	49.5	3.9	101
1750	64.2	33.3	2.3	42
1751	40.0	60.0	0	5

Examining the cavalry reveals that, apart from the two years immediately following the first Jacobite Rebellion, discharges of men at or under the age of thirty-nine were very small throughout the decade of the 1720s. They rose only gradually during the 1730s, only once reaching 25%, though that was in a year with a low total figure of departures to pension. It is only from 1743 that

there is a noticeable and consistent rise during the war years, which is accounted for predominantly by injury and illness on campaign, to which wounds in action contribute, though only as the third factor in scale of importance. (See Table 5-1 in Chapter 5) After 1749 the small sizes of the annual samples give more prominence to the percentages than perhaps they deserve. In looking at Column B, it is evident that most men were discharged from within the forty to fifty-nine age group. The percentages are most frequent in the sixties and seventies, they show in the eighties in five years and only provide proportions of less than 50% in four years. In 1722 the balance is provided not by more, younger men being discharged, but by an increase in older men leaving the Service. What is really striking about the table – Column C - is that it shows what a large proportion of cavalymen were retained up to and beyond their sixtieth year. Up to the start of the War of Jenkin's Ear it falls below 10% in only five years and stands at 20% or more during ten years. The high percentages in column C in 1741 and 1742 indicate the clearing out of those unlikely to be able to stand the strains of active service and it is evident that by the start of the Austrian war the cavalry had been largely purged of its really old men, though by 1755, the percentage begins to rise again.

In relation to discharges of men in the younger age group, the Foot Guards show a completely different pattern. During the years of peace before 1739 these regiments usually dismissed larger percentages of younger men than the mounted branch. During the Austrian Succession War, the increased percentages exhibited amongst this group tend to indicate that, quite naturally, younger men were selected to make up the Guards battalions that went on active service to Flanders and Germany. This is supported by the noticeable decline in discharges amongst the over-sixties during the same period. Again it is clear that most men did their soldiering up to the age of fifty-nine; in four years 80% of discharges fell within this age group and in sixteen years prior to

1741 this age group accounted for more than 70% of those released. Nevertheless, service beyond the age of sixty was certainly not unusual in the Foot Guards and up to the mid-1730s it almost always accounted for significantly more than 10% and above 15% in seven out of twenty years. Even more so than the cavalry, by 1745, the Foot Guards seem to have disposed of most of their old men and the percentage shown by this grouping continues to remain very low for the remainder of the period under examination.

The Marching Foot presented considerably more soldiers before the Commissioners than either of the other two branches of service. They were also much more frequently involved in active service against enemies, rebels or rioting fellow citizens than the Foot Guards or most of the cavalry. The Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1719 and the expedition to Vigo in 1720 probably account for the quite high percentages of younger men – aged thirty-nine and below – who were discharged in the first five years of the survey. However, the Army was so under-strength that soldiers who had been discharged from the Marching Regiments, pensioned and then sent to the Invalid companies in Portsmouth and Plymouth before 1720, were gathered up to fill the regiments going on the Vigo expedition. These men would have increased the age profile of the expeditionary force.³¹ Thereafter, until the onset of war in 1739 the percentages discharged from this young age group normally appear as less than 10%, and this is so even in the years immediately following the siege of Gibraltar in 1727, which might have been expected to produce a blip in this trend. The recommencement of war, first in the Caribbean and subsequently in mainland Europe, exhibits the anticipated effect of producing more discharges in this range, with the young men taken in to build up the Army from 1740 suffering particularly heavy losses

³¹ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/22, ff. 193 & 227 SaW to Colonel Fielding to allow Lord Cobham to draft men out of the Invalid Regiment, 6.8.1719.

between 1745 and 1747. This must reflect the disposal of men whose military careers had been cut short by combat at Fontenoy or in Scotland, and it is noticeable that the percentages of those discharged because of wounds in 1745 and 1746 exceeds, unusually, those attributed to illness in those two years - See Table 5-3.

In only five years does the percentage of men aged between forty and fifty-nine years fall below 50% (1716, 1743, 1745, 1746, 1747). This again emphasizes the loss of the younger age group, but it also shows how much infantry service was, for most soldiers who were pensioned, a long-term career to be slogged through in all its repetition and monotony. Column C – the percentages of men discharged at or beyond the age of sixty – reinforces this observation: the proportions rarely falling below 10% in the years before 1745 and not infrequently register at 20% and generally above 15%.

Taken together, these sets of statistics relating to length of service and age at discharge indicate that the British Army in the first half of the eighteenth century was overwhelmingly a long-service force, which retained men for as many years as it possibly could. This was true of all branches. Experience and maturity were clearly valued, because of the advantages they conveyed in terms of discipline and steadiness - what might be referred to as 'professionalism' in the ranks - rather than being a reflection of the difficulty of recruiting replacement personnel.³² One might suppose that the country's generally buoyant and developing economy meant that the lure of civilian employment was almost always more attractive than the soldiering life, and that it was only

³² The concept of 'professionalism' amongst the soldiers is open to interpretation. Experience, discipline and steadiness seems a better gauge of professionalism than youth and physical fitness, cf. Nielsen, Out-pensioners Chapter 2 Section 2.3.

the combination of the seduction of adventure and the necessity to take in large influxes of new personnel when a major war again broke out that refreshed the manpower of the Army after 1739. The long peace that followed the War of the Spanish Succession was likely to lead to a degree of stagnation within the Army, and this stability matched the political climate and gave as little offence as possible to that part of the nation that was suspicious of the existence of a Standing Army.

Remarkable as these statistics are, they need to be fleshed out with the stories of the men who were recommended in order to make them memorable and to illustrate the wide variety of circumstances in relation to age and length of service that the Commissioners had presented to them. We must also consider how age related to length of service, because it is clear that old age did not necessarily imply long service, no more than relative youth at discharge invariably implied short service. Considerations of this kind prompt questions as to the age at which soldiers were recruited and the wide range of ages at which pensions were awarded, and in turn engender questions as to how many years the recipients collected them. The fundamental point of the last question relates to the number of pensioners who, in any one year, were received upon the pension and the number who, for whatever reason, but usually death, departed from it. Underlying the whole is the recognition of the long-term nature of the pension burden that the Hospital, and by extension the government, was accepting.³³

³³ Both Innes and Nielsen have plotted the number of men on the Out-pension against the number of men serving in the Army year-for-year. However, as a pensioner might remain on the pension for several decades covering periods of both peace and war, there does not appear to be any dynamic relationship between these two sets of figures. See - J. Innes, 'The Domestic Face of the Military-Fiscal State: Government and Society in eighteenth-century Britain' in L. Stone (ed), *An Imperial State at War: Britain 1688-1815* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 111 and Nielsen, Out-pensioners, Appendix 1 Table 1.

As has been shown, old age was no absolute obstacle to soldiering in this period, and one cannot but wonder at the stamina of the tough old fellows scattered throughout the Army. Beyond his eightieth birthday, Trumpeter John Wood settled himself into his saddle and blew the calls that summoned his comrades in the 4th Regiment of Horse to their duties.³⁴ George Murray, though a year younger than Wood, joined the Army in the reign of Charles II. His service in the 6th Foot had included being wounded at the siege of Namur in 1692, but he soldiered on for more than three decades after that, receiving his pension at age seventy-nine after fifty-five years service. He was also one of the fortunate few who became In-Pensioners.³⁵ Less fortunate than his namesake, Dragoon Daniel Wood was afflicted with loss of hearing, memory and poor sight as a result of lying in the camp at Stirling in anticipation of a Jacobite invasion in the winter of 1718-19.³⁶ His previous service in Cadogan's Horse must have made him familiar with such discomforts, but at seventy years of age his constitution was no longer able to put up with it, though he must have been considered fit enough when he had re-enlisted ten years before.

However, old age at discharge did not inevitably mean that the prospective pensioner had served for many years. Private William Walker of Chudleigh's Foot finally retired in his eightieth year. The fact that he had been blown up at the siege of Douai in 1710 had secured him a pension, but it had been deferred whilst he served a further four years in an Invalid Company doing garrison duty at Tynemouth.³⁷ Thereafter he was taken into the Hospital as an In-Pensioner, but he clearly continued to exhibit an acceptable level of fitness, because in 1727 he was 'drafted out of the House' into Chudleigh's Foot to serve at the siege of Gibraltar in 1727. His

³⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 18.7.1729, DB 2924.

³⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 12.11.1724, DB 8596.

³⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 25.4.1719, DB 20741 and J.L. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars, Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002), p. 60.

³⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 25.4.1735, DB 4741.

final release onto Out-pension in 1735 must have come as something of a relief, though in fact he had served only twenty-five years having entered the Army at the age of fifty-five. Anthony Whitton of Roger Handasyde's Foot had served a year less than Walker, but the lack of restriction on the age at which recruits could be accepted meant that he was eighty-four when he was placed on the Out-pension in 1716.³⁸ Thomas Brown of Bragg's Foot was fortunate to receive a pension after only four years service, though his failing of eyesight and the pains in his body from lying in a wet camp were scarcely unexpected in a man recruited during his fifty-seventh year.³⁹

Enlistment in later years, however, had its disadvantages because the Commissioners were well aware of the difficulties that might arise from such a practice. The recruiting officer of Battereau's Foot clearly should not have taken John Fisher in his fifty-seventh year and he was rejected for pension when he appeared complaining of consumption after only fifteen months service.⁴⁰ Nor was the Board prepared to accept that Finlay Monro had been an appropriate recruit and had become superannuated by only four years service in the Black Watch. They rejected him despite his sixty years.⁴¹

In contrast to the examples above, some men had joined the Army at a much more tender age. Lieutenant Paul Pepper secured a place for his son, Robert aged ten, in his own regiment, Pearce's Foot.⁴² The lad presumably first served as a drummer, but was a private by the time he lost his left eye to a shell fragment at the siege of Gibraltar and was placed on the pension in 1730. He had, of course, served beyond the twenty-year minimum to qualify in

³⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 12.5.1716, DB 19687.

³⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 24.1.1746, DB 13950.

⁴⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 16.10.1746, DB 15024.

⁴¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 25.1.1749, DB 21776.

⁴² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.12.1730, DB 883. C. Dalton, *George I's Army* Vol. 1, (Uckfield: Naval & Military Press Reprint, 2005) p. 142.

addition to his wound, but was still only thirty-four years old. Having been born in the regiment and known no life other than the Army, his adaptation to civilian ways was unlikely to be easy. Eight men appear in the registers having been recruited into the Foot Guards or Marching Foot regiments at age eleven, among them Thomas Jones of Edward Wolfe's Foot (The King's Regiment) who clearly took to his duties as a drummer with great enthusiasm, as he left the service having become the regiment's drum major, when rheumatism disabled him in 1755, though he had served only twenty-two years.⁴³ Eleven men who had enlisted as twelve year olds were pensioned in the survey years, and for some the service clearly offered unusual opportunities. Army child William Brown, who had been a dragoon for six years, but was pensioned from Onslow's Foot, had gathered enough medical knowledge to be noted as a surgeon when he was examined for pension after thirty-two years service.⁴⁴ His intelligence and skill, as well as his relative youth at forty-four, got him a posting as a sergeant in an Invalid company.

Though all of these youngsters served more than the minimum qualifying period, plenty of pitfalls lay in the path of young recruits, which might cut short their service almost before it had begun. The tables in Chapter 5 give the possible causes and the tables in Chapter 4 the percentages. Whereas the Army could do nothing about illness, animal misbehaviour or genuine accidents, the Commissioners were obliged to take a humane and pragmatic view in respect of misfortunes involving weapons that might, and often did, have catastrophic effects. Experience and a refined sense of self-preservation could protect the soldier to some degree, but the danger to new recruits dealing with the unfamiliar and before they had developed these skills was significant.

⁴³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 21.3.1755, DB 25542.

⁴⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 3.11.1742, DB 10332.

Regiments were frequently obliged to retain firearms for very long periods of time and, considering the wear and tear engendered by almost daily drill and more occasional firing practice, they were often in poor condition. Houlding cites instances of muskets going off unintentionally during inspections and regiments declining to demonstrate their firing practice at inspections because their arms were not safe enough to do so.⁴⁵ The consequences of this to soldiers of any age could be very serious, but the loss of new recruits is particularly noteworthy. Joseph Green of the 1st Foot Guards lost his right hand by his piece going off while on guard at St. James's Palace.⁴⁶ He had served only five months. Precisely the same accident happened to his regimental comrade William Franklin in 1734.⁴⁷ Thomas Sudds of Kane's Foot, a promising young recruit of nineteen newly-arrived in Minorca, was discharged to pension after only six months having blown his left hand off cleaning his firelock.⁴⁸ Dragoon Lawrence Higgins served only a year before losing fingers from his left hand by an accidental shot.⁴⁹ All of these men were disabled and pensioned in their early twenties, none of them having served more than twelve months.

The examples above illustrate the variety of circumstances in relation to age and length of service that could arise within the body of those who might be recommended for pension. It makes clear that there was no consistent linkage between the factors of length of service and age at discharge. Both of them exhibit a greater degree of randomness than might have been anticipated,

⁴⁵ J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service, the Training of the British Army 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp.140-142. See also De Witt Bailey, *Small Arms of the British Forces in America, 1664-1815* (Woonsocket, Rhode Island: Mowbray Publishers, 2009), p. 113 – Fuller's and Warburton's regiments of Foot sent from Gibraltar to garrison Louisbourg in 1745 had received arms in 1740 and 1741 respectively. They were not replaced until 1755.

⁴⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.9.1730, DB 754.

⁴⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.11.1734, DB 4493.

⁴⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 25.7.1735, DB 4817.

⁴⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 9.1.1747, DB 15330.

but this is precisely because there was no logical standard against which they can be considered. Both depended entirely upon ungoverned circumstance.

Whatever degree of contribution age and experience or youth and callowness made to the decision to discharge a man that decision fell predominantly to his captain as company or troop commander. This was particularly so because the dispersed nature of duty in Great Britain where constituent parts of regiments were very widely scattered⁵⁰ would have made centralised decision-making problematic, though the captain's ruling was, probably, confirmed by the lieutenant-colonel commanding the regiment. On release from his regiment, the soldier's discharge certificate was deemed to be sufficient documentation for him to be able to claim quarters in public houses during his march to London. Though discharged from their regiments, their colonels, and more particularly the colonels' agents, continued to be responsible for them until their status formally changed on being accepted for pension by the Hospital. Simes implies in *The Military Guide* that the effect of a discharge once given was absolute and that the recipient was no longer part of the regiment.⁵¹ Clearly this was not so, as the regiment remained responsible for providing the discharged man

⁵⁰ As examples, in the summer of 1730 the 23rd Foot had four companies in Birmingham, three 15 miles away in Wolverhampton and one each at Tamworth (15 miles), Walsall (8 miles) and Stafford (25 miles). Whetham's Foot had four companies in Colchester, three in Ipswich 18 miles away and one each in Woodbridge (26 miles), Braintree (16 miles) and Cogshall (10 miles). In August a detachment of Lord Mark Kerr's Foot in Aberystwyth had nineteen days of marching to rejoin its comrades in Berwick and Kerr's 7th Dragoons had a detachment in Lewes, Sussex 26 days riding marches away from the regiment's headquarters. TNA, Marching Orders WO5/30, ff. 11, 61, 196 and 433, the latter in May 1733. In April 1737, Handasyde's 16th Foot serving at Berwick was ordered to send a detachment to Aberystwyth in Wales against smugglers and to Ledbury in Herefordshire to protect the turnpike roads. TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/34, f. 405.

⁵¹ T. Simes, *The Military Guide for Young Officers* (London: 1781), pp. 172-3.

with the means to return home, if rejected by Chelsea or, in those cases in which the captain was prepared to take the man back into his company, the delivery of the order to return and the provision of subsistence money for his journey. Men so rejected were given back their discharge certificates, which acted as their permits to claim quarters while they were returning to their regiments.⁵² It is evident in some cases that regiments did indeed receive back men who had been rejected at examination because it is sometimes the case that these men were again recommended to the king's bounty several years or a few months later. Francis Dover of Cadogan's Dragoons was rejected on 6 May 1737, but his case was re-stated and he was received on 9th June.⁵³ Peter Bernice was first examined when serving in the 3rd Foot Guards in November 1728. He was eventually pensioned from Handasyde's 16th Foot thirteen years later.⁵⁴ Between 1715 and 1755 1,303 men were rejected for pension at their first examinations. Of these 137 were given second examinations, though data is lacking for seven of these cases. Eleven of these examinations were short deferrals of a month or less, presumably because the men were too ill to attend their first call-ins. Seventeen men were rejected again at second examination. Fifty were pensioned within one to twelve months of their first examination. Thirty-four had to serve on for between thirteen months and five years before being pensioned. Eighteen men continued to serve for between five and nineteen years before receiving the royal bounty.⁵⁵

⁵² Thomas Wallis of the 1st Foot Guards returned his certificate to his captain in 1725 and was pensioned at his second examination four years later (WO116/2, 2.12.1729, DB 2663) Robert Heard of Barrell's Foot had his certificate given back to the officer who had vouched for him at his examination in 1740. (WO116/3, 6.11.1740, DB 9479) Roger Gasken of the Royal Dragoons was told to serve on in April 1746 and had his certificate returned. (WO116/4, 11.4.1746, DB 14259) He was pensioned in December 1748 (DB 19072). John Day of Graham's Foot was treated likewise when rejected in July 1744. (WO116/4, 18.7.1746, DB 14726).

⁵³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 9.8.1737, DB 6874.

⁵⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 24.3.1741, DB 5496.

⁵⁵ Examination of database on 16 November 2015. Of the entire sample 52 came from the Marching Foot and 47 from the Foot

Indications as to the status of men in the intervening period between leaving their regiments and appearing before the Chelsea Board is provided in particular by James Wolfe as Lieutenant-Colonel of Bury's 20th Foot. The detail of his notes to the monthly returns give a rare glimpse into how men were accounted for until their status changed from soldier to Out-pensioner. In May 1750 he noted that the five men recommended to Chelsea were marked down as 'Effectives' (still considered to be in the ranks) as they had not yet passed the Board.⁵⁶ They continued to be so recorded until August by which time the regiment had heard that all of them had been pensioned. By this means, of course, the regiment continued to draw pay for them, which provided their subsistence during their absence. In 1754 the King's Regiment of Foot recorded that it had marked down the eighteen men recommended to Chelsea as being on furlough, and still therefore 'Effectives', until their fate should be known.⁵⁷

There are no indications that the Secretaries of the Chelsea Board wrote to the commanding officers of the regiments whose men had been rejected at examination advising them that one or more of their soldiers were supposed to be returning to them. The requirement for the regimental agents to attend the meetings of the Board, however, ensured that they were aware of those who had been received by Chelsea and those who had not. The future status of the discharged soldier who was rejected for pension by the Hospital and whose captain would not receive him back must have been confirmed by correspondence between the regiment

Guards. Thirty-three were cavalry, 19 of them deriving from the Horse and Dragoons and the Horse Guards and Horse Grenadier Guards accounting for 14. It seems likely that the Household troops - Foot and Horse - were able to deploy resources of patronage to secure a disproportionate number of successes at second examination given the disparity of numbers between the Line and the Guards.

⁵⁶ TNA, Monthly Returns 1751, WO27/2. The 20th Foot was in Scotland at the time.

⁵⁷ TNA, Inspection Return, WO27/3, 31 October 1754.

and the agent, and it seems likely that a new discharge certificate and a small amount of subsistence would have been issued by the latter. Men in uniform were not permitted to wander about the country with no 'protection certificate' for fear of being taken up as deserters, and in the interests of avoiding the expenses regiments would have had to bear out of the Non-effective fund to look into the cases of men believed to have deserted, and to pay for their upkeep while they were in custody, the necessary formalities would have been strictly complied with.⁵⁸ Those who were discharged and rejected for pension, in the event of not being able to find any other means of subsistence were at liberty to re-enlist if they could find any regiment prepared to take them. It is clear that some men did re-enlist with different regiments and continued to serve, despite the causes that had resulted in their first discharge. Some of them re-appeared before the Chelsea Board and, if their period out of the Army was brief, they did not fall foul of the rules governing continuous service. This was a particularly popular manoeuvre in the early years of a war when regiments going on active service cleared out men thought unlikely to be fit enough for campaigning. If they were not qualified for the Hospital, it was not difficult to put their experience to good use in new-raising formations, which were anxious to acquire experienced instructors, and probably not too particular as to their physical condition. The generous bounty offered to recruits at the start of a war doubtless acted as a further enticement for old soldiers to go back into the Army. The fact that their previous service would probably be mentioned in their discharge when they were presented to the Commissioners for a second time would not necessarily indicate that the man had been discharged once before. Unless very specific questioning took place, it may have been

⁵⁸ The Act of Parliament relating to vagrants, 12 Annæ 2 c.23 of 1713 says nothing about soldiers other than the fact that they should not be 'whipt' before being sent on, ie they should not be considered vagrants. The Act of 1740, 13 Geo II c.24, was repealed by 17 Geo II c.5 (1744) and paragraph 3 specified that soldiers be provided with sufficient certificates to protect them from being taken up as vagrants.

assumed that the man had been drafted to his second regiment and that his service had therefore been continuous.

In peacetime, men rejected by both the Hospital and their regiments were obliged to make the best way in the world that they could, though they did, at least, have the advantage of being officially permitted by the Mutiny Acts to settle in any place they chose, therein to ply whatever trade or skill they may have had. At the end of each of the major wars after the accession of William III, these Acts of Parliament included clauses '... to enable such Officers and Soldiers as have been in HM's service ... to exercise trades'. The Mutiny Act of 1713 only permitted this within the county in which the soldier had been born, though it also protected the man for three years from arrest for debt or the confiscation of his stock in trade. The Act of 1749 gave permission for any soldier who had served since King George II's accession so to trade and the Act that was passed at the conclusion of the Seven Years War had retrospective effect to any Army or Marine personnel employed since 1748, and extended the privilege to the wives and children of such soldiers. Failure in such business, however, resulting in the trader becoming chargeable on the parish in which he or she had settled, would result in removal to their place of legal settlement; an affidavit whereof was required to be sworn in front of two magistrates before the soldier or his family was permitted to benefit from the terms of the act in the parish where he wished to start up the new enterprise.⁵⁹

Having looked in general at the reasons why soldiers were discharged and what part in this process age and length of service played, it is necessary to examine the specific reasons given for discharge. In the process of doing so, an attempt will be made to

⁵⁹ *The Statutes at Large* – Mutiny Acts 10 Will III c.11 (Vol. 3, p. 13), 12 Annæ c.13, Stat. 1 (Vol. 4, p. 609), 22 Geo II c.44 (Vol. 7) and 3 Geo III c.8 (Vol. 9, pp. 4-5).

elucidate how they arose and to illuminate the nature of employment in the profession of arms.

Chapter 5

Wounds, Injuries and Diseases

Having examined military service up to the stage at which a soldier might find himself about to be discharged, the question must be asked 'what deficiencies or incapacities did the man have to exhibit and how had he acquired them?' What was it that brought men to the point at which their services were dispensed with? The registers recording the examinations of all of the men who came before the Hospital's Commissioners are the key source in answering these questions. They throw much light on the strains and stresses of the military life and make it clear that warfare alone was not the only cause of soldiers being to discharged. This central chapter of the thesis therefore presents a statistical analysis of the causes of discharge.

There are three important entries in the Chelsea Hospital admissions registers that provide the information upon which the Commissioners, in consultation with their surgeon, based their decision whether to grant a pension or not. The key entry is the brief passage of text that described why the soldier was no longer capable of duty and which occasionally included information in amplification of his service. The other important entries are the man's age and his length of service. Of themselves, the last could assure a man a place on the Hospital's lists, but his true qualifications are only really made clear by an examination of all three pieces of data.

In the analysis that follows, the injuries or ailments listed as the reasons for discharge have been grouped together in the following way.

Wounds

Wounds appear in the record sometimes with the weapon that caused them - swords, bayonets, dirks or polearms - but they also appear as gunshot wounds, though very rarely with the details of the firearm from which the projectile had come. Occasionally the nature of the projectile itself is described, particularly if it was unusual – slug, small shot – but

in most cases it must be assumed that the projectile was a lead ball. At the beginning of the period under discussion none of the European armies used firearms of standard calibre throughout the different branches of their forces; cavalry firearms were always of smaller calibre than infantry firelocks, though as the eighteenth century progressed, large strides towards standardisation were taken by most nations in the interests of facilitating ammunition production and distribution.

Wounds were also caused by being struck with firearms used as clubs or by blows from bladed tools that had dual function as weapons – axes, hatchets or tomahawks – or tools that were being used as improvised weapons – spades or pickaxes. Service in North America also exposed British soldiers to the native populations' arrows. Unspecified battle injuries, which normally appear in the registers as 'wounded at ...' followed by the name of a battle or siege, are also included in this group. It is impossible to differentiate injuries of this type received in battle from those of the same type received in other forms of operations, if the entries lack these location or occasion details. Where such differentiation does exist, injuries caused unintentionally with weapons will be classed as injuries. Wounds received either in private quarrels with comrades-in-arms in which men had willingly engaged, or in attempts to separate and restore order between fellow soldiers who were themselves fighting are classed as wounds. It is frequently the case that scars are mentioned in descriptions with no indication of their origins or whether received by accident, in battle or even before the soldier had joined the Army. Unless the context makes it clear that they were in some way attributable to his service, these scars are not taken account of in assessing the reason behind the discharge.

As many men were wounded more than once in the course of their service, numbers of wounds received are cited. This also gives some indication of the success of the medical provision that assisted the men to recover from their injuries. Many of the wounds mentioned, as we have already noted, were received many years before the man appeared before the pension board. From the beginning of the War of Jenkin's

Ear, it became increasingly common for statements to appear saying that the man had been wounded, but without specifying the number or the nature or cause of the wounds received. The reason for this alteration in recording procedure is unknown, but may simply be attributable to the numbers of wounded men being dealt with. For the purposes of this study the bland phrase 'wounded at the battle of ...' has been recorded as the man having suffered a single wound, though this (doubtless significantly) under-represents those who received multiple injuries on a single occasion. Where different bodily locations of wounds are mentioned, or where the number of wounds has been specified, these indications have been recorded. Men were also frequently described as 'much' wounded, wounded in more than one engagement or as '... received several wounds at ...' and these instances have been recorded under 'several'.

It is very rare for a man to appear in the records having survived being hit directly by an artillery projectile, though it was not completely unknown. In the cases of men recorded as having lost limbs, the precise cause of such loss is often not stated and it cannot be assumed safely that they relate to artillery injuries. Being hurt indirectly by artillery or the effects of artillery fire have therefore been classified under injuries, not wounds. Only where the narrative is very precise are artillery projectile injuries classified as wounds.

Undefined disablements, Worn Out or incapable of further service

As we have seen, some men managed to serve for substantial periods of time and to present themselves for pension with no specific ailment, injury or medical condition. In these cases the reason for discharge is often given as Worn Out, with no further detail. If more detail is present – Worn out plus some specified ailment - the man has been classified as ill. The classification Worn out has also been used for cases in which age, but no infirmity or injury, is mentioned, or statements such as 'unfit and unable to march', 'incapable of his duty' or where the word superannuated has been used despite the man being only of middle age. For the purposes of this study only men who had reached the age of 60

and had served 30 or more years and who exhibited no defined injury, ailment or wound, have been classed as superannuated.

Defects of Eyesight, blindness or loss of eyes

The third category records deficiencies in eyesight – blind, lost an eye, lost one eye and dim in the other or being noted as dim sighted. It is sometimes clear what the cause of these conditions may have been and where this is possible the incident that gave rise to it has been classified as a wound, a medical condition or an injury. Where dim-sightedness is not further qualified by cause it has been taken to be decay due to age.

Loss of limbs, members or loss of the use of parts of the body

This category records the loss of limbs, fingers or toes, broken or wasted limbs, the loss of use of limbs or fingers by dislocation or other causes, but not identified as 'paralytic'. The latter is taken to be a physiological or neurological condition, which was not the direct and immediate result of a physical injury. The loss of a limb has been taken to mean that it had been so severely damaged by some cause as to require its amputation. Amputations have been classified as resulting from wounds unless accompanied by other causes - ailments or injuries - which gave rise to their necessity.

Injuries received from horses

The fifth category records injuries to all types of cavalry involving their mounts including falling from or being thrown from a horse, falling with a horse in which the accident happened to the animal with consequences for its rider, being kicked or bitten by horses or being crushed by the animal in pushing its rider against something. The class also contains injuries to muscles or other soft tissue caused by unruly horses and other injuries unspecified as to location on the recipient's body caused by horses in undefined circumstances.

Illnesses

The sixth category records defined medical conditions, the causes of which may or may not be mentioned in the discharge statement.

Conditions such as rheumatism or gout, *fistula in ano* or other fistula, involuntary passage of urine, dizziness in the head, consumption, which may or may not involve the spitting of blood, 'paralytic', falling sickness, stone or gravel, convulsion fits or other nervous disorders and lunacy. It also includes all those recorded as sick, ailing, suffering from 'inner decay', weak or 'a complication of distempers' or other such imprecise terms.

Injuries

The seventh category encompasses injuries of all types not caused directly by weapons and consists of accidents involving being knocked down or run over by vehicles or falling off vehicles whilst in motion, falls from walls, rocks or stiles, buildings collapsing onto men below or structures collapsing when soldiers were on them or in them. In addition injuries received as a result of work while constructing fortifications or roads are included in this heading. Accidental injuries received when on shipboard appear in this category, including falls down hatches or gangways or being hit or crushed by parts of the running rigging of ships. Burns received from fires in camp or domestic circumstances or as a result of gunpowder accidents are included here. Injuries that are often recorded as 'wounds' in the registers, but which resulted from being in close proximity to the effects of a weapon, though not hit by the weapon or projectile itself, are included in this category. Such hurts include being hit by splinters or fragments of a ship or fragments of stone detached at speed by the strike of an artillery projectile. Injuries received by the springing of a mine, which appears in the records as 'blown up' or 'buried in earth' are included here.

As with the less specific recording of wounds after 1740, the records make very frequent use of the phrase 'disabled at the battle of ...' As it is clear that men sustained injuries in battle which were not directly caused by the enemy's weapons or projectiles, it has been considered unwise to classify all of these instances as wounds: some of them undoubtedly were, but others were not. In the absence of precise information, the mention of disablement has been taken to be an injury

and not a wound, unless the statement of disability has been qualified by the mention of a weapon or projectile.

Accidents deriving from weapons usage or operation

This category deals with accidental injuries caused by weapons, usually in the form of the operator shooting himself or a comrade, or malfunctions of or the bursting of the soldier's own firelock. Also included are stab or cut injuries from edged weapons, either his own or those of a comrade and injuries arising from the operation of cannons.

Disabilities attributed to weather conditions

Weather was frequently cited as a cause of malady or loss of capacity and is included as a contributory factor. Ailments were attributed to the effects of alternate heats and colds particularly in foreign garrisons, but cold or wet service was also believed to give rise to disabilities. Lightning was cited as a cause of blindness.

The brevity, imprecision and yet complexity of the discharge statements makes it impossible, in most cases, accurately to attribute the reason for a soldier's discharge to one cause, but it is worthwhile to record the number of complaints specified in the statements in order to give some indication of the extent of the combinations which were cited as justifications for the termination of service. It must be borne in mind, nevertheless, that a high proportion of those who presented with only one stated cause – worn out, disabled or incapable of duty – were, in all likelihood, subject to a number of undiagnosed medical conditions, undefined injuries or ailments which, in combination, manifested themselves in the portmanteau condition of being 'Worn Out'.

This common definition of incapacity for further service encapsulates a general problem deriving from the rudimentary understanding of illness

and its causes that prevailed in the eighteenth century.¹ The reasons for the incapacity of a soldier to continue in the ranks were very frequently defined by how he had become disabled and not by the precise nature of the injury, or ailment, which disabled him. Naturally this did not apply in those obvious cases in which a limb had been lost or rendered non-functional or in which there were other externally identifiable symptoms such as rupture or cataracts. Any complaint of an internal nature – consumption, spitting of blood, incontinence, giddiness in the head, asthma, dropsy, blindness or deafness and suchlike – were not subject to diagnosis in any form other than by the definition of the injury or condition and its effect or by the occurrence which was believed to have given rise to it. The classic example of this practice is the definition of fever as an illness in itself rather than a symptom of an underlying medical condition. Thus Horse Grenadier Thomas Harding's loss of one eye and the impairment of his other was attributed to the cold weather in which he had been obliged to undertake sentry duty while serving with his previous regiment, Pearce's Regiment of Horse in Belfast.² In addition, some men were reported with what may be termed an observation on their appearance, but with no comprehensible justification stated directly in the text. Horse Grenadier John Farquherson was noted as having a scar on the right side of his head. Its origin or its effects were not commented upon, so the text gives nothing upon which to grasp as a reason for his discharge. The fact that he was sixty-nine years old and had served thirty-three years may well have accounted for it, but it was not directly to this that his release from service was attributed by the Board.³ Describing James Duplessis as a thin little man with no further comment, is similarly unenlightening⁴ and defining John Smith as 'a short, square man' also leaves the researcher grasping for an adequate reason for his discharge.⁵ Though

¹ M. McCrae, *Saving the Army. The Life of Sir John Pringle* (Edinburgh: John Donald/Birlinn Ltd, 2014) gives an over-view of the state of medical knowledge in the early decades of the century.

² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 15.5.1740, DB 9553.

³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 24.5.1723, DB 9087.

⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 19.12.1723, DB 9330.

⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 16.10.1723, DB 9169.

such cases appear in the records up to the mid-1720s, in the majority of cases a clear cause is stated.

It is also evident that men sometimes attributed the condition that brought them to the moment of discharge to events which had happened long ago, but whose disagreeable memories remained with them. Doubtless in their minds, there was a link, but whether such events were genuinely the cause of the condition that led to discharge in all cases is doubtful.

In addition to this inability fully to link diagnosis and causality, there was an entirely pragmatic retention of the Galenean explanation of medical conditions in terms of reference to the humours.⁶ Hence Timothy Morris of Tyrrell's Foot was pensioned on 6 February 1733 on account of 'an humour fallen into his eyes occasion'd by a fever got on duty at Minorca' and, whereas in many instances age was assuredly a factor in defective eyesight, in this diagnosis it could scarcely be so, as Morris was only twenty-six years old.⁷ Equally mysteriously, Thomas Priest of the 1st Foot Guards, though understandably diagnosed as consumptive and asthmatic, was said to have 'a humour all over his body' which, it can only be assumed, was a very different type of ailment to that suffered by Morris.⁸

Some of the categories outlined above therefore depend upon the interpretation of descriptions of disablements or medical conditions recognized or accepted as adequate at the time, which are not amenable

⁶ Hudson implies that the humoral interpretation of illness, which he says decreased in the 1730s, was because the soldiers themselves accounted for their ailments in this way. As the soldiers did not, and in the majority of cases, because of illiteracy could not, write their own recommendations, which were furnished by their regimental surgeons, it was the latter who continued to diagnose in this way at least up to this date. See Hudson, G.L., 'Arguing Disability: Ex-Servicemen's Own Stories in Early Modern England, 1590-1790' in Bivins, R. & Pickstone, J.V. (eds), *Medicine, Madness and Social History – Essays in Honour of Roy Porter*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), p. 113.

⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 6.2.1733, DB 1667.

⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 18.7.1729, DB 2689.

to precise definition or recognition in the twenty-first century. What are we, for instance, to make of Private Charles Jones⁹ of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers who was disabled in his right arm from an 'ailment by a swelling which happened on duty' according to his declaration on 4 July 1740, or Private Gentleman David Rowland of the 4th Troop of Horse Guards¹⁰ who 'contracted an illness on party to Newmarket which hath given him an infirmity in his limbs' and was pensioned on 18 December 1734. More puzzling still was Horse Grenadier Peter Blouet, presumably of Huguenot descent, who was pensioned having become delirious and lost his memory after the theft of all his accoutrements in camp in 1723.¹¹ In February of the following year he was still so deranged as to be unable to give his age.

Different sets of disabilities were exhibited by the two branches of the Army - the infantry and the cavalry - and, were they to be included, a third set would undoubtedly have been exhibited by the artillery. Though the Royal Regiment of Artillery is not included in this survey, the types of injuries to which men of that branch were prone are likely to have been the same as those suffered by infantrymen who were obliged to assist in the service of guns in fortresses. A much higher incidence of rupture and of crush injuries to feet and hands would have been presented by artillerymen.

The analysis of the causes for discharge is therefore complex and decidedly mixed and overlapping. In order to impose some order on such a catalogue of suffering, all cases have been categorized for analytical purposes as falling within one of eleven categories – ill, wounded-and-ill, injured-and-ill, injured alone, wounded alone, wounded-and-injured, wounded-and-decayed, decayed, worn out, superannuated or dismissed. Decay has been used for incapacities that appear to derive from old age and natural causes; men whose deafness was accompanied by the statement that they had been serving artillery,

⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 4.7.1740, DB 9401.

¹⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.12.1734, DB 4520.

¹¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 14.2.1724, DB 8408.

for instance, have had their deafness classified as an injury. Similarly loss of sight in combination with mentions of lightning or wounds to the head are categorized as injuries or wounds, whilst cataracts or 'dim sighted' have been attributed to decay. Superannuation has been defined strictly as those who presented themselves to the Commissioners with vaguely described conditions, but who were aged at least sixty and had served thirty years or more. As noted above, men who were recorded, primarily at the end of the War of the Austrian Succession as 'superannuated' but who were in their forties or early fifties, and often with less than twenty years service, have been classed as worn out. Statements that men were lame clearly did not merely indicate that they had ailments of the feet or legs, as phrases such as 'lame of his right side' or lameness in arms, shoulders or hands appear. Where no other indicators are present, lameness has been taken as an injury amongst those below forty and as due to illness for those of greater age.

These categories could have been expanded further to include men who were wounded, injured and ill and there are undoubtedly examples of this and other combinations. It was considered, however, that the permutations should be kept to a manageable number representative of the vast majority of cases. The results for the whole of the cavalry, the Foot Guards, the Marching Foot and the Marines are presented in Appendices 5-1 to 5-4.

THE CAVALRY

In respect of the cavalry it is important to remember that this arm, unlike the infantry, undertook no active war service between the 1719 Jacobite Rebellion and the dispatch of the expeditionary force to Flanders in June 1742. Over most of the period under consideration, the cavalry consisted of four Troops of Horse Guards, two Troops of Horse Grenadier Guards, eight Regiments of Horse and fourteen regiments of

Dragoons. On 25 December 1746 the 3rd and 4th Troops of Horse Guards were disbanded, and the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Regiments of Horse were converted to Dragoon Guards being renumbered 1st, 2nd and 3rd. Like the Foot Guards, the Household cavalry always remained in Great Britain in peacetime, but a portion of the Horse and dragoons always served in Ireland.¹² Horsemen were a very small minority of those who were presented before the Hospital Board: 3,921 men in total between 1715 and 1755.

Appendix 5-1 indicates that the numbers discharged solely through illness remained fairly steady until 1732, rising thereafter to reach a high point in 1749. The increase after 1740 probably represents the clearing out of old and unfit men who were unlikely to be able to support the rigours of the anticipated active service in mainland Europe. It continued to rise to a level accounting for almost 60% of discharges to pension at the end of the war, as illness always claimed more casualties than battle. This trend probably also reflects the lengths of service and the ages of soldiers who, as we have seen were retained much beyond the age at which optimum performance was reached, and particularly when the general fitness and the resistance to ailments of relative youth had declined.

The category of wounded-and-ill is a consistent, but low-level, cause of discharge, though with a peak in 1718-19, which probably represents ill men who also cited wounds from the Spanish War as part of their reasons for discharge. Thereafter, it is consistently low even throughout the War of the Austrian Succession. The decrease in this combined causality arguably reflects the increased disposal of men for a predominant cause – illness - before they had the opportunity to be wounded.

¹² Analysis of the Establishments in TNA, WO24 indicates that the four junior regiments of Horse (the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th) and the three most junior regiments of Dragoons (12th, 13th and 14th) along with three other Dragoon regiments having Irish connections (the 5th Royal Irish, the 8th – raised in King William's war in Ireland and the 9th posted to the Irish Establishment since 1705) all served exclusively on the Irish Establishment from 1719 to 1740.

Those whose discharge may be attributed to injury alone remain consistently significant throughout the period of peace, declining only slightly during wartime when illness as a factor took over as the chief cause. In only sixteen of the forty years surveyed was it below 20% and for the decade 1732-1743 injuries accounted for between a third and a half of discharges. This merely emphasizes that peacetime soldiering was not without its dangers, particularly when having to deal with animals. It seems likely that the increasing incidence of disabling illness, which replaced injury as the chief cause of discharge after 1743, was related to campaign conditions and the necessity to live under canvas. While regiments in Great Britain lived in public houses and were not crowded together, the health of the troops was maintained, though, as we shall see, with notable exceptions at the beginning of the summer each year. Living out of doors took its toll in illness, though it appears to have given rise to a reduction in injuries. This may be attributable to the reduced potential for being hurt by falling from or with the cavalryman's mount. Falls undoubtedly happened, but being thrown onto soft ground was likely to have less disabling effect than falling onto cobbles. Tending horses in picketed lines in a field rather than in the confines of a stable offered more chance of getting away from an unruly animal. Horses given regular daily work in the open and not cooped up in stables were more likely to behave well, or to be too fatigued to behave badly, thus rendering them less prone to exhibit the vices attendant upon boredom and confinement.

Those men discharged under the heading of wounded-only reflects the continuous shedding of men who had fought in the War of the Spanish Succession and the two early Jacobite Rebellions. Many of these, as noted earlier, will have had wounds cited as marks of faithful service rather than as active contributors to their inability any longer to serve. When examined in combination with the men classified as wounded-and-ill, the compounded percentages indicate that rarely fewer than a quarter of men fell into this combined category and that the percentages were often above 40% until 1732. In that year the trend declines when

illness takes over as the principal cause of incapacity. Nevertheless the last cavalryman wounded at Oudenarde in 1708 was not pensioned until 1737, and it was not until 1743 that the last mounted casualty from Malplaquet received the king's bounty.

The manner of recording the reasons for discharge evolved over the period. The reasons for this are not clear, but the increasing numbers discharged during the Austrian War led regimental surgeons simply to classify men as superannuated and no longer able to serve. The term worn out was certainly used prior to 1740, but it was usually accompanied by an identified ailment, which enables the man to be classified in a more specific way. Increasingly during the war, the Commissioners were prepared to accept men who were described as superannuated, worn out or incapable of duty with no further indication of the precise nature of the disability which contributed to this state. By the end of the war, however, a more wary approach to such bland statements is evident, and men thus described in their certificates who had, for instance, served only twelve years and were aged in their late forties were not accepted for pension.

Having presented the general picture by classification, we will turn to the detail. Out of the 3,921 cavalry examined for pension, 1,507 were noted as being ill or decayed either solely or in combination with other factors (38.8%). Of these, 398 (26.4%) were recorded simply as being generally ill. Of the rest, a long list of specific ailments was exhibited. Fistulas or *fistula in ano* accounted for 2.9%, dropsy, palsey, asthma, spitting of blood, paralytic complaints, migraine and lunacy accounted for numbers representing between 1 and 2 %. Nervous conditions, often reported as convulsion fits, and leg ulcers both showed at just over 2%, with epilepsy, falling sickness, scurvy, cancer, voiding of blood and involuntary passage of urine each represented at less than 1%. Deafness was complained of by 6.03% of the sample and 5.3% were said to be consumptive. By far the largest percentage was accounted for by those who complained of rheumatism; 515 men representing 34.1% of the sample. Not only did the numbers presenting with this complaint rise

during wartime (when a portion of a truss of straw was all that protected a man from the cold earth), but the onset of it in peacetime was often cited as arising from men having to guard horses that were put out to grass in the early summer to regain condition after being stabled throughout the winter. The annual practice of the grass guard and the camping out associated with it was something that men accustomed to the warm and dry of a bustling public house clearly did not relish. Horse Grenadier Nehemiah White was flooded out of his pasture near Reading and was pensioned due to various distempers acquired there in 1728.¹³ Charles King of the King's Own Horse was so affected in his limbs that he was unable to mount his horse and swore that it was due to colds got on a grass guard.¹⁴ Though retained for a further two years after the onset of his condition, Daniel Coates of the Blues had not been able to do duty during that time owing to rheumatism acquired on grass guard in 1736.¹⁵ However beneficial it was for the horses to be let out, it clearly did little good to some of the men who had to watch over them.

Fourteen hundred and ninety-eight men from the total (38.2%) had been injured in some way. Percentages of less than three accounted for many of the specific complaints – wood or stone splinters and injury by the indirect effects of artillery fire or grenades; being burnt, burnt with gunpowder or blown up; dislocation of limbs, strain or weakness in the back and instances of the loss of one or more fingers, or loss of the use of fingers. Becoming 'disabled', hurt or lame was complained of by 6.1% of the sample of injured, though some lameness would, doubtless be attributable to illness rather than injury. Amputation of limbs, which is never specified as a surgical procedure but appears as 'lost his arm at ...', accounted for 2.1%, and an unknown portion of this tally must be attributed to wounding. Larger percentages appear for broken bones, loss of the use of or wasted limbs and rupture, all of which produce tallies between 13.6 and 13.8%. It is highly likely that some of those

¹³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.6.1728, DB 5793.

¹⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.1.1737, DB 6746.

¹⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.1.1738, DB 7157.

presenting with loss of the use of limbs were suffering from illnesses rather than injuries, but lack of statements of causality prevents greater specificity.

Bruising, by which must be meant haematoma – haemorrhage of blood vessels deep within the muscles – was suffered by 310 men, a fifth of those injured. Almost half of the injured– 726 men (48.3%) – presented instances of injury caused by horses and although some men fell from, or were thrown by, their horses more than once, often a single incident was enough to disable a man. Twenty-eight men suffered soft tissue injuries from restive horses, often being thrown against or bounced painfully on the pommels of their saddles. Eighteen horses pushed their riders when mounted or unmounted against buildings or other structures. Four hundred and six horses threw and trod on their riders and a further 204 fell on them, adding crush injuries to whatever damage had been done by the man hitting the ground. The weaponry and worn-equipment of the soldier was likely to cause him damage additional to that sustained in the fall itself. Private Gentleman Aymondisham Innocent of the 3rd Troop of Horse Guards had his carbine smashed when he was thrown and dragged by his horse in Hyde Park¹⁶ and William Dossett of the 4th Troop had his carbine ‘broke by ye Violence’ of his fall.¹⁷ Ten men were bitten by their own or their comrades’ mounts. No one, however, recorded such misfortunes as Horse Grenadier John Powell who was seized by his horse in the right side and lifted from the ground having flesh torn from his body. He was, as a consequence, ‘quite wasted’ and was pensioned despite only having served nineteen months.¹⁸

Apart from accidents attributable to their mounts, seventy-eight men recorded mishaps due to other causes. A quarter of these were caused by firearms either bursting on being fired or discharging themselves during cleaning or having the ammunition drawn from them. Damage

¹⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 8.6.1734, DB 4229.

¹⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.7.1738, DB 7307.

¹⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.7.1738, DB 7308.

to fingers, occasionally requiring amputation of the entire hand, but sometimes also to the face and eyes was the inevitable consequence. Few accidental injuries were caused by swords - four instances only - though the consequences could be severe. George Moreton of Hawley's 13th Dragoons had only completed eight months service when he was disabled at drill by his comrade's sword as they both drew from their scabbards on order and mis-timed the movements.¹⁹ Falling from or being crushed by wagons accounted for 14.1% of accidents and a further 11.5% were due to strains received loading baggage or shifting large quantities of forage. Simply falling down steps, off platforms or from hay-lofts contributed to the discharges of twenty men (25.6%) and botched medical procedures, collapsing buildings and dog bites accounted for others. Horse Grenadier Thomas Paddison was almost blinded by 'a bottle of powder' exploding in Hyde Park when, presumably a spark got into his powder flask.²⁰ A spark or a red hot fragment of slag ruined one eye of Farrier Abraham Hoskins of Montagu's Horse as he was shoeing,²¹ and Daniel Goddard was disabled by his own knife as he tried to cut away some harness from a restive horse.²²

One hundred and eighty men recorded eyesight defects, 104 (57.7%) of them simply dim sight or 'bad eyes', but fifty-six of the total had served part of their time with one eye only or having lost the sight of one eye. Drummer Francis Capell of Marlborough's Dragoons lost an eye in Spain before 1712, though he continued to serve until 1740.²³ Twenty men were blind at discharge or almost so.

One thousand and fifty-two cavalymen discharged to pension had been wounded in one way or another during their service - 26.8% of the total pensioned, though a quarter of them (264 - 26.9%) gave no specific details of how they received their injuries. Precision in the recording of

¹⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.8.1740, DB 9406.

²⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 8.1.1730, DB 2107.

²¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.8.1741, DB 9769.

²² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.5.1742, DB 10133.

²³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 11.3.1740, DB 7711.

the weapon or weapons by which the recipient's wounds were inflicted falls markedly during the Austrian War, many men being simply recorded as wounded at an engagement. However, evidence that the *arme blanche* had taken over from the pistol as the cavalry's principal weapon is provided by the 45.3% who presented one or more cut or stab wounds. It should be noted, however, that 'stabb'd at the battle of ...' has been assumed, in the absence of further detail, to be a sword wound and not a stab caused by any other type of pointed weapon. Bayonets, specifically identified, caused few wounds to cavalry - seventeen instances only or 1.6% - but striking upwards, successfully, with such a weapon was not easy against a man often wearing a cuirass, though his thighs would not be protected. Musketry, almost all of it from infantry, though a small (unidentifiable) proportion from the carbines of other cavalry, accounted for the 360 instances of men being shot. The old seventeenth-century practice of using pistols as clubs continued to a small degree, 1.5% of the sample reported having been so wounded, and, although they had assumed an indicative and largely ceremonial function, polearms inflicted wounds on 0.87% of pensioned cavalry. Operations that disrupted soldiers or peasants working on field fortifications accounted for three men being wounded by spades, the same number who received the attentions of North Britons wielding dirks. Though it would usually be expected that being hit by an artillery projectile would be fatal, five men survived such an encounter to present themselves before the Commissioners.

Being wounded, of course, was not necessarily represented by a single unsuccessful encounter with the monarch's enemies. Almost sixty-three percent (659) of the wounded had that experience only once, but 21.7% (229) had it twice. Fifty-seven cavalymen (5.4%) were wounded three times and thereafter the percentage of those affected slips quickly below 1% for those enumerating their wounds, although one man recorded nine. Eighty-five men in this sample (8.0%) were, however, described as being wounded several times or being 'much wounded', though it is not clear in the latter case whether 'much' means many times or indicates the severity of the injuries received. Thomas Brown of Bland's 3rd

Dragoons, though his Register entry says several wounds, in fact received two pistol balls in his back, eight cuts to his head, neck and face and lost two fingers of his bridle hand.²⁴

Equally, for those men with more than one wound, their wounds did not necessarily happen during one combat. Trooper Ralph Falconer was cut on the back of his head at the Boyne in 1690, had his right wrist wounded at Hochstett/Blenheim in 1704 and was again slashed across the head at the battle of Ramillies in 1706.²⁵ His comrade in the King's Own Horse, William Crow, was wounded by musket or pistol balls in three, out of four, of Marlborough's great battles – Blenheim, Ramillies and Malplaquet.²⁶

Wounding, however, was not solely an experience of the battlefield any more than were certain types of injury. Being hurt by weapons, by improvised weapons or simply by being dragged off a horse in the performance of duty could happen in many situations. John Holliday was shot in the leg by rioters in Glasgow,²⁷ Robert Hoy of Rich's Dragoons was stabbed in the foot with a dirk in unrecorded circumstances²⁸ and John Geddes received a sword wound from a drunken comrade.²⁹ Men had their bones broken or were badly bruised by being brought down, sometimes with their mounts, by rioters. The requirement for the Army to act as a police force exposed soldiers of all types to the reactions of those they were sent to control, and the response of smugglers and owlers was commensurate with the value of the goods they were dealing with and the retribution that would fall upon them if they were apprehended.³⁰ Soldiers and Customs officials

²⁴ A. Cormack, 'The Sword of Private Thomas Brown of Bland's Dragoons, Dettingen, 1743' *JSAHR*, Vol. 87 (2009), pp. 99-107.

²⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 11.1.1732, DB 1347.

²⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.8.1734, DB 4382.

²⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.7.1737, DB 6932.

²⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 17.6.1742, DB 10198.

²⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 24.2.1743, DB 11063.

³⁰ Tony Hayter, *The Army and the Crowd in Mid-Georgian England* (London: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1978) explains the legal background against which the Army operated in the public order role. It concentrates mainly on the second half of the eighteenth century. P.

were certainly killed in the struggle against these men and many others were injured. Corporal Hudson of Honywood's Dragoons was disabled in the legs after being beaten with oars on the Suffolk coast;³¹ Thomas Lomax was shot through the body by smugglers trading with France during the War of the Austrian Succession³² and Corporal Matthew Scot had to have his right arm amputated in the following year due to an unspecified injury received on a smuggling party.³³ In accounting for a wide range of wounds, injuries and ailments, fifty-four pensioned dragoons mentioned duties against smugglers as the occasions on which they had acquired the causes which led to their discharges. Only three men from regiments of Horse or from the Horse Grenadiers recorded encounters with them. As the most numerous and widespread part of the mounted arm, the coast duty fell largely upon the dragoons, but also significantly upon the infantry.

THE FOOT GUARDS

Three regiments of Foot Guards existed in the eighteenth century and they were much larger than the regiments of Marching Foot. In 1716 the 2nd and 3rd Foot Guards each stood at 1,405 NCOs, musicians and privates and the 1st Foot Guards numbered 2,188 non-officer ranks. In effect, the Coldstream and the 3rd Foot Guards were always two battalion regiments and the 1st a three battalion regiment; by comparison in the same year the regiments of Marching Foot stood at 684 NCO's, musicians and privates.³⁴ There were reductions and expansions in the size of these three regiments over the period under

Muskett, 'Military Operations against Smuggling in Kent and Sussex, 1698-1750', *JSAHR*, Vol. LII (1974), pp. 89-110 provides a good survey for a limited area. Houlding in *Fit for Service* gives a very good over-view of the Army's commitment to the 'Coast Duty', p. 75 et seq.

³¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.2.1736, DB 5051.

³² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 6.11.1747, DB 16331.

³³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 15.7.1748, DB 17539.

³⁴ TNA, Establishment of the Guards and Garrisons from 25 December 1716, WO24/79.

study, but in total they never numbered less than 3,500 men and by 1740 they stood at more than 5,000 non-officer ranks.³⁵

The Foot Guards were always stationed in London and though they were not entirely accommodated in barracks, parts of each of the regiments occupied quarters in the Tower of London and the Savoy Palace. The remainders were billeted in public houses in the same way as the Marching Foot. They provided the immediate police force for the capital and occupied sentry posts scattered throughout Westminster at royal residences, government offices and the approaches to the Houses of Parliament, and they were on-call for the suppression of the frequent riots that broke out in the capital.³⁶ Apart from their presence at the Tower, they did not find guards for the City of London: the regular picquet for the Bank of England only being established in 1780.³⁷ They were, however, called upon for a large variety of general policing and crowd control duties amongst which was the prevention of any revellers attending the balls at the King's Theatre in 'habits that may tend to drawing down Reflections upon Religion or in ridicule of the same'.³⁸ As well as being used as 'jacks of all trades' within the capital, there were so many of them that the men were not kept to military duty all the time and when they were not on duty they were permitted to engage in civilian work.³⁹ Many did so in the Port of London unloading ships and this would appear to account for the very common qualifier attached to those who presented themselves before the Commissioners with ruptures that these injuries had been suffered 'in service' or 'on duty', so

³⁵ Survey of all of the Establishments relating to British forces in TNA, WO24, 1715 to 1750.

³⁶ T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), Chapter 3. Hitchcock and Shoemaker assert that riots, large or small, took place in London on every other day by the 1720s - p. 73.

³⁷ W. Marston Acres, 'The Bank of England Picquet' *JSAHR*, Vol. XII (1933), pp. 74-83.

³⁸ TNA, Marching Orders, WO5/22, f. 256.

³⁹ G.A. Steppler, *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793*, Unpublished PhD, Oxford, 1984. Though referring to a later period, there is no reason to suppose that civilian working did not take place in the early eighteenth century.

that there could be no suggestion that these were off-duty, injuries sustained while labouring.

The large numbers of men in these regiments permitted contingents to remain in London, while temporary battalions were assembled when required for service overseas. In October 1719 the expedition to raid the Galician coast, which captured Vigo and Pontevedra, contained small battalions from each of the Foot Guards regiments.⁴⁰ Only the 1st Foot Guards were sent to the siege of Gibraltar in 1727, 662 Men being drawn by lot⁴¹ and a larger force of three battalions was sent to Flanders as part of the army that participated in the War of the Austrian Succession. The 1st Foot Guards contributed ten companies amounting to 825 non-officer ranks and the other two regiments sent a battalion each of nine companies numbering 745 men apiece.⁴² The fact that these regiments were able to divide themselves, and the convenience of their being permanently based in London, permitted much easier reinforcement or casualty replacement of any component which was serving overseas for any length of time, but it also permitted them to absorb back into their companies at home men who had been wounded abroad but who were thought likely to recover and return to fitness. The necessity to discharge a man when he became temporarily unfit was therefore not so pressing to the Guards regiments as to the Marching Foot because their size, their more settled living conditions and the relative lightness of their London duties provided the opportunity to allow sick or wounded men a recovery period within their regiments. Thus Colonel Darby certified that Thomas Booth had done no duty for six months owing to rheumatism when he was examined in 1719; William Webb of the Coldstream Regiment had done no duty for two of his six years service

⁴⁰ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/22, ff. 182 & 189 and also Marching Orders, WO5/23, ff. 169-170 & 181 makes it clear that each of the Foot Guards regiments were ordered to provide a battalion of seven companies numbering 413 men.

⁴¹ C. Dalton, *George the First's Army, 1714-1727* (Uckfield: Naval & Military Press, 2005), Vol. II, p. xlv, and J.H. Leslie, 'The Siege of Gibraltar by the Spaniards, 1727' *JSAHR*, Vol. III (1924), p. 112.

⁴² TNA, Establishment for the Forces in Flanders from 25 December 1742, WO24/216.

because of consumption caught in standing guard in the windy passage under the War Office building for three years; Job Penny had become consumptive by overheating himself running to his guard and then standing sentry in the cold and as a consequence had done no duty in the last fifteen months when pensioned in 1738, and William Newton had been retained for two years doing no duty in the hope that his arms, withered in the cold at Hampton Court camp in 1732, would recover.⁴³

Between 1716 and 1755, 4,982 Foot Guards were examined for pension of whom 319 were dismissed, sent back to serve on or volunteered to continue in service (6.4%). Of those who received the pension (4,663), more than half 2,440 (52.3%) mentioned illness or decay with or without other factors, 1,368 (29.3%) were suffering from injuries and 1,175 (25.1%) had been wounded. The cumulative total in excess of those pensioned being accounted for by those who presented with composite reasons for discharge. Appendix 5-2 indicates that men presenting with wounds almost always exceeded a quarter of those discharged up to 1726. Thereafter illness took over as the predominant reason for discharge reaching ranges well above 60% after the Austrian War. The extreme peak of wounded in 1745 was accounted for by the exceedingly hard-fought battle of Fontenoy in that year. As with the cavalry, the quite high percentages discharged as wounded-and-ill reflect men citing old scars alongside current disabling illnesses. Men wounded-and-injured were, most likely, also using the marks of their past service as reinforcement to their claims for pension owing to injuries probably caused by over-exertion in the performance of duties ill-suited to their age. This category declines to almost zero in line with the reduction of the average age of men presenting themselves for pension.

In detail, rheumatism, consumption and unspecified ailments accounted for 70% of those categorized as ill and respectively 34.9%, 22.1% and 13.7% by complaint. Only dimness of sight registered with the same sort of frequency as a disability: 368 men complaining of it (15.0%). The

⁴³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, Booth, DB 20797, 30.4.1719, WO 116/3, Webb DB 7736, 12.3.1740, Penny, DB 7152 and Newton, DB 7150, 18.1.1738.

records indicate, however, that myopia or more serious, but partial, losses of sight were not considered to be sufficient of themselves to warrant discharge and deficiencies of eyesight were mentioned as an accompanying factor to other afflictions. Deafness, whether caused by injury or decay, affected only 118 men of the sample (4.8%). Slightly more, 124, were affected by leg ulcers or sores, abscesses or imposthumes (5.0%). Convulsion fits and nervous disorders were complained of by 5.8% of the sample (142 men) and all other illnesses registered below 5%, with *fistula* (3.2%), dropsy (2.7%), asthma (2.5%), palsy (2.4%), gravel and the stone (2.1%) and falling sickness (2.0%) and all others below 2%. Those registering at less than 2% were swellings (1.6%), lunacy or disordered in senses (1.3%), dizziness in the head, head-aches and migraines (1.2%) and spitting of blood (1.1%).

All other conditions – involuntary passage of urine, ulcers in bladder, kidneys or testicles, leprosy, scrofula, diabetes, scurvy / scorbutic eruptions, cancer, voiding of blood and *fistula in ano*, amongst others, registered at less than 1%.

On their own, or in combination with other factors, injuries were recorded by 29.3% of Foot Guards pensioned – 1,368 men. Rupture, loss of the use of limbs, being lamed, disabled or maimed and broken bones were cited by 19.8, 19.2, 14.5 and 14.3 percent of examinees and accounted for 67.8% of the injured category. It must, nevertheless, be accepted that some of the loss of limb function and lameness must have been owing to illness, but the absence of causality statements prevents absolutely accurate classification. Lameness was a condition that affected not only the feet and legs, but the upper limbs also. The percentage of those suffering serious bruising was 12.7. Of the remainder, the indirect effects of artillery fire or grenades were cited by ninety-two men (6.7%) and wood or stone splinters by a further sixty-five men. These last were, almost certainly, also the consequences of artillery fire received either in ships, in earthworks constructed with palisades or in masonry fortifications or at Gibraltar. Thirty-five men complained of burns from unspecified sources, powder burns or being

blown up by mines during siege operations. Forty-four men had undergone major amputations and survived long enough to be examined, and a further fifty-four had lost one or more fingers.

Slightly more (fifty-seven men) were simply recorded as 'hurt', and many more were injured in accidents; 259 mentioning the specific circumstances of their mishaps and a further twenty-three unspecified – 20.6% of the sample thus had experienced injury by chance. Falls accounted for almost a third of these (ninety men/31.9%) and despite the fact that these regiments had little, officially, to do with horses, fifty-two men, 18.4% of the accidents sub-set, had been injured by them either during previous service in the cavalry or by simple mischance. John Todd of the Coldstream Guards was particularly unfortunate being very badly kicked by a Brandenburg general's horse at the siege of Bouchain and 'it was thought necessary to cut of [sic] his leg but was cur'd by a frend' and he served for a further nineteen years.⁴⁴ Forty-five men suffered by firearms accidents (15.9%), though only seven were hurt by swords or recorded stab injuries. Despite living very largely in London, the occasional duty at Windsor Castle, Hampton Court or in camp in Hyde Park meant that fourteen men were hurt in connection with wagons or in loading baggage. Eight had buildings or sentry boxes collapse on them and a similar number received injuries from serving, or having in some other way to deal with, artillery (2.8%). Six men were disabled by medical procedures that were incompetently performed and four recited injuries resulting from shipwrecks. Incidents involving the restoration of discipline were very few, resulting in only five occurrences of injury amongst men trying to separate brawls between their comrades.

There were also a smattering of cases of simple bad luck: William Lintop had his leg damaged by a barrel of beer falling on him;⁴⁵ Private Adams was gored in the groin by an ox in the capital's streets while going to his

⁴⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 4.12.1729, DB 2528.

⁴⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 15.4.1742, DB 10075.

duty;⁴⁶ Jeffrey Curtis was crushed by chairmen hurrying their passengers to the opera in the Haymarket⁴⁷ while on crowd control duties and Drummer Buffrey was thrown to the ground and bruised in the head, disordering him in his senses, by a drunken gentleman who objected to his beating of the tattoo.⁴⁸

In addition to those who complained of dim sight as a medical condition, ninety-two Guardsmen had lost an eye or the use of an eye and thirty-eight were said to be blind. This presumably means severely visually impaired in both eyes rather than stone blind, though the two men who complained of blindness by lightning flashes may have been entirely without sight. John Ellis had served for twenty-one years after loosing his left eye to a bayonet at the siege of Ghent in 1708⁴⁹ and his comrade in the Coldstream Guards, Adam Stowers, had functioned without his right eye for a year longer, having lost it at the battle of Almanza in 1707.⁵⁰ Corporal Edward Guy⁵¹ lost the use of both hands and an eye as the result of being blown up whilst making cartridges in 1745 and William Osler had his eyesight damaged by a similar accident in 1728.⁵²

Despite the fact that only a proportion of the Foot Guards during any war saw active service, just over 30% recorded wounds in their discharge narratives. A small number had acquired these injuries when serving in other regiments, mounted or foot, before re-enlisting in the Guards regiments. Many cite no other regiment and therefore were recording wounds received during service in Guards battalions in the War of the Spanish Succession or in later expeditions. Crowd control or riot suppression duties in the capital gave rise to some wounds that were fully the equivalent of battlefield injuries. Up to 1745 the majority of those citing wounds give details of the weaponry involved and often

⁴⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 17.3.1723, DB 9052.

⁴⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 6.5.1737, DB 6878.

⁴⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 11.3.1740, DB 7721.

⁴⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 3.12.1729, DB 2480.

⁵⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 4.12.1729, DB 2534.

⁵¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 30.7.1745, DB 13163.

⁵² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 5.8.1728, DB 5641.

the action or actions in which the wounds were received. After that date the precise nature of the wound is often unspecified, though the engagements continue to be cited. Two hundred and sixty-five instances of wounding within the sample (23.1%) are unidentified as to the causal weapon. Lack of precision in the recording certainly means that disablement owing to wounds is under-represented in the statistics, but it was not considered justifiable to record 'disabled at Fontenoy' as being the inevitable consequence of a wound, as the narratives relating to earlier wars indicated that many men received injuries during battles that were not inflicted by weapons. Dislocated limbs or broken bones, being ridden over by enemy or their own cavalry, rupture caused by over-exertion, all of these could result in disablement on a battlefield, though no weapon was involved in the incident.

Swords and firearm projectiles accounted for very similar proportions of wounds, 39.3% and 40.5% respectively, with other weapons showing very significantly less: bayonets 4.3%, polearms 1.9%, cannon balls 0.5% and pickaxes, dirks and pitchforks in lesser proportions. One thousand and twelve men suffered two wounds or less, amounting to 88.3% of the sample. Seventy-nine men were wounded three times and thereafter the proportions are tiny, though one man recorded ten separate wounds. Thirty-eight men were said to be wounded several times or much wounded representing 3.3% of the sample.

Though not at all concerned with the suppression of smuggling, crowd control in the heaving metropolis subjected the Foot Guards to injuries that took their toll. In the press of the crowd several men were recorded as receiving wounds by bayonets which were either accidents, self-inflicted or unintentionally inflicted by their comrades owing to lack of room, or were inflicted with their own or their comrades' weapons snatched by rioters. Even on occasions of public celebration, the ambivalent attitude of some of the crowd towards the Hanoverian royal family, or perhaps merely to anyone in authority, could become painfully manifest. Guardsman Edward Gore would long remember the

Coronation in 1727 when he lost the use of an eye in a scuffle,⁵³ as would Thomas Dobinson⁵⁴ who had an eye put out and Henry Myers who was cut about the head and face.⁵⁵ The wedding of George II's daughter, Princess Anne to the Prince of Orange in March 1734 was similarly memorable for John Dowler of the 1st Guards who was stabbed in the right leg with a bayonet. Eventually being declared incurable by St. Thomas's Hospital, he was discharged to pension four years later.⁵⁶

THE MARCHING REGIMENTS OF FOOT

By far the majority of candidates for the Out-Pension derived from the Marching Regiments of Foot; up to the end of 1755, 13,668 men from these regiments were examined by the Board. The regiments that served in Great Britain (England, Wales and Scotland) were permitted to recommend their invalids to Chelsea, as were those regiments serving in Gibraltar, Minorca, North America (South Carolina, Georgia, Annapolis Royal and Placentia) and the West Indies. From 1719, the number of Marching Regiments stabilized at forty, composed of forty-one battalions, until the beginning of the War of the Austrian Succession and at any particular time about half of them were stationed in Ireland and had no right of discharge to Chelsea.⁵⁷ The year 1739 saw the beginning of a period when many more regiments were raised and this lasted until the end of the war. Apart from the ten regiments of Marines, which were initially the responsibility of the War Office not the Admiralty, and which will be dealt with separately, twenty-seven new regiments of Foot and two of Horse were raised. Not all of them were retained until the end of the war and only eight regiments of Foot were permanently

⁵³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO 116/2, 9.1.1730, DB 212.

⁵⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 17.3.1730, DB 595.

⁵⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 17.3.1730, DB 592.

⁵⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 10.5.1738, DB 7233.

⁵⁷ The 1st (Royal) Regiment of Foot was the only non-Guards regiment to possess two battalions until the beginning of the Seven Years War.

added to the establishment at its close.⁵⁸ The garrison of Ireland remained substantial throughout the period 1740-1748, though old, experienced regiments were withdrawn from it to fight in Flanders and new-raised regiments were sent there to replace them.

The Marching Regiments were so designated because they had no permanent bases in Great Britain. They were almost constantly on the move from one area to another, either as a result of definite requirements for a force to undertake policing or anti-smuggling operations, or simply to give temporary relief from the presence of soldiers to the towns and villages in which they were quartered. An underlying concern was that troops who integrated closely into the communities in which they lived were unlikely to be as tractable and impartial in enforcing policing actions upon those with whom they had been living. Soldiers were quartered, in the almost entire absence of barracks, in public houses and were therefore, at best, scattered about a large town, or were more widely separated in companies amongst a number of small towns or large villages wherever sufficient accommodation could be found.⁵⁹ The disadvantages to military efficiency of this peripatetic existence have been fully explored by Houlding in *Fit for Service*. In comparison with the Foot Guards, this domestic instability gave the Foot very little opportunity to retain men who were no longer fit for duty pending their recovery, and the scattered nature of their quarters placed much responsibility on company commanders as to when men no longer capable of duty should be discharged. It is clear that those regiments, Dragoons as well as Foot, which served in Scotland, took the opportunity to transfer unfit men, who probably would not qualify for a Chelsea pension, into the garrison companies in the castles of Edinburgh, Stirling, Blackness and Dumbarton. There they could serve out the remainder of their

⁵⁸ The best survey of regiments raised during the 1739-1748 war is to be found in C.T. Atkinson, 'Jenkin's Ear, The Austrian Succession War and the 'Forty-Five' *JSAHR*, Vol. XXII, 1944, pp. 280-298.

⁵⁹ For an explanation of the scarcity and provision of barracks in the British Isles, See - J. Douet, *British Barracks 1600-1914 - Their Architecture and Role in Society* (London: English Heritage, 1998).

qualifying time (and often much longer) rather than the regiments having to dismiss them unprovided for or necessarily obliging them to get themselves to London for a Board examination.⁶⁰

The classification of the Marching Foot (Appendix 5-3) indicates that illness counted for a relatively low proportion of discharges until 1731 when it rose steadily, stabilizing at about 30% during the Austrian War. In the war's immediate aftermath and until the close of this study it became by far the predominant reason for discharge. Wounds in combination with illness remained low throughout the period and declined even further from 1744, but the start of the war clearly led to a clearing out of older men; those discharged under the heading superannuated doubled in 1740 and there was another large increase in 1743 after the first year of active service in mainland Europe required the winnowing out of those proven to be too old for active campaigning. A similar large rise in those classed as worn out, but not over the age of sixty, is revealed in the 21.5% of discharges under that heading in the following year. It probably represented men who should have been discharged before the war began, but who were retained until their incapacity for further service became manifest. Wounds by themselves accounted for a very high proportion of discharges throughout the reign

⁶⁰ Between 1751 and 1755 there are several instances of significant discharges to Out-pension of men serving in the garrisons of the Scottish castles. All of them mention or indicate by wounds received that they had served in Marching Regiments during their earlier service, and they were clearly left in the Independent Companies because they were no longer capable of Marching service when their regiments were called back into England, TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/48, f. 356, 17.12.1751; WO4/49, f. 315, 22.10.1753; WO4/50, f. 53, 4.10.1754; WO4/50, f. 493, 21.10.1755. The practice was of long standing as Nathan Furnaw when sent to Chelsea from Stirling Castle was noted as being 'put into ye castle by Genl. Wade' out of the 10th Foot after being injured whilst constructing roads - TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.9.1730, DB 774. Samuel Connor, late of Battereau's Foot, was put into Edinburgh Castle after being wounded at Culloden, but had still not recovered when pensioned in November 1752 - TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 20.11.1752, DB24462. The practice is confirmed by the comment attached to the list of thirty-one men pensioned from the Scottish castles without examination as from 1 November 1754 'the day they are to be succeeded by 31 worn out soldiers recommended by the Regiments in Scotland' - TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/50, f. 53.

of George I reflecting the gradual exit of men who had fought in the War of the Spanish Succession, the effect of whose wounds was inducing disablement or whose scars were being cited as honourable indicators of long and faithful service. From the middle of the Austrian War, the impact of combat is very clear, with numerous discharges attributable to that cause in 1745 and 1746 taking account of the casualties of the battles of Fontenoy, Prestonpans, Falkirk and Culloden. Men wounded at this time appear to have been cleared quickly from the ranks as the decline to low percentages is dramatic as soon as the war was concluded. The injured-and-ill discharge rate remains low throughout the survey, though with a notable blip between 1739 and 1742 at the start of the renewal of conflict. Here again one may detect the clearing out of men thought unlikely to be able to sustain the rigours of campaigning. The very high figure of 36.6% of discharges due to illness in 1749 emphasizes that disablement through injury or wounds resulted in the rapid departure of men from the Army, whereas those who were ill, but remained capable of service were, not surprisingly, retained until they could safely be dispensed with at the general reduction of the forces.

The cluster of high percentages of discharges due to injury in the years 1728 to 1731 reflects those who served during the siege of Gibraltar between February and June 1727, many of whom suffered stone splinter injuries.⁶¹ Overall, the discharges due to injury remained significant across most of the period.

Of the 13,061 Marching Foot accepted onto the pension – 607 having been dismissed from the total sample – 36.4% (4,765 men) complained of illness alone or in combination with wounds or injuries. Unspecified ailments accounted for 1,715 cases – 35.9% of the sub-sample. Those whose discharge certificates mentioned diagnoses made by their regimental surgeons cited rheumatism as a predominant complaint suffered – alone or in combination – by 1,073 men (22.5%). Only

⁶¹ A total of 619 men discharged and recommended for pension between 1727 and 1731 cited wounds or injuries that they had received at Gibraltar during the siege.

damage, deterioration or disease to the eyes exceeded this percentage, 1,383 men (29.0% of all ill) being so reported. It is, however, impossible to differentiate the proportion within this sub-set whose disability was caused by injury or wounding rather than illness. One hundred and sixty-two men (11.7%) were said to be blind, presumably severely visually impaired rather than stone blind; 281 men had lost an eye or the use of an eye (20%) and 940 reported dim sight or bad eyes (67.9%). Nevertheless problems of eyesight were almost always mentioned with other conditions and rarely constituted the sole reason for discharge.

Consumption was cited in 363 discharge statements (7.6%) and sores, ulcers and abscesses by 3.7% (177 men). Fits and nervous conditions appeared in 175 cases (3.6%) and 108 men (2.2%) complained of falling sickness, which was often accompanied by injuries. Ailments registering at between 2 and 1 percent included, in declining order, stone and gravel in the kidneys or bladder at 1.8%, asthma and palsy at 1.7%, spitting or voiding of blood, piles or the flux, and dropsy at 1.5%, *fistulae* 1.4% and swellings 1.3%. The term paralytic was used to describe fifty-two men (1.0%), though this condition appears to have been something other than loss of the use of limbs, which was reported differently. Lunacy /disordered in his senses was cited in fifty instances. Many, though not all, cases of this affliction were dealt with by referring the sufferer to Bethlem (Bedlam) Hospital and arrangements were then made for the man's Out-pension to be paid directly to Bedlam's Treasurer to cover the expense of treatment and maintenance.⁶²

Illnesses, which featured in lower percentages, were complaints of the head – dizziness, migraine and headache – 0.9%; involuntary passage or stoppage of urine, bladder, kidney or testicular ulcers 0.6%; cancer or tumours 0.5%; scurvy or scorbutic conditions 0.4%; *fistula in ano* 0.3% and scrofula 'the King's Evil' at 0.2%. Epilepsy, diabetes and leprosy were reported in less than ten instances each.

⁶² Quoted from TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/50, f. 16 in respect of William Bain of Lord Robert Manners's 36th Foot, 9.8.1754, though there are many other examples of such letters. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 6.9.1754, DB 25295.

Unlike the Foot Guards, the Marching Foot were exposed to tropical diseases. Forty-three men attributed their ailments to service in Jamaica, many of them from Cornwallis's Foot, which, with Wentworth's Foot, had been sent to the island in 1730 to quell long-running disturbances perpetrated by the Maroon community in the island.⁶³ The Regulars were not effective in stamping out the disturbances and were withdrawn during 1732. Hugh Davis had his right arm and hand wasted, presumably by infection from an insect bite and was pensioned on 23 October 1733.⁶⁴ Francis Coombs of Wentworth's was injured while on insurrection suppression duties in Jamaica, but was also described as 'a miserable object much reduct by sickness'.⁶⁵ Sergeant Christopher Allen of Cornwallis's Foot had his skull broken and was shot in the leg, but was appointed to a 'Captain's command' for his bravery after taking two negro settlements. Eventually he was forced to return home owing to sickness.⁶⁶

The unluckiest regiment with regard to exposure to this sort of threat, however, was the 38th Foot.⁶⁷ It was posted to the Leeward Islands in 1714 and was not relieved until 1765.⁶⁸ Notionally standing at an establishment of 401 NCO's, musicians and soldiers between 1719 and 1729 and at 361 men between 1730 and 1739, it served in circumstances that would not have permitted men to be released unless they were

⁶³ P. Wright, 'War and Peace with the Maroons, 1730-1739', *Caribbean Quarterly*, Vol. 16 (1970), pp. 5-27. This period of operations, mostly undertaken by Jamaican Militia forces, was known as the First Maroon War. (I am grateful to Mr. Stephen Wood for this reference.)

⁶⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 23.10.1733, DB 1988.

⁶⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 19.12.1734, DB 4569.

⁶⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.2.1736, DB 5328. See also Wright, *War and Peace with the Maroons* pp. 12, 17 & 18. The settlements appear to have been Nanny Town, Diana Town and Molly Town.

⁶⁷ The diseases suffered by Europeans domiciled in the West Indies and the ability to acclimatise are dealt with in P.D. Curtin, *Death by Migration - Europe's encounter with the Tropical World in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁶⁸ Alexander's Foot, later the 38th Foot, posted to the Leeward Isles from at least December 1713, TNA, WO24/72.

utterly incapable of duty.⁶⁹ In the decade 1719 to 1728 the Regiment pensioned sixteen men only. Between 1729 and 1738 it pensioned four. In the 1740s and '50s, with many more ships passing between the West Indies and England, and with a much larger recruitment pool to draw from, it pensioned seventy-five men, many of them wounded and thereby rendered instantly non-functional. It is clear, therefore, that in peacetime, apart from these few, all of the discharges from this regiment were attributable to death or desertion, and it is highly unlikely that the latter accounted for any significant proportion. For the men who volunteered, or who were sent, to serve in the 38th Regiment of Foot the chances of seeing England ever again were infinitesimally slim.⁷⁰

An almost exactly equal number of men who complained of illness amongst the Marching Foot had suffered injuries – 4,745 making 36.3% of those pensioned. Loss of the use of limbs or hands was suffered by 926 men (19.5%), though some of these would have been attributable to illness rather than injury. Those described as hurt or disabled, but whose injuries were not otherwise specified made up 14.0% of the sample (667 men). Severe bruising had been experienced by 14.3% (680) and rupture by 593 men (12.4%).⁷¹ The incidence of broken bones was cited by 533 men, though their appearance in London with all limbs rather than as amputees indicates that all of these fractures had healed more or less satisfactorily, though leaving the man incapable of duty. Three hundred and forty-eight men were recorded as lame, though here again their disability could have been caused by illness rather than

⁶⁹ As revealed by a survey of all the Establishments of those years in TNA, WO24.

⁷⁰ By comparison, in the decade 1719 to 1728 the 3rd Foot Guards serving exclusively in England, and at three times the Establishment of the 38th Foot, had 405 soldiers examined by the Commissioners.

⁷¹ An excellent account of the treatment of hernias and rupture appears in 'Privates on Parade: Soldiers, Medicine and the treatment of Inguinal Hernias in Georgian England' by P.R. Mills in G.L. Hudson, (ed), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* (New York: Rodopi, 2007). The incidence of rupture in the Marching Foot must have been exacerbated by the fact that the Mutiny Acts forbade the retention of hired wagons for more than the duration of one day's march. When moving between postings therefore all the regimental baggage had to be unloaded each evening and re-loaded the next morning on different vehicles.

injury. Those whose limbs had been amputated for whatever reason accounted for 5.2% of the sample, some of whom would, doubtless have owed their losses to wounds rather than injuries. In addition 182 men had lost fingers and forty had lost toes due to frostbite. Dislocations of major limbs were mentioned in 120 discharge statements, and strained limbs or backs in another 104 cases making, in combination, 4.7% of the total sample.

In accounting for the causes of injuries, 150 men said that they had been burnt, had received injuries from gunpowder or had been damaged in explosions associated with siege operations. Splinters from palisades or ships' timbers were cited by 104 examinees, but three times as many men were injured by stone fragments, almost all of them having served in the siege of Gibraltar – 338 men (7.1%). A similar number – 324 men – attributed their injuries to cannon balls, shells or grenades that had landed close to them. In combination therefore 766 men had suffered from the indirect effects of artillery fire.

A larger number of men, 894, attributed their injuries to mischance, thirty-eight mentioning unspecified accidents. In an age of leather-soled and heeled shoes, no safety rails, slime and rubbish in the streets and uneven, ill-maintained roadways and steps it is not surprising to find 377 cases where falls were the cause of harm – 42.1% of all accidents. Proximity to artillery, either manning it in fortifications or serving unavoidably close to it, caused injury to ninety-four men (10.5% of the sub-set), more than half of these being reported in the years immediately following the siege of Gibraltar. Falling from or being struck by vehicles was recorded in 57 cases (6.3%). Joseph Harris of Columbine's Foot was badly bruised by a runaway cart striking him as it careered down hill at Gibraltar.⁷² Samuel Sunderland of Deloraine's Foot was bruised 'by a fall with a ... waggon near Doncaster when sick, ye waggon fell on him three times'.⁷³ Encounters with animals gave rise to notable injuries. Sixty-four men were injured by horses, most of them kicked, trodden on

⁷² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.11.1737, DB 7074.

⁷³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 3.11.1727, DB 6306.

or crushed and some of them reported old hurts from previous service in mounted regiments prior to their infantry enlistments. Men from Johnson's Foot and Durore's Foot were trampled on by the French cavalry at the battle of Dettingen, and similar incidents happened at Landen, Melle, Laufeldt and Fontenoy. George Musgrave was gored by a bull from Barbary landed as provisions at Gibraltar.⁷⁴ Seven men complained of bites by land or sea creatures – five by scorpions at Gibraltar or in Portugal, Thomas Phillips, 'a tall Blackmoor' was bitten by a 'worm' [a snake] in the West Indies⁷⁵ and William Abbott was stung by a sea creature at Gibraltar.⁷⁶ Dougal Camron of Middleton's Foot had his service terminated by an antelope in Gibraltar which butted him with its horns and 'scarrify'd' his leg.⁷⁷

Twenty-five men had been shipwrecked, many during the 1711 expedition against Quebec⁷⁸ and a similar number had been injured by rigging, machinery or falls while on ships. Flag staffs, timber or trees fell on seventeen men and the same number were hurt when walls, buildings, earthworks or other structures collapsed onto them. A guard house disintegrated around Nathaniel Hill in Spain;⁷⁹ John Mc Cabe's sentry box was knocked over by a cannon ball with him inside it at Willis's Battery, Gibraltar in 1728⁸⁰ and Ralph Barry was struck on the head by a collapsing chimney stack in Braintree, Essex.⁸¹ Thunder, lightning or the glare of the sun hurt fifteen men, frostbite accounted for five and botched medical procedures another nine. Labouring on the King's Works disabled fourteen men who fell from scaffolding or had it collapse under them while working in Minorca, Gibraltar or at Fort

⁷⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 2.11.1737, DB 7065.

⁷⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 6.8.1724, DB 8561.

⁷⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 17.5.1739, DB 7587.

⁷⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 20.3.1728, DB 5974.

⁷⁸ J. Sloss, *Richard Kane, Governor of Minorca* (Troubridge: Bonaventura Press, 1995), pp. 109-122 – Kane's Regiment formed part of the expedition. For an Order of Battle see W. Drenth, *A Regimental List of the Half Pay Officers for the Year 1714 on the English and Irish Establishments* (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2012), p. 98. Hereafter cited as Drenth, *Half Pay 1714*.

⁷⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 28.4.1719, DB 20769.

⁸⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 18.3.1728, DB 6155.

⁸¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 10.2.1736, DB 5283.

George, Inverness; Drummer Thomas Wright and John Tunicliff, both of Pearce's Foot, suffered eye damage by quick lime at Gibraltar and James Sparrow of Egerton's Foot was left there as lime burner to the garrison having lost an eye to its caustic effects.⁸² Sixty-three men (7% of the accidents sub-set) were hurt labouring in Scotland, most of them while constructing or maintaining roads in the Highlands, which was a continuous duty for the infantry that garrisoned North Britain from 1728 until beyond 1755.⁸³ Daniel Sutherland and Roger Perkins were hurt building Marshal Wade's great bridge over the River Tay,⁸⁴ William Urquhart was 'terribly disabled' by a boulder falling on him during road work in 1741, and Thomas Jones received a contusion in his head from a pickaxe.⁸⁵ Henry Perry, Peter Boyd, Henry Sarrat and Richard Froggott were all hurt while blasting rocks in the Highlands.⁸⁶

In turning to a detailed analysis of those men citing wounds as the sole or a contributory cause of their discharge, we find 3,636 men making 27.8% of all Marching Foot pensioned. Of these, 1,123 gave no details of what had wounded them or the nature of their wounds. Of those whose regimental surgeons gave more detailed accounts, 42% (1,529) had been shot and 1,104 (30.3%) had received sword stabs or cuts. Bayonets were mentioned in ninety instances (2.4%), being clubbed with a firearm in 1.0% of cases - thirty-eight instances - and being wounded by polearms was experienced by twenty-two men (0.6%). Eleven soldiers had been stabbed with dirks and two each had received their wounds from pitchforks or spades used as makeshift weapons. Eleven soldiers

⁸² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 9.12.1730, DB 871 (Wright), 8.1.1730, DB 2064 (Tunicliff), 11.1.1732, DB 1367 (Sparrow).

⁸³ Though a little old, the only overall survey of the building of the Highland road system is W. Taylor, *The Military Roads of Scotland* (Newton Abbott: David & Charles, 1976). See also D. Hagist, 'Maintaining Scotland's Military Roads: Orders for Sergeant McGregor's Party, 1772', *JSAHR*, Vol. 93, 2015, pp. 210-213.

⁸⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.1.1743, DB 10998 (Sutherland) and 19.7.1737, DB 6990 (Perkins).

⁸⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 8.10.1741, DB 9866 (Urquhart) and 31.1.1736, DB 4987 (Jones).

⁸⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 13.12.1752, DB 24622 (Perry), 28.1.1747, DB 15603 (Boyd), WO116/2, 15.6.1731, DB 1163 (Sarrat) and WO116/4, 24.6.1752, DB 24358 (Froggott).

identified their attackers as native North Americans, all of them from Philipps's 40th Foot in garrison at Placentia (Newfoundland) and Annapolis Royal (Nova Scotia). Archery featured in two of these attacks, Peter Chisham being discharged with an arrow scar under his left ear and William Williamson having lost his left eye to a similar missile when serving in his previous regiment.⁸⁷ Four men mentioned cuts inflicted by native weapons and another four firearms wounds. One specified a hatchet, probably meaning a tomahawk. Edward Doyle was severely wounded by one of the sergeants of the 40th 'who was going to slay an Indian which he prevented'.⁸⁸

Though most hurts received from artillery ammunition have been classified as injuries not wounds, as they appear to have been received indirectly, wounds attributed to 'cannon balls' were mentioned in fifty-two cases. It would seem that the term was being used loosely and that in many cases artillery projectiles – components of canister shot - is what was meant and that not every instance featured full calibre rounds. Where wounds were caused by full calibre balls, the results, if survived at all, were catastrophic and the only medical treatment was amputation. Thus Collen Stuart and James French wounded at the attack on Boca Chica and John Elliott wounded at Carthagena appeared before the commissioners with only one arm each, while Peter Campbell returned from Gibraltar and Robert White from Dettingen with wooden legs.⁸⁹ At least eleven men, though mentioning cannon balls, had lost no limbs. As being hit in the body by a full calibre round would have been fatal, it can only be assumed that their wounds were due to the component projectiles of canister shot. Three of this type of casualty were wounded at Dettingen⁹⁰ and six at Fontenoy⁹¹ and, though good

⁸⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 13.10.1730, DB 850 (Chisham) and WO116/3, 12.2.1736, DB 5360 (Williamson).

⁸⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 7.11.1728, DB 5593.

⁸⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.10.1741, DB 9793 (Stuart), DB 9796 (French) and DB 9802 (Elliott); WO116/2, 20.11.1727, DB 6220 (Campbell); WO116/3, 1.3.1744, DB 11802 (White).

⁹⁰ John Mac Intosh, 21st Foot, 14.12.1743, DB 11532; Hugh Weer, 31.1.1744, DB 11753 and David Walton, 11th Foot, 1.3.1744, DB 11801 – all from TNA, WO116/3.

fortune probably played a considerable part, the use by the French Army of high numbers of small calibre light-weight guns during the War of the Austrian Succession was acknowledged to have reduced the lethality of its artillery arm.⁹² Against concentrated troop formations canister shot delivered by such weapons was not as effective as from heavier guns firing with more propellant. The Duke of Cumberland, is likely to have benefitted similarly from this temporary French passion for light guns when he was wounded at Dettingen.

A very high proportion of wounded men recorded only one incident – 2,502 cases (68.8%). Almost 21% had received two wounds (759 men) and 180 – almost 5% - had been wounded three times. Thereafter the numbers register at below 1%, though two men cited ten wounds, another pair cited fourteen and fifteen wounds respectively and a further two had suffered sixteen wounds each. Two hundred and sixty-six men were said to be much wounded or to have received several wounds (7.3%). The unfortunate Private John Ford of Thomas Murray's 46th Foot was wounded 265 times at the battle of Prestonpans. Whether this was the result of savagery on the part of the rebellious Highlanders or the use of a fowling piece or blunderbus loaded with very small shot is unknown, but his recovery was protracted; two years passed before he could appear before the Commissioners.⁹³ Seven men mentioned that wounds or injuries to their heads had been treated with trepanning operations.

⁹¹ Thomas Gardiner, 18.10.1745, DB 13238; John Vozey, 1st Foot, 9.11.1745, DB 13381; John Brawbent, 33rd Foot, 13.11.1745, DB 13603; Thomas Badger, 11th Foot, 28.11.1745, DB 13668; James Mills, 25th Foot, 19.12.1745, DB 13775 and George Scott, 3rd Foot, 20.12.1745, DB 13830 – all from TNA, WO116/3.

⁹² F. Naulet, *L'Artillerie Francaise (1665-1765), Naissance d'une Arme* (Paris: Economica, 2002), pp. 113-122. J. Muller, *A Treatise of Artillery* 3rd Ed., 1780, (Ottawa: Museum Restoration Service reprint, 1965) Part 1, unpaginated, gives the calibre of a French 4 Pounder as 3.111 Pouces and the diameter, allowing for windage, of any round as being 3 Pouces. The equivalent English measurements are 3.315 and 3.196 inches. The individual projectiles contained within a canister shot could therefore be barely bigger than a musket ball.

⁹³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 17.8.1747, DB 16110. Prestonpans had been fought on 20 September 1745.

THE MARINE REGIMENTS OF FOOT

As it was anticipated that the war, which broke out in 1739 might be confined to amphibious operations against Spain's settlements in the Caribbean and Central America, a force of Marines was immediately raised.⁹⁴ They were classed as Marine Regiments of Foot and they were, until 1747, the responsibility of the War Office and not the Admiralty.⁹⁵ This species of troops had existed in the British Army since 1664 when the Lord High Admiral's Regiment was raised. More regiments of Marines were formed during the War of the Spanish Succession, but all were either broken or converted to Marching Foot at the end of that war.⁹⁶ The Marines of 1739 were constructed on cadres of experienced men provided by the existing infantry regiments and, with regard to the details that appear in the Chelsea Registers this is reflected in lengths of service, and the ailments, wounds or injuries that went with that service, which pre-dated 1739.

Turning to the analysis of the reasons for discharge (Appendix 5-4), it is noticeable that although the percentage of wounded men is relatively consistent throughout the regiments' existence, there is a high point at the very beginning. This is explained by the fact that the original six regiments provided the bulk of the forces in the expedition against

⁹⁴ The establishment of six regiments of marines was laid down in TNA WO24/187 with effect from 25 October 1739 as 816 all ranks, 780 NCOs and Other Ranks. Their Establishment from 25 December 1739 (WO24/188) augmented each regiment by ten Second Lieutenants and ten each of Sergeants, Corporals and Drummers and 300 Privates per regiment to 1,110 NCOs and Other Ranks each. Another four regiments were formed at this increased establishment with effect from 25 December 1740 (TNA, WO24/198).

⁹⁵ The Marine Regiments were transferred from the War Office to the Admiralty by a warrant dated 28 February 1746/7 (TNA, AO15/45). The men of these regiments nevertheless continued to be discharged for pension to the Royal Hospital until the end of the war.

⁹⁶ Drenth, *Half Pay 1714*, p. 73.

Cartagena in 1740.⁹⁷ Of course, men continued to receive wounds throughout the war, largely by musketry while serving in ships, though some cited encounters with smugglers on land as the occasions of their wounding. The number of cannonball-related instances is very small, five, but the weapon involved in seventy-three instances is unmentioned (6.5%) and some of these 'wounds' may be injuries as defined in this study. The five marines who returned wounded from Pondicherry and who were discharged in 1750 and 1752, included the famous female soldier Hannah Snell, who was wounded three times in the thighs and groin.⁹⁸ That expedition must have entailed particularly testing service because two of her comrades-in-arms returned to Great Britain afflicted with lunacy as well as their wounds.

Some of the high sickness rate in the years immediately after the Cartagena expedition was attributed to serving in the West Indies; fifty-four men supposing their ailments to have originated in that theatre (4.8%). However, service afloat in the cramped and airless conditions of a warship or transport always gave rise to high illness rates that are duly reflected in the roughly 30% attributed to this cause in the reasons for discharge. Rheumatism was mentioned in sixty-eight cases (6.0% of the 1,120 Marines pensioned), consumption by fifty men (4.4%), dropsy, deafness and fits or nervous disorders by between 2.5 and 2.0%, other specified ailments accounted for percentages of one or less – asthma, palsy, stone or gravel and scurvy. Eight men were classed as lunatics, most having wounds, injuries or ailments besides. Unspecified sickness, illness or infirmities were mentioned in 111 cases, 9.9% of the sample.

What is even more noticeable is the very high injury rate, which is consistent across most of the period. Ships constituted extraordinarily dangerous working environments for land-lubbers to operate in and the opportunities for being hit by running rigging, getting fingers or toes trapped in machinery aboard or being crushed by guns, stores or

⁹⁷ R. Harding, *Amphibious Warfare in the Eighteenth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1991), pp. 66-70.

⁹⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 21.11.1750, DB 23962.

equipment in the hold were legion. Two hundred and sixty-three men appear to indicate that their injuries were received on shipboard and were not owing to having lost their balance (23.4%). Robert Kile of Cochran's Marines had his leg crushed by a chest of arms falling on him;⁹⁹ John Simpson was hurt by casks of water shifting from their storage;¹⁰⁰ William Eyles, Joseph Woodnott and John Nisbett all pensioned on the same day from Sowle's Marines, but serving in different ships, were hit by capstan bars while assisting in hauling.¹⁰¹ Thomas Killett lost two toes by a cask falling on his foot.¹⁰² Operating in a world that was almost constantly moving, sometimes very violently, the opportunities to fall down hatchways or against part of the structure of the vessel also gave rise to frequent disabling injuries – a further 126 instances making 11.25% of all those examined. Twenty-one men specified that they fell down hatchways, another six fell into, or while in, the holds of ships. John Jones of Jeffrey's Marines 'fell between the gratings' of the *Victory*.¹⁰³ George Goble fell out of the shrouds of the sloop *Despatch*¹⁰⁴, and Henry Brown fell from the mizzen-mast of his ship.¹⁰⁵ Peter Churchill of Jeffrey's Marines fell from the top mast-head of the *Assistance*, though presumably saved himself from death by grabbing hold of the rigging and thereby breaking his fall. The episode terminated his twenty-one months of service with a very bad rupture.¹⁰⁶ It is clear that when Marines were aboard they were expected to participate in the labour of the vessel. Thomas Salter¹⁰⁷ had his right hand badly hurt by getting it jammed under the cable when weighing anchor in the *Squirrel*, and David Linning lost parts of three fingers when 'throwing' the anchor in the *Princess Amelia*.¹⁰⁸

⁹⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 17.11.1748, DB 18235.

¹⁰⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 17.11.1748, DB 18234.

¹⁰¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 28.5.1746, DB 14431, 14441 & 14443.

¹⁰² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.6.1742, DB 10246.

¹⁰³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.5.1742, DB 10180.

¹⁰⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 11.11.1748, DB 18191.

¹⁰⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 19.6.1750, DB 23855.

¹⁰⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 27.1.1743, DB 11042.

¹⁰⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 14.7.1744, DB 12148.

¹⁰⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 6.12.1748, DB 18826.

With such a catalogue of mishaps it is not surprising to find that the commonest forms of injury were represented within the sample of those accepted for pension by the following percentages: lost the use of limbs 14.8%, 'hurt' or disabled 10.8%, rupture 10%, broken bones including skulls and broken backs 4.2% and bruised 3%. Sixty men, 5.3% of the sample, had suffered amputations, though as in the other infantry, the words amputee or amputations are never used and the entries appear as 'lost his leg at ...'. Sometimes it is possible to be certain that the cause of the loss was a severe wound, but often it is unclear whether the loss was due to an injury or illness. Eight men had been blinded or suffered impairment of sight by lightning flashes. Road vehicles featured hardly at all as the causes of injuries, though John Laxon's expectant pleasure at receiving his prize money must have been somewhat abated by having his leg broken by the wagon loaded with it that he was escorting.¹⁰⁹ Four men attributed their disablement to injuries sustained by being struck by Royal Naval officers on the ships in which they were serving. All of them were pensioned.

Though the proportion of Marines rejected for pension by the Chelsea Board was low while the war was in progress, it attained a surprisingly high level in 1748 when more than a quarter of those who presented themselves were rejected. The reason for this is unclear, because the complaints cited on their certificates do not differ significantly from those mentioned by comrades who had earlier received the royal bounty. No Marching Orders exist to indicate when contingents of Marines left their ports of disembarkation to journey up to London, and it may be that the period between discharge and examination was sufficient for some men to have recovered under the beneficial influence of fresh air and food, no work and the uplifting sensation of once more being 'at home'. The loss of one finger was not considered by the Board to be disabling, and the degree of disability of other candidates was clearly not believed. In ten cases the refutation of the Hospital's own surgeon was recorded in the registers. Samuel Marwood, an old soldier having served three years in Tyrawley's Royal Fusiliers before his seven

¹⁰⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 18.3.1748, DB 17194.

years in Laforey's Marines, and discharged as having his sight impaired, must have been disappointed to find that 'the Surgeon says his eyes are good' when he was rejected in April 1749.¹¹⁰

When examined cumulatively, the sample shows that 140 men (12.6%) out of the 1,120 Marines who received pensions, had suffered wounds with or without other injuries or ailments. Four hundred and forty-two men were ill or decayed, though some of these illnesses would have been exacerbated or brought on by wounds or injuries. They represented 39.6% of the sample. More than half of all Marines pensioned had been injured, with or without additional wounding or distempers (53.8%). Despite the hard service that fighting on ships entailed, only forty-three men were discharged to pension under the 'catch all' definition of worn out. A tiny proportion, 0.98% (eleven men) were classified as superannuated having served more than thirty years and attained at least sixty years of age. Clearly these were old soldiers from Marching Regiments who formed part of the cadres around which the Marine Regiments of Foot were formed.

The imprecision as to causality of the conditions which led to soldiers being presented before the Commissioners for admission to pension make it impossible to compose an absolutely neat and statistically tidy summary of the reasons for discharge.¹¹¹ Being wounded was the least common contributory factor, accounting for just over a quarter of men in the cavalry and infantry and about one in eight of all Marines. Amongst the Marching Foot and the cavalry, illness and injury were evenly balanced at slightly below 40% in each case. Only the Foot Guards show a significant disparity in these factors being noticeably more unhealthy and less prone to injury. One might speculate that the cause of this

¹¹⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 26.4.1749, DB 22517.

¹¹¹ Nielsen, Out-pensioners provides an analysis of illnesses and disabilities in Appendix 3.1. However, it covers the period 1715 to 1795 and is divided neither by the branch of service in which these incidents occurred nor by the sort of classifications used in this study.

imbalance was living almost solely within the crowded and noisome Metropolis as well as having less exercise in moving around the country. The similarity in the incidence of wounding within the Foot Guards when compared with the other main branches of the Army indicates, however, that when it came to active service they were used, and therefore suffered, in exactly the same way as their fellows.

CHAPTER 6

How the Out-pension was paid

Having passed through trial by fire, disease and the random misfortunes of being seriously injured, and finally been accepted onto the Out-pension of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea, how was the pensioner to receive his money? Was central government capable of dispensing it directly to the pensioners? Did the Treasury, on a regular basis, have funds immediately to hand with which to meet the commitment? What checks were put in place to make sure that the men who claimed that they were pensioners were indeed the very same individuals who had served their sovereign and merited the royal bounty? Though there are undoubtedly gaps in the record, this chapter will provide answers to these questions and lay out the administrative method of the Chelsea Out-pension.

In Chapter 3 we examined the difficult circumstances that prevailed at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession with regard to Out-pensioners, invalids awaiting examination and pensioners re-engaged in service in the Invalid companies who had been occupying quarters scattered to the south-west of London. Turning now strictly to the Out-pensioners at that time, three factors combined to create an *impasse* which prevented them from returning to their homes: they had not received furloughs allowing them to do so; they had built up considerable debts to the inn keepers for subsistence, and the Hospital had no money with which to pay what was owed. The problem was addressed in 1713 when funds were provided to clear the debts and release the men from their creditors and to enable them to return home. Each was provided with a pass to assure his unmolested travel homeward, since some form of protection from arrest as a deserter or a vagabond was required.

In effect, the Hospital's inability to pay off the pensioners had forced the publicans into the role of providers of victuals and accommodation to the discharged soldiers on credit. Once these debts had been paid, men

wishing to return home nevertheless still found themselves with no ready cash to undertake their journeys because the pension was paid in arrears. The *London Gazette* warned those who had maintained the Out-pensioners that they should not 'upon any pretence whatever, continue to Credit or Subsist the said Pensioners' after 24 June 1713, and this notice must effectively mark the moment from which Out-pensioners started engaging with 'dealers' to receive their money.¹ The central role of these money lenders in the operation of the Out-pension up to 1755 will be explained in detail in the following pages. Those pensioners who, by good fortune or because they originated from London, had been supported by kith and kin during the unpaid period, and who were therefore owed pension money, were called in to receive it from 28 September at the Hospital.² Those whose debts had been paid, but who required cash to travel home, would, at that point, have had to borrow money against their future pensions.

Pension periods ran from 25 December to 24 June and from 25 June to 24 December. In order to keep to the stipulated six months arrears, payment days should therefore have been established regularly in late June to cover the previous June to December period and in late December to cover the previous December to June period. However, the time between the end of each pension period and the date when the money was actually issued to cover that period was often longer than six months, sometimes considerably so. In addition, though the pension was supposedly paid in six monthly instalments, in fact this was not so. In the thirty-seven years between 1719 and 1755 inclusive, on thirty-two occasions the arrears periods were twelve months and on only ten occasions were they for six months.

The irregularity and infrequency with which the Treasury was able to release monies to the Hospital meant that the payment of the Out-pensioners until 1719 was intermittent and, although assured in the long

¹ London Gazette No. 5129, 13–16 June 1713 and *The Annals of King George* p. 333.

² London Gazette No. 5147, 15–18 August 1713.

term, was unpredictable as to the precise date of its disbursement. The occasions of payment can be plotted from the announcements made in the *London Gazette* and are detailed in Table 6-1.³

The column headed *Time after end of payment period* ought to read consistently at twenty-six weeks if the pension had been paid regularly six months in arrears. However, up to 1718 payment was deferred and the periods of arrears were allowed to extend. The effect of repeatedly allowing this to happen meant that eventually very large sums had to be paid off and that the payment of the first delayed tranche would be very late and the others somewhat less late. In the exceptional payment period June 1713 to June 1715, the first tranche - June -December 1713 - was sixteen months late, the second tranche - December 1713 - June 1714 - was ten months late, the third tranche - June - December 1714 - was four months late and the fourth - December 1714 - June 1715 - was two months early.

For most of the period after 1723, and given that the money was delivered in annual rather than half-yearly instalments, payment was often made of the paired half-years close to the twenty-six weeks of the due date of the end of the period concerned. It is notable that when payments were made in six-monthly tranches, the associated periods of delay were longer. The column - *Time from start date* - illustrates more fully the pensioners' predicament. For example, a man having been pensioned in early June 1722 was obliged to wait seventeen months before any money was issued for his subsistence. Even when pension money was provided on time, the extension of the arrears periods to twelve months meant that existing pensioners always had to wait more than a year for their money. Clearly for the vast majority, this was a completely unrealistic expectation and made it absolutely essential to

³ London Gazette on line consulted on numerous occasions 2011 to 2014. It seems that the on-line set is not absolutely complete as the pay announcements in 1744 and 1752 were not traceable on-line. They were found in the paper copies in TNA, London Gazette, ZJ1/41 & 48. It should be noted that the dates on the London Gazette volume for 1744 are, unlike any other year, given in the Julian calendar form – the year being given as 1743 up to the issue after 24 March 1744.

resort to dealers who would advance ready cash. Nor is it surprising to find that men newly-released from the Army, and much in need of the succour likely to be found in their own 'countries', would willingly have engaged in any scheme, however disadvantageous in the long term, that allowed them to return home as quickly as possible.

Selling the proprietary right to a pension in return for ready cash was therefore a solution to the problem that very quickly became normal practice. This would, in fact, have been a quite natural process, as the difficulty with which money circulated in the country at large was an accepted norm of the era, and consequently the concept of enabling a third party to receive dues by calling on local credit while providing an equivalent credit at a distant location was commonplace. Such transactions over distance and time were achieved by means of a legal instrument – a letter of attorney - which authorized collection of funds from the issuing body by a third party on behalf of a person who would receive the value of the money at a location close to his place of abode.

The practice, however, had consequences that were compounded by the fact that the pension was paid in arrears. By the time the dealer had received the pension money, which redeemed the first instalment of the pensioner's debt, the latter was, doubtless, desperately in need of an influx of cash to sustain his continued existence. Once engaged therefore, the Out-pensioner was trapped in a cycle of debt from which it would be very hard to escape.

The government's inability to provide sources of its own cash at the moment of the pensioners' departure from London, or later in the provinces, meant that private enterprise was called upon to meet the challenge. Several factors contributed towards this necessity. At a most basic level, transferring large amounts of small denomination cash around the country was impractical. Coinage, both bulky and heavy, was difficult to transport on the road network and was far from safe in

such circumstances. Surprisingly, in the account of all the other duties that Houlding⁴ enumerates as distracting the Army from its training, it was not responsible for safeguarding transfers of money around the country with the exception of providing an escort from the Horse Grenadier Guards to protect wagon-loads of cash despatched from the Navy Pay Office in London to Portsmouth. There are almost no other instances of military escorts being provided for such purposes in the Marching Orders,⁵ and it is surely not to be doubted that highwaymen would have taken full advantage of any unprotected transfers had they taken place.

Additionally, almost throughout the eighteenth century the country suffered from a chronic shortage of small denomination coinage, both silver and copper, and that which did exist was largely old and underweight by clipping and filing to such a degree that for copper coins - the denominations most likely to have been used by Out-pensioners - traders would not accept the face value, but only the metal value by weight.⁶ The Mint did not run a constant programme of manufacture with the intention of regularly renewing the coinage, and therefore what was already in circulation had to suffice for transactions. Even if it had wished to send out to the pensioners the large amount of small coin that was required, the government had no ready stock of such cash to draw on for this purpose.

A further factor was that the Army's practice of recruiting in the four corners of the British Isles meant that men accepted onto the Out-pension, even from the same regiment, might originate from Cornwall, Cumberland, Caithness and Caernarvonshire as well as County Cavan.

⁴ J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981). The entirety of Chapter 1 is an account of all of those activities that distracted the Army from its training regime.

⁵ This statement is based upon a survey of every volume of the Marching Orders (TNA, WO5) from 1719 to 1749.

⁶ Ashton, T.S., *An Economic History of England – The Eighteenth Century* (London: Methuen & Co., 1972), pp. 173-174. Hereafter cited as Ashton, Economic History.

The impracticability of delivering minute packets of cash on a regular basis to such widely dispersed locations, and many thousands in-between, requires little explanation. The readiness of a 'polite and commercial people' to step into the breach and fulfil a requirement of which the government was incapable,⁷ is scarcely to be wondered at, particularly when no restriction was placed upon the terms under which Out-pensioners were permitted to dispose of their proprietary rights. As we have seen, the people who set themselves up to service this requirement were known as dealers, but were often referred to by others as usurers.

However convenient this interposition of private enterprise and commercial advantage-taking may have been, it is clear that it did not work exclusively to the benefit of the pensioners. On the days when the Commissioners sat to examine invalided soldiers, the environs of the Old Horse Guards building or Killigrew Court were frequented by the lesser dealers themselves or by the clerks of those few large dealers whose other business affairs took precedence. The process for the new Out-pensioner must have been similar to that which he had experienced on first being recruited into the Army. In ones and twos, or perhaps in small groups, the maimed, ruptured, consumptive and worn out would most likely have been regaled in a tavern with the deal that the money-lender was prepared to offer them. It seems unlikely that involved explanations of interest rates, claw back and discount were entered into, and the jingle of ready coin in the hand would, doubtless, have played as seductive a role in this decision-making process as the recruitment bounty, which had enticed many of the men into the Army in the first

⁷ According to P. Jupp, *The Governing of Britain 1688-1848* (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 27, Government employees number about 6,000 in 1716 and about 7,250 by 1755. These figures differ somewhat from those given by J. Brewer, *The Sinews of Power* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 64-69 who cites 6,484 in the fiscal bureaucracy alone in 1755. Nevertheless, the number of War Office 'civil servants' permanently in the provinces was tiny: a couple of dozen Commissaries of the Musters and their deputies who were part-time workers. They could not have formed the basis of a payment network.

place. Nevertheless, certain niceties would have had to be explained and satisfaction given on two counts in particular.

Firstly the dealer would have made quite sure that the Out-pensioner was willing to accompany him to an attorney to place his mark upon the letter that authorized the money-lender to collect the pensioner's cash at the Chelsea pay office whenever the Treasury was prepared to let the Hospital have it. Secondly, the new pensioner would have been anxious to establish from whom he was to collect his payments after he had returned home.⁸

The whole procedure of providing credit in distant places would have been very familiar to any man of business in the eighteenth century, whether based in the capital or in the counties.⁹ In the absence of cash dispensing facilities in any but the very largest cities of the kingdom – the Post Office had no responsibility for such a function and provincial banks were a rarity until after 1760¹⁰ – shop-keepers, merchants and traders, large and small, were obliged to depend upon bonds of trust

⁸ The procedure was somewhat analogous to that practised by the womenfolk of Royal Navy personnel as described in M. Hunt, 'Women and the Fiscal-Imperial State in the late Seventeenth Century and early Eighteenth Century' pp. 29-47 in K. Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial history - Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁹ The development of credit, and of the concept of credit-money - paper money - as well as the problem of the English coinage, both before and after the great Recoinage of 1696, are discussed in C. Wennerlind, *Casualties of Credit. The English Financial Revolution, 1620-1720* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 2011). The ethos and mode of operation of the commercial state is explained in A. Graham, *Corruption, Party and Government in Britain, 1702-1713* (Oxford, OUP, 2015), pp.14-18. Although dealing with a much longer time period, C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation - The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1998) examines the all-pervading nature of credit relationships across all sectors of society and maintains that this *modus operandi* within the national economy persisted throughout the period of this study and into the nineteenth century.

¹⁰ Ashton, *Economic History* p. 183. Only about a dozen provincial banks existed before 1750. The functions of the Post Office are explained in K. Ellis, *The Post Office in the Eighteenth Century - A Study in Administrative History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958).

built up with suppliers of goods that they required, but which were unobtainable locally. Equally, those metropolitan businessmen who needed to pay for commodities or services not available in London were dependent upon the discharge of their debts by local contacts in those places where their requirements were to be had. It was essential that in the long term the monetary value and the level of service provided at one end of the chain matched that provided at the other.

The mechanism through which such transactions were achieved was the bill of exchange. The provincial shop-keeper who wished to supply his customers with lawful tea, wine, tobacco or sugar¹¹ in the market town where he conducted business needed to buy these commodities in London, Bristol or any other port through which they might enter the country. The merchant of these commodities in those cities might have commercial dealings with fellow traders or manufacturers in his home city who required agricultural or other produce – wool, grain, hemp, flax, coal, tin or finished dairy products – which were plentiful in the grocer's locality. In return for the city merchant arranging the transport to and payment for the foreign comestibles desired by the provincial grocer, the latter would arrange transport and pay for his rural neighbour's produce or raw materials to go to the city merchant. Such commercial transactions, and the trustworthy credit provision upon which they depended at both localities, under-pinned the entire structure of internal trade within the country. Thousands of such transactions took place every day and, as Smail has pointed out, they were an 'open-ended and everyday element in the lives of merchants and manufacturers'.¹² It was upon this network that the payment of the

¹¹ These commodities, of course, entered the country as contraband, but some legal purchases were always required to furnish the veneer of legality to stocks that derived from other sources. W.A. Cole, 'Trends in Eighteenth Century Smuggling', *Economic History Review*, 1957-58, pp. 395-409. About 3 million pounds weight of tea is estimated to have been consumed in the period 1742 - 1745, amounting to more than three times the legal sales - p. 397.

¹² I follow Ashton in general for the explanation of this process. See *Economic History*, Chapter 6. See also J. Smail, 'Credit, Risk and Honor in Eighteenth Century Commerce', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 44 (2005), pp. 439-456 - hereafter cited as Smail, 'Credit, Risk and Honor'.

Chelsea Out-pension depended while it remained in the hands of the dealers.

Though straightforward in concept, the system could not have been without some difficulties in practice. Pensioners would most likely not have wished to receive intangible credit from the principal trader of their nearest, though perhaps quite distant, market town. They would almost certainly have preferred to receive cash. It seems likely, however, that if goods-in-kind were all that the dealer's agent in the local market town was prepared to offer, then the Out-pensioner would have had no choice but to accept them, though the agent may well have taken his cut out of the notional value of the pension in addition to that taken by the dealer.¹³ It would have been impossible for each dealer in London to build up a credit relationship with even one small trader in every village in which one of his client Out-pensioners might happen to reside. As Mui has pointed out, such village traders probably would have had a credit relationship with a large retailer-wholesaler in their nearest market town, even if they were only supplying the meagre needs of a village inhabited by agricultural workers and lesser artisans, but they would certainly not have required direct contact with any London suppliers.¹⁴ The system therefore depended upon the provision of either goods or small denomination coinage, acquired through the normal activity of any substantial trader in a rural town, to the pensioner directly or to a designated helper who collected it on the pensioner's behalf. By this means the provincial grocer would discharge the London dealer's debt to the pensioner, while the dealer would pay the grocer's tea, wine or sugar bill in London. The significant advantage to the provincial grocer however, was that as the pension was paid in cash, the

¹³ J. Hoppitt, 'Attitudes to Credit in Britain, 1680-1790', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 33, 1990, pp. 305-322. In particular p. 318 where trade credit is discussed. See also B.L. Anderson, 'Money and the Structure of Credit in the Eighteenth Century', *Business History*, Vol. 12, 1970, pp. 85-101.

¹⁴ H. & L. Mui, *Shops and shop-keeping in Eighteenth Century England* (Kingston: Mc Gill-Queen's University Press, 1989), p. 21. Hereafter cited as Mui, Shops.

dealer in London paid off his debt in money rather than by extending yet another credit arrangement by means of a bill of exchange.¹⁵

Pondering such arrangements within the context of the Chelsea pension, however, gives rise to questions of scale. Though the small sum of cash which the provincial shop-keeper supplied to his local pensioner was, doubtless, essential to the latter, the credit which that single payment represented in London would be of only limited usefulness to the shop-keeper. It may be supposed therefore that it was very much in the interests of dealers to take on Out-pensioners who were conveniently co-located so that several of them could collect their money from the same shop-keeper, who would thereby be able to call upon a useful, cumulative sum of credit with the dealer in London. It is possible that dealers did indeed seek to acquire clients who would constitute a 'critical mass' in a convenient location and attempt to avoid the worst possible circumstance of having fifty-two Out-pensioners on their books each one resident in the different counties of England and Wales. Scarcity of records in the form of dealers' client lists matched with locations makes it impossible to say how far such concentrations might have been achieved. What evidence there is, appears to present a mixed picture.

The only available list that matches dealers with the Out-pensioners whom they serviced with money, and which gives the place of residence of the latter, was compiled by Mr Johnston as part of an enquiry into fraudulent claims for the pension being perpetrated in Ireland during the early 1740s.¹⁶ Of Johnston himself, nothing is known, but his work in revealing abuses of the pension will be examined in the next chapter.

¹⁵ See Smail, 'Credit, Risk and Honor', p. 442.

¹⁶ The document catalogued as WO118/45 in The National Archives (UK). It is erroneously believed to relate to the Kilmainham pension because all of the pensioners were resident in Ireland. However, they are all traceable to the admissions registers of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea. The document was signed by the compiler, John Johnston, 30 June 1744.

His list provides a record of living 557 Out-pensioners and forty-three who, at the time of its compilation, were believed to be recently dead, plus a further twenty-one whose records are incomplete or who, for some other reason, cannot be linked to a dealer.

Regardless of the reason for which it was compiled, it illustrates how varied was the incidence of residential concentration that dealers were able to achieve in respect of their clients. The results of the analysis are presented as Table 6-2. In total thirty-four dealers are represented on the list, three of whom may be present under variant spellings of their names, reducing the total to thirty-one.¹⁷ Despite the similarity in names, the Dublin City list clearly indicates that Bates and Beats were not the same man, and nor were Camp, Champ and Kamp, or at least the compiler of the list did not believe so.

¹⁷ Armatage/Hermatage, Haughton/Naughton, McCool/McCoul.

Table 6-2 Dealers in Great Britain having Out-pensioner clients living in Ireland arranged alphabetically by county / city showing how many out-pensioners each dealer had in each location, 1744.

Source TNA, WO118/45

County	Dealer	Client per dealer	Total per county
Antrim			
	Abbott	1	
	Alberry	1	
	Baccus	1	21
	Burrows	1	
	Caddell	10	
	Campbell	1	
	Highstreet	6	
Armagh			
	Alberry	1	
	Burrows	1	
	Campbell	3	16
	Highstreet	3	
	King	7	
	Kinnard	1	
Carlow			
	Highstreet	1	
	Webb	1	2
Cavan			
	Alberry	1	
	Campbell	2	
	Highstreet	4	9
	King	1	
	Webb	1	
Clare			
	Webb	1	1
Cork			
	Alberry	1	
	Baccus	3	
	Bates	1	
	Haughton	1	96
	Highstreet	79	
	Hussey	1	
	King	7	
	Mc Cool	1	
	Webb	2	

Donegal		
Highstreet	9	9
Down		
Alberry	1	
Baccus	1	
Caddell	29	
Camp	1	
Gibson	1	
Highstreet	2	41
Hussey	4	
Mc Coul	1	
Webb	1	
Dublin Co		
Burrows	2	
Desally	1	
Highstreet	1	7
King	1	
Webb	2	
Dublin City		
Abbott	3	
Alberry	11	
Baccus	2	
Bates	2	
Beats	6	
Bitters	1	
Burrows	2	
Caddell	1	
Camp	2	
Campbell	6	
Champ	1	
Harding	1	
Hermatage	1	170
Highstreet	59	
Hussey	1	
Kamp	3	
King	8	
Kinnard	1	
Martin	4	
Mc Cool	5	
Sharp	2	
Smith	2	
Taylor	7	
Webb	38	
Wedge	1	

Fermanagh		
Alberry	1	
Campbell	2	
Highstreet	5	
Naughton	1	11
Ward	1	
Webb	1	
Galway		
Bates	1	
Gilchrist	1	8
Highstreet	4	
Webb	2	
Kerry		
Burrows	2	
Gibson	1	4
Taylor	1	
Kildare		
Alberry	1	
Highstreet	3	5
Webb	1	
Kilkenny		
Alberry	2	
Highstreet	7	
Hussey	3	15
Ward	1	
Webb	2	
King's County		
Highstreet	1	
Webb	1	2
Leitrim		
Ward	1	1
Limerick		
Alberry	2	
Campbell	1	
Highstreet	3	
Martin	1	19
Sharp	1	
Taylor	5	
Webb	6	

Londonderry		
Baccus	1	
Caddell	2	
Campbell	1	19
Highstreet	14	
Mc Coul	1	
Longford		
Alberry	1	
Beats	1	
Campbell	2	7
Highstreet	2	
Hussey	1	
Louth		
Armatage	1	
Highstreet	1	3
Webb	1	
Mayo		
Highstreet	3	3
Meath		
		0
Monaghan		
Caddell	1	
Highstreet	2	6
Taylor	2	
Webb	1	
Queen's County		
Highstreet	2	
Kinnea	1	3
Roscommon		
Alberry	2	
Beats	2	
Highstreet	3	12
Taylor	2	
Webb	3	
Sligo		
Abbott	1	
Burrows	2	
Campbell	2	7
Carrick	1	
Taylor	1	

Tipperary		
Abbott	1	
Burrows	1	
Campbell	1	
Haughton	2	10
Highstreet	2	
Taylor	1	
Webb	2	
Tyrone		
Alberry	4	
Highstreet	4	
King	1	13
Taylor	1	
Webb	3	
Waterford		
Abbott	2	
Alberry	2	
Baccus	3	
Bates	3	
Campbell	2	30
Champ	1	
Harding	1	
Highstreet	8	
Taylor	1	
Ward	6	
Webb	1	
Westmeath		
Burrows	1	
Highstreet	3	4
Wexford		
Highstreet	1	
King	1	2
Wicklow		
Alberry	1	
Carrick	1	4
King	1	
Webb	1	
Grand Total recorded with dealers		581
Reported dead		43
Sent Certificate		1
Did not appear		1

In gaol	1
Become an In-Pensioner	1
Otherwise provided for	5
No dealer stated	2
No entry in other columns	2
Gone to –	
England	5
Scotland	2
Late of Berwick on Tweed	
Woodman	1

The table below shows each dealer with his total number of clients and in how many of the thirty-three possible counties or cities these clients were resident. This is represented by a fraction $x/33$. Thus Mr Baccus had 11 Out-pensioners spread among 6 counties/cities.

Dealer	Total No. of Clients	in how many different counties did these clients live?
Abbott	8	5/33
Alberry	32	15/33
Armatage	1	1/33
Baccus	11	6/33
Bates	7	4/33
Beats	9	3/33
Bitters	1	1/33
Burrows	12	8/33
Caddell	43	5/33
Camp	3	2/33
Campbell	23	11/33
Carrick	2	2/33

Champ	2	2/33
Desally	1	1/33
Gibson	2	2/33
Gilchrist	1	1/33
Harding	2	2/33
Haughton	3	2/33
Hermatage	1	1/33
Highstreet	232	27/33
Hussey	10	5/33
Kamp	3	1/33
King	27	8/33
Kinnard	2	2/33
Kinnea	1	1/33
Martin	5	2/33
McCool	6	2/33
McCoul	2	2/33
Naughton	1	1/33
Sharp	3	2/33
Smith	2	1/33
Taylor	21	9/33
Ward	9	4/33
Webb	71	20/33
Wedge	1	1/33

The list is dominated by Mr Andrew Highstreet with 232 pensioners on his books. Mr Webb, with the second largest client list, had seventy-one borrowers and Mr Caddell serviced forty-three Out-pensioners. In terms of county distribution, however, most dealers had a very thin scattering of clients with the majority having less than a handful in each of the counties of the kingdom, though there were a few slightly larger concentrations in the City of Dublin. Eight dealers had only one client each; seven had only two each and four had only three apiece. Of those having more than one, only Mr Kamp was fortunate enough to have all three of his borrowers in Dublin.

What the list does appear to indicate is that there was, seemingly, no effective effort to assemble groupings of pensioners living in one area or to share out between dealers pensioners living within groups of counties so that convenient concentrations could be achieved. The scattering and the difference in the sizes of client-base indicates that the business of acquiring pensioners as clients was an entirely free-for-all affair exhibiting no co-operation or group activity on the part of the dealers. Those having one client in each county were therefore able to offer as credit in London no more than six guineas Sterling to their agent in Ireland who actually paid the Out-pensioner, whereas Andrew Highstreet had about £350 of credit available in London annually, deriving from his pension dealings with Dublin residents, to offer to the merchants of that city alone. His entire dealings within the whole of Ireland represented a Sterling value of £1,392 worth of credit, though even he could only offer six guineas to individual merchants in County Carlow, County Louth or King's County.¹⁸ It must be assumed therefore that even the small sums of credit, which could be made available in

¹⁸ www.MeasuringWorth.com website indicates that this would equate to about £195,000 in money value in 2013. (Consulted 15.6.2014). www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/results.asp [hash]mid (consulted 13.7.2015) gives a figure of £120,115. The English and Irish pounds did not hold the same value at this time. *The Gentleman's and Citizen's Almanack compiled by Samuel Watson for the Year of Our Lord*, (Dublin: 1756) gives a very extensive conversion table of Sterling into Irish money and vice versa. The Irish Pound was worth 18s 5 1/2d Sterling. It had the same value in the 1771 edition of Watson's Almanack.

London by the lesser dealers were useful, or that they contributed to a larger pot of credit that the dealer accumulated through some other aspects of his business having nothing to do with the pension.

According to Hutt, the 600 Out-pensioners mentioned on this Irish list represented about one-seventh (14.3%) of the total Out-pension list in 1744.¹⁹ It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that the sort of distribution pattern shown by Johnston's list in respect of Ireland would be replicated in Great Britain, though with a larger number of big towns being represented amongst the locations.

Although the Irish List is by far the best source on dealers, it is possible to trace some others from the letters of attorney that they registered in order to collect their clients' pensions, and from miscellaneous mentions in the correspondence of the Secretary-at-War or that of the Hospital's own Secretary and his Journal.²⁰ These sources, piece-meal as they are, provide another nineteen names of men who may have been dealers, though some may simply have been authorized to collect a pensioner's money until a private debt had been paid. The brothers John and William Adair, Merchants of London, although they do not appear on Johnston's list, had all of their clients - eighteen in number - in Ireland between 1726 and 1741.²¹ Three of their clients transferred to Mr. Caddell in 1742. Of those with borrowers in Great Britain, three dealers each had single clients in Inverness, Nottinghamshire and Hampshire. Amongst the other eleven dealers whose clients' locations are specified, single borrowers were represented in Berkshire, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Cheshire, Cumberland, Denbighshire, Glamorganshire, Lanarkshire, Lancashire, London, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Westminster and

¹⁹ G. Hutt, *Papers illustrative of the Origin and Early History of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1872), p. 85 in which he gives the total number of Out-pensioners in 1743 as 4,103 made up of 3,962 5-penny men, 106 9-penny men and 35 Lettermen.

²⁰ TNA, Audit Office Registers of Letters of Attorney, AO15/37 & 38; Hospital Journal (Minute Book) WO250/459, 469; WO250/470 Hospital Letterbooks: WO4 SaW Out-letters.

²¹ It is possible that William Adair transformed himself from a dealer into the well-known Army Agent after 1742 - See E. Goldstein, *Eighteenth Century Weapons of the Royal Welsh Fuziliers from Flixton Hall* (Gettysburg, Pa: Thomas Publications, 2002), pp. 13-23.

Wiltshire. There is no information regarding the places of habitation of sixteen clients whose dealers are known and from this tiny sample, no dealer had more than one Out-pensioner in each county, so no concentrations appear. This cannot represent an accurate picture, in that concentrations must have existed if the Irish list is at all indicative, but evidence to increase our understanding of this aspect is not forthcoming. From the mid 1720s the admissions registers increasingly record where soldiers had been born and, merely as an illustration of the recruiting locations of the British Army in the early eighteenth century, these places of origin are presented in Table 6-3. As we have seen, this does not mean that all soldiers returned to their places of birth after discharge, because as long as they were able to maintain themselves, they could settle wherever they chose. If, however, they fell on hard times and needed to have recourse to the Poor Law, then they would have been required to return to their place of legal settlement.

Table 6-3 County origins of recruits

The following list compiled from the Admissions Registers of Chelsea Hospital 1715-1755 (ie. covering a forty year period) records the counties or other general areas from which soldiers said they had been recruited. The total of 15,990 represents 63.8% of the 25,026 entries in the database.

Bedfordshire	88
Berkshire	150
Berwick-on-Tweed	27
Buckinghamshire	116
Cambridge	74
Cheshire	375
Cornwall	60
Cumberland	144
Derbyshire	241
Devon	384
Dorset	126
Durham	113
Ely	22
Essex	225

Gloucestershire	400
Hampshire	153
Herefordshire	98
Hertfordshire	104
Huntingdonshire	51
Isle of Man	16
Isle of Wight	11
Kent	170
Lancashire	579
Leicestershire	200
Lincolnshire	203
Middlesex	100
Monmouthshire	17
Norfolk	273
Northamptonshire	220
Northumberland	189
Nottinghamshire	192
Oxfordshire	178
Rutland	26
Shropshire	305
Somerset	676
Staffordshire	478
Suffolk	214
Surrey	131
Sussex	68
Warwickshire	356
Westmorland	32
Wiltshire	412
Worcestershire	314
Yorkshire	876
Sub-total	9,187
London including Westminster	514
Wales	397

Scotland	3,228
Ireland	2,655
Channel Isles (Guernsey & Jersey)	9
Grand total	15,990

It is interesting to note that five of the dealers had been soldiers and were themselves Out-pensioners who had set themselves up in the dealing business after their discharge. Three had been infantry sergeants and two were Private Gentlemen of the Troops of Horse Guards.²² The only dealer for whom substantial information is available is Andrew Highstreet, who made his will in 1758. It was proved in October 1761.²³ Apart from houses in the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster and Richmond in Surrey and other unspecified real estate, investments in public funds and high value personal possessions, he bequeathed either directly or in provisional clauses, or forgave debts, to the value of £13,220. Like Highstreet himself, two of his executors were entrepreneurs, one a coal merchant and the other a brewer. On the basis of Income Value calculated on the bequests and legacies that he left, Highstreet was worth the modern day equivalent of almost £990,000.²⁴ His showing in the Irish list indicates that he was very much an exception amongst the Out-pension dealers, and it cannot be known what percentage of his total wealth derived from this part of his

²² Sergeant John Bacchus, Lord Mark Kerr's 13th Foot, TNA, WO116/2, 9.1.1730, DB 400; Sergeant Luke Armstrong, Clayton's 14th Foot, WO116/2, 19.5.1728, DB 7981; Sergeant Michael Hinds, Fleming's 36th Foot, WO116/4, 21.11.1748, DB 18412; Private Gentleman Peter Landreau, 1st Troop of Horse Guards, WO116/2, 13.5.1735, DB 4743 and Private Gentleman Alexander Young, 4th Troop of Horse Guards, WO116/2, 12.3.1736, DB 6374.

²³ TNA, Last Will and Testament of Andrew Highstreet, PROB11/869. I am grateful to Mr Stephen Wood for suggesting this method of tracing the financial background of dealers.

²⁴ [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/results.asp\[hash\]mid](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/results.asp[hash]mid) consulted 27.12.2014.

business. Nevertheless, it is likely to have made a significant contribution.

Unfortunately papers recording the transactions between Out-pensioners, their dealers and the local shop-keepers who actually paid them appear not to have survived. The system persisted for about forty years, but the fact that no archives which might give us an insight into the business exist is indicative of the fact that these arrangements were entirely private and were not regulated or policed by any element of officialdom. The disappearance of what must have been a large collection of In-letters to the Chelsea Secretary covering all sorts of matters, but which surely would have contained some material on this subject - largely complaints, one suspects - deprives us of the ability more closely to analyse this aspect of the payment of the Out-pension.

After the flurry of re-examinations in the year immediately after the War of the Spanish Succession had died down and some stabilization and reduction had been achieved, the Hospital was still faced with the problem of administering the Out-pension accurately. Its methodology for this developed over a few years, but essentially consisted of undertaking a physical check on the Out-pensioners to verify that they were still alive and to take sight of the papers with which they had been issued when they were first accepted onto the royal bounty. In this methodology lies the reasoning behind the recording of scars, birth-marks or oddities of appearance that, in combination with his papers, would positively identify the man as the pensioner he claimed to be.

These periodic call-ins can be plotted from the notices that appeared in the *London Gazette*.²⁵ As there was no alternative but to address such important announcements through a printed medium to a community that was predominantly illiterate, the methodology depended upon

²⁵ P.M. Handover, *A History of the London Gazette, 1665-1965* (London: HMSO, 1965), pp. 49-51 indicates that the circulation of this paper was less than 2,000 copies in 1717 of which more than half went to government departments.

those who received such papers - the squire, the parson and a few local gentlemen, some of whom were, doubtless, magistrates - passing on the requirement to obey the summons by word of mouth, probably through their servants or the parish officials, in church or in the local public house. One may imagine that village constables, parish clerks or the overseers of the Poor Law would endeavour to make sure that all of those who needed to know were informed in a timely fashion of what was expected of them.

The procedure was, at least to start with, cumbersome in that the pensioners, no matter where they lived, were expected to appear in person at the Horse Guards building in Whitehall bringing their papers with them. Furthermore 'the Commanding Officers, Surgeon, Adjutant or such other officers as shall be most capable of giving the truest information shall attend to prevent or discover any Fraud by forged Certificates or otherwise.'²⁶ The first such examination was set to start on 11 April 1715 and to conclude on 22nd July, the Troops of Horse Guards being dealt with on the first day and groups of regiments - Horse, Dragoons, Foot Guards and Foot in strict seniority - being called to attend on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the four month period. It must surely have been problematic to secure the attendance of officers to verify the claims of the men whom they had commanded, as the majority of the regiments from which they derived had been disbanded at the end of the war. It may be assumed that many officers had dispersed, some doubtless overseas or to distant parts of the kingdom, and their willingness to travel to and stay in London for several days at their own expense while they responded to the Commissioners' requirements, may not have been an obligation that they welcomed. Late-comers were examined on 19 and 21 July 1715 and all those who had been approved were expected to re-appear in Burton Court in front of the Hospital a week later. For those from distant parts who had been examined in mid-April, this presumed a residence in London covering the entire period of the examination or, if they had returned home, another journey back to the capital. Those who failed to

²⁶ London Gazette No. 5316, 29 March - 2 April 1715.

appear were threatened with being struck off. Unfortunately that for none of the examinations conducted throughout the period under consideration does there exist a list of those who were revealed to have died or who were struck off for non-appearance. It must have been the case, however, that such lists were compiled as effectively as possible from the information available to the Chelsea clerks because that was, to a large degree, the object of the exercise.

The period 1712 to 1715, one of financial uncertainty, administrative experimentation and consequent disruption for the pensioners, was followed by a few years of seeming neglect. This may well have been connected with the unwillingness of the Treasury to provide pension money, as illustrated by Appendix 6-1, but it was also connected to the further reduction of the Army following the Jacobite rebellion of 1715. No announcements concerning payment of the Out-pension appeared in either the *London Gazette* or the *Daily Courant* in these years, though Appendix 3-1 indicates no lack of activity on the part of the Commissioners as newly invalided men were examined and received onto the pension throughout 1716, 1717 and 1718. Additionally, the reduction of the Army had partially been achieved by the disbandment of all of the Invalid companies in May 1717,²⁷ and as the personnel of these companies derived solely from the Out-pensioners, all these men again became the responsibility of the Royal Hospital.²⁸ While previously serving in the garrisons, they had been paid as active soldiers from the Army budget, not the Hospital budget. Table 6-4 (List of Out-

²⁷ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/20, f. 65, 16.5.1717. Warrants for the disbandment of the units were signed on 16th May for action on 24th. TNA, Warrants, WO26/15, ff. 13 & 21.

²⁸ Nielsen, *Out-pensioners*, Chapter 4 Section 3.3 states that all men discharged from Invalid companies were re-examined by the Commissioners. There is no evidence for this before 1755, and as the personnel of the Invalid companies had already been accepted onto the Out-pension and then temporarily allocated to a garrison, there was no necessity to verify again their qualifications for pension. The Commissioners required that the captains of Invalid companies gave proper discharge certificates to these men, but that was so that they could be restored to the pension and that their Invalid company pay should cease and they would not be paid twice. See TNA, WO250/459, f. 47 for a ruling on this matter, 10.7.1717.

pensioners examined by year) clearly shows the large increase in the year 1717 when these men were put back onto the pension, as well as the number of new pensioners who were received.

Table 6-4 Numbers of Out-pensioners examined per year

List of Out-pensioners by year taken from Hutt - columns A, B & C with the annual total at D. Column E has been added to show the number examined per year taken from the Admissions Registers WO 116 as recorded in the database.

Date	A OP @ 5d	B LM	C 9d	D Total	E No. Exam'd
1714	4,372	19		4,391	
1715	4,700	40		4,740	52
1716	3,384	44		3,428	416
1717	4,806	89		4,895	354
1718	4,826	100		4,926	309
1719	2,794	100		2,894	293
1720	2,516	100		2,616	174
1721	2,366	94		2,460	274
1722	2,354	95		2,449	428
1723	2,357	99	31	2,487	358
1724	2,856	111	33	3,000	409
1725	2,676	100	31	2,807	267
1726	2,823	100	39	2,962	289
1727	2,939	103	46	3,088	454
1728	3,210	107	58	3,375	690
1729	3,235	105	51	3,391	1,199
1730	4,011	100	51	4,162	763
1731	4,188	107	53	4,348	286
1732	4,090	100	44	4,234	312
1733	4,047	101	46	4,194	374
1734	3,989	105	45	4,139	353
1735	3,954	108	45	4,107	360
1736	4,431	108	42	4,581	961
1737	4,420	100	41	4,561	417
1738	4,421	107	42	4,570	315
1739	4,292	105	39	4,436	264
1740	3,810	110	37	3,957	303
1741	3,705	113	38	3,856	422
1742	3,727	100	37	3,864	536
1743	3,962	106	35	4,103	636
1744	4,479	100	31	4,610	1,201
1745	5,143	100	31	5,274	1,129
1746	5,799	102	32	5,933	1,446
1747	6,807	107	33	6,947	1,334
1748	8,431	106	33	8,570	2,698
1749	9,843	106	32	9,981	2,330

1750	9,748	105	36	9,889	369
1751	9,400	104	33	9,537	262
1752	9,118	109	34	9,261	389
1753	9,113	104	32	9,249	406
1754	9,214	108	33	9,355	487
1755	8,518	106	31	8,655	356

By the winter of 1718-19 threats of another Jacobite incursion, initially from Sweden and later from Spain,²⁹ made it clear that the fit part of the Army might be required for the field and that the garrisons should again be entrusted to the care of Invalid companies. The Invalid corps was therefore re-established in the form of one regiment of ten companies stationed in Portsmouth, and twenty-five Independent companies of Invalids in March and April 1719³⁰ and this prompted a new effort to review the Out-pensioners and to pay them. Making money available was the most effective way of enticing the old soldiers into London, and thereby obliging them to exhibit their level of fitness, which, if it was deemed sufficient, resulted in the man receiving a summons to take up a post in an Invalid company. Those living within forty miles of the capital were ordered to collect their money between 10th and 19th March on pain of being struck off for non-appearance.³¹ This gave rise to a significant thinning out of the pensioners by directing 1,925 men into the Invalid service,³² who were thereby temporarily taken off the

²⁹ The background to the Jacobite plots and the rebellion of 1719 is succinctly given in J.L. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars - Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002), pp. 60-64.

³⁰ The process of re-establishing the Invalid corps can be followed from TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/22, ff. 25 - 55.

³¹ London Gazette Nos. 5727 and 5728, 7-14.3.1719. No specific instructions were issued regarding those who lived at distances greater than 40 miles from the capital.

³² TNA, Establishments, WO24/96, 11.3.1719, established the Invalid Regiment and 10 Independent Companies of Invalids at a total of 1,100 NCOs, musicians and privates. WO24/97, 25.12.1719 acknowledged the addition of another 15 Invalid companies making 1,925 Invalids. WO24/101, 25.12.1720 reduced the privates per company to 45 making 1,750. WO24/104, 25.12.1721 reduced the privates of Regiment and Companies to 44 each making 1,715 Invalids and WO24/109, 25.12.1722

Chelsea pay list. It also revealed 'that great Numbers have neglected the said Summons' and 608 names were duly listed in the Gazette in three batches to appear within ten days of the notices. It is not known how many men obeyed these final summonses, but it seems likely that a majority had either died or were no longer interested in collecting their money and were therefore struck off the pension.³³

This significant reduction in the number of the pensioners marked a turning point in the history of the Out-pension. Having given the appearance of lurching from crisis to crisis during the years since 1712, and though assured of ungrudging governmental support after 1714, the first five years of King George's reign had not been easy for the Hospital and its external dependants. The balance that was re-established by the resurrection of the Invalid corps, and the sharing of costs that was achieved thereby between the Army budget and the Hospital's own budget, meant that the provision of the royal bounty ceased to be a contentious matter. The firm commitment of the dominant Whig party to avoid, so far as possible, foreign entanglements and to keep the Army as small as was feasible placated both those who regarded the Standing Army with suspicion, as well as those who resented military expenditure regardless of whether or not they saw in soldiers a threat to the subjects' liberties. Another step on the path of stability and acceptance had been achieved.

Nevertheless, the summer and early autumn of 1719 were taken up with another call-in of 477 named individuals who were required to make a personal appearance.³⁴ Precisely what the purpose of this exercise was is unclear, but apart from those drafted, or noted to be drafted in future, to the Invalid service it seems likely that there was a suspicion that these men were either fictitious names dating back to the alleged packing of

reduced the Regiment's companies to 43 privates each making 1,705. The Invalid corps remained at this strength until 1739.

³³ London Gazette Nos. 5734, 4 April; 5737, 14 April and 5741, 28 April 1719.

³⁴ London Gazette Nos. 5772, 5776, 5780 & 5781, 11 August - 15 September 1719.

the books by Secretary Crispe, or that they were dead or were fit enough to do Invalid duty, but were avoiding it. It is not possible to say how many of these men did, in fact, appear, but after having been given a further period of grace in which to report, those who had not done so were struck off on 31 October 1719. What is clear from the lists is that the majority were men who had been pensioned before 1715 and their names do not therefore feature in the extant Admissions Registers. Only eighty-seven of the individuals had been pensioned since 1715, and some of them did present themselves before the Commissioners.

Valentine Pitcher was sent to the Invalid Regiment and served for a further five years, being buried at St. Thomas's church, Portsmouth in April 1724.³⁵ James Cazemajou of Bouchetière's Dragoons answered the call, but avoided being sent to garrison - he was probably a Huguenot gentleman. He survived for another thirty years, and was eventually interred in the Hospital's own burying ground in February 1751.³⁶ John Mitchael 'a little pale Black man' of Kerr's 7th Dragoons, pensioned in July 1717, was required to make his appearance, though it is not known whether he did so.³⁷ Joseph Brabant of the 1st Foot Guards, who had broken his leg at Blenheim, dutifully went to garrison when called in 1719 and served another nineteen years. By that time he was seventy-four and absented himself when on furlough, but was forgiven and restored to the Out-pension for his remaining days.³⁸

An administrative innovation that was introduced for the general call-in announced in June 1719 was that those pensioners who lived 'at a further distance' than twenty miles from London were to 'apply themselves to the next Justice of the Peace where they reside and make Oath of their being Pensioners of the said Hospital, mentioning the Regiment they did belong to, their Age, how long they served, how

³⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 31.1.1716, DB 19457 and Burial Register of St. Thomas's Church Portsmouth, Family History Centre of the Church of Latterday Saints Microfilm No. 0919725.

³⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 5.6.1716, DB 19709 and Hospital Burial Register TNA RG4/4330.

³⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 17.7.1717, DB 19995.

³⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 5.2.1718, DB 20404 and WO 4/34, f. 512.

wounded or disabled, the present place of their abode; and that they are no otherways provided for by Government'. Their affidavits were to be sent to the Paymaster General so that the pay warrant could be compiled from them, and from the information collected during the personal appearances of those living nearer London. It was further announced that 'the like Method will be observed within two months after the 24th December next and so continue after every half year following.'³⁹ From the summer examination of 1735 the radius from the centre of London within which pensioners had to make their personal appearance was increased to twenty-five miles. The system of taking affidavits established in 1719 became a standard part of the reporting-in procedure and instructions regarding it were incorporated into the principal handbook of magistrates' practice and it was specifically stated that magistrates were not to take fees for this service.⁴⁰ Out-pensioners were also encouraged when swearing to their own affidavits to give information relating to the deaths of any of their fellow pensioners in order that the Hospital could amend its records. As will be seen from Table 6-5 examinations proceeded in the manner outlined throughout the period under study, though there were occasional deviations from that procedure.

Although Nielsen states that the procedure of re-examinations 'would have placed a huge strain on many Out-pensioners', the system of requiring affidavits to be submitted absolved the vast majority from presenting themselves for personal examination.⁴¹ Table 6.3, which covers the whole forty years of this survey, indicates that if a quarter of Out-pensioners residing in Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, Middlesex and Surrey in any particular year were within twenty miles of London and were therefore expected to appear in person, that would represent a very small number out of the total pensioner group. It would still only

³⁹ London Gazette No. 5759, 30 June 1719.

⁴⁰ R. Burn, *The Justice of the Peace and Parish Officer* 2nd Ed, 2 Vols, (London: 1756), Vol. 2 p. 453. J. Shaw, *The Practical Justice of Peace and Parish and Ward Officer* 6th Ed., 2 Vols., (London: 1756).

⁴¹ Nielsen, *Out-pensioners*, Chapter 3 Section 4. It is also incorrectly supposed - See reference from Burn above - that Out-pensioners were charged for their affidavits.

be a small number if all of those within the London and Westminster area in any particular year were added to it. However, it must be recalled that the place of birth or residence declared at the soldier's initial examination might not be where he settled after becoming a pensioner. Nielsen goes on to say that after 1719 'all Out-pensioners had to be examined before a Justice of the Peace once every 6 months to reconfirm both their ongoing physical infirmity and loyalty to the Crown'.⁴² No such requirements have been found in the *London Gazette* notices or in the JPs' instruction books. Most magistrates would not have been medically qualified and no stipulation has been found prior to 1755 that required Out-pensioners to take or to re-affirm their oaths of loyalty. The content of their affidavit was, of course, taken 'under oath' in the legal sense that the pensioner swore to its truthfulness, but this had nothing to do with oaths of loyalty. The magistrates' function was to see that the man was still alive and to examine the paperwork that the Hospital had given him.⁴³

⁴² Nielsen, Chapter 3 Section 5.

⁴³ Precisely what happened if an Out-pensioner became bed-ridden during the final period of his life is unknown. Perhaps the word of the local clergyman or the village constable was sufficient for a JP to make out the affidavit.

Table 6-5 Dates of the announcements of verification checks on Out-pensioners.

From late 1719 a system of examinations was established by which the Out-pensioners were to present themselves at the Secretary's office in the Hospital before a stated date in order to prove that they were still alive. Examination days were generally Tuesdays and Wednesdays only, but from 1731 Thursdays were also used. Notice was given about two months before the last check-in date. The columns below give the date of the London Gazette in which the announcement appeared, the Gazette No., the date before which the pensioners had to present themselves and the number of days on which examinations took place. The Leap Years in this sequence, having one day extra - 29th February - start at 1720 and occur every fourth year thereafter: 1724, 1728, 1732 etc.

From Gazette No. 6437 December 1725 the notice says 'attendance will be given from 4th 5th Jan next ...' so it is assumed that the examinations started the week after the announcement was made 'and so continue every Tuesday & Wednesday until the said 25th Feb...'

LG date	LG No.	By	Exam days
26.12.1719	5810	25.2.1720	18
25.6.1720	5862	25.8.1720	18
31.12.1720	5916	29.3.1721	26
24.6.1721	5966	25.8.1721	18
30.12.1721	6020	25.2.1722	18
23.6.1722	6070	25.8.1722	17
Special examination Autumn 1722 - see Text			
There was no verification check in the first half of 1723			
18.6.1723	6173	25.8.1723	18
4.1.1724	6230	25.2.1724	14
17.6.1724	6280	25.8.1724	20
2.1.1725	6334	25.2.1725	14
26.6.1725	6384	25.8.1725	16
28.12.1725	6437	25.2.1726	18
25.6.1726	6488	25.8.1726	17
24.12.1726	6540	25.2.1727	18
24.6.1727	6592	25.8.1727	19
19.12.1727	6633	25.2.1728	18
18.6.1728	6683	25.8.1728	18
17.12.1728	6735	25.2.1729	15
21.6.1729	6788	25.8.1729	16
27.12.1729	6842	6.1.-17.2.1730*	13
16.6.1730	6891	30.6.-11.8.1730	13
22.12.1730	6945	5.1.-2.2.1731	13
22.6.1731	6997	29.6.-10.8.1731	13
25.12.1731	7050	4.1.-25.1.1732	13
24.6.1732	7102	4.7.-1.8.1732	13
26.12.1732	7155	2.1.-17.2.1733	13
23.6.1733	7206	26.6.- 1.8.1733	12

25.12.1733	7259	8.1.-6.2.1734	10
18.6.1734	7307	25.6.-24.7.1734	10
31.12.1734	7363	7.1.-15.2.1735	10
17.6.1735	7411	1.7.-30.7.1735**	10
23.12.1735	7465	6.1.-4.2.1736	10
26.6.1736	7518	29.6.-28.7.1736	10
25.12.1736	7570	4.1.-2.2.1737	10
21.6.1737	7611	28.6.-27.7.1737	10
24.12.1737	7660	3.1.-1.2.1738	10
20.6.1738	7711	27.6.-26.7.1738	10
23.12.1738	7764	3.1.-1.2.1739	10
23.6.1739	7816	26.6.-25.7.1739	10
29.12.1739	7870	2.1.-30.1.1740	10
21.6.1740	7920	15.7.-13.8.1740	10
27.12.1740	7974	8.1.-10.2.1741	10
30.6.1741	8027	14.7.-13.8.1741	10
19.12.1741	8076	5.1.-4.2.1742	10
22.6.1742	8129	6.7.-5.8.1742	10
18.12.1742	8180	4.1.-3.2.1743	10
21.6.1743	8233	12.7.-11.8.1743	10
20.12.1743	8285	2.1.-2.2.1744	10
23.6.1744	8338	2.7.-2.8.1744	10
22.12.1744	8390	3.1.-4.2.1745	10
22.6.1745	8442	1.7.-1.8.1745	10
28.12.1745	8496	6.1.-6.2.1746	10
28.6.1746	8548	3.7.-4.8.1746	10
27.12.1746	8600	6.1.-5.2.1747	10
23.6.1747	8671	2.7.-4.8.1747	10
26.12.1747	8704	5.1.-4.2.1748	10
25.6.1748	8756	5.7.-4.8.1748	10
24.12.1748	8808	5.1.-2.2.1749	10
27.6.1749	8861	4.7.-3.8.1749	10
23.12.1749	8912	2.1.-1.2.1750	10
26.6.1750	8965	3.7.-2.8.1750	10
22.12.1750	9016	3.1.-5.2.1751	10
25.6.1751	9069	2.7.-6.8.1751	10
24.12.1751	9121	2.1.-4.2.1752	10
27.6.1752	9178	30.6.-30.7.1752	10
26.12.1752	9227	2.1.-1.2.1753	10
23.6.1753	9278	26.6.-26.7.1753	10
25.12.1753	9331	3.1.-5.2.1754	10
25.6.1754	9383	2.7.-1.8.1754	10
24.12.1754	9435	2.1.-4.2.1755	10
21.6.1755	9486	26.6.-29.7.1755	10

* This was the first time since 1715 that men were required to present themselves in regimental order and from this announcement the first and last days of the examination period were stated.

** From the summer examination of 1735 the radius of London from within which pensioners had to make their personal appearance was increased to 25 miles.

In the autumn of 1722 'in Order to prevent any Frauds or Abuses that may happen by the Concealment of the Death of any of the Out-pensioners' a series of regional examinations was arranged. All Out-pensioners residing in London and the counties of Berkshire, Buckingham, Bedford, Cambridge, Essex, Southampton (Hampshire), Hertford, Huntingdon, Kent, Leicester, Middlesex, Northampton, Norfolk, Oxford, Surrey, Sussex, Suffolk, Wiltshire and Warwickshire were required to present themselves at the Horse Guards between 18 September and 6 October on a Tuesday, Thursday or Saturday. Pensioners resident in any part of Wales, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Gloucester, Hereford, Monmouth, Shropshire, Somerset and Worcester were called before Brigadier General Stanwix at Bristol between 18 September and 4 October. Those living in Cheshire, Cumberland, Derby, Durham, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Northumberland, Rutland, Staffordshire, Yorkshire and Westmorland were inspected by Lord Carpenter at Rippon. Out-pensioners in Scotland were required to travel to Edinburgh to appear before Major-General Sabine between 24 September and 10 October and pensioners resident in Ireland were to be examined by the Lord Lieutenant, Viscount Shannon, in Dublin between 24 September and 20 October. This was a head-counting exercise only, as the pensioners were not required to bring certificates 'their Pretensions being settled at former Examinations'.⁴⁴ No report exists as to how many deaths this process revealed, but it is perhaps indicative that Hutt's figures given in Table 6-4 indicate that the total number of pensioners increased by only three between 1722 and 1723 despite 428 new candidates having been examined and accepted.

The procedure established in 1719, which gave an end date by which all re-examinations had to take place, or affidavits be received, lasted for a decade. Though in 1715 the call-in had been arranged in regimental order, this practice was not initially followed from 1719 onwards. On every day of re-examination therefore, the Commissioners dealt with a

⁴⁴ London Gazette No. 6092, 8 September 1722, repeated in 6093 and 6096

variable number of men deriving from any and all regiments, troops or companies. This must have made the keeping of records difficult and required ledgers to be leafed through repeatedly to check the details of the men who presented themselves in random order. It may well have given rise to some days when more Out-pensioners than could conveniently be dealt with presented themselves and other days on which the Commissioners had little to do. From January 1730 therefore the old procedure was re-instituted allotting to certain groups of units or to individual regiments a specific day on which its pensioners were to appear.⁴⁵ The first day was given over to Out-pensioners from the four Troops of Horse Guards, 'The Royal Blue Regiment' (the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards, the Blues⁴⁶) and the 1st Troop of the Horse Grenadier Guards. The second day dealt with the 2nd Troop of Horse Grenadier Guards and the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Horse. The third re-examination day saw the inspection of men from the remaining regiments of Horse, whether still extant or disbanded, and all of the extant or former regiments of Dragoons. Each of the Foot Guards regiments was given a day to itself, and then the Foot current and disbanded, but not including those regiments on the Irish Establishment. The lists for the remaining days constitute a fascinating compilation of existing regiments, but an increasingly large number of regiments that had been disbanded at the end of the Spanish War. Among them were regiments designated by the names of the colonels who commanded at the times when those units were on the English establishment and had a right to discharge to Chelsea, but which, though they still existed in 1730, were at that time on the Irish establishment and whose recent pensioners had no provision in Chelsea. The penultimate day was taken up by long disbanded regiments, at least one of which dated back to the War of the League of Augsburg⁴⁷ and by Independent companies, soldiers from the

⁴⁵ London Gazette No. 6842, 27 December 1729 announcing the re-examination commencing on 6 January 1730.

⁴⁶ The Royal Regiment of Horse Guards, the Blues, took rank as the 1st Regiment of Horse. At this time it was not part of the 'Household Cavalry'.

⁴⁷ Lemolinier's Foot, presumably the infantry regiment of Colonel Isaac Monceau de la Melonière, raised in 1689 and disbanded in 1699 - W. Drenth, *A Regimental List of the Reduced Officers for the Year 1699 on the*

Scots Dutch Brigade and pensioners who had only been recorded under the names of the captains of the Invalid companies in which they had served rather than their original regiments. The final day was concerned with Letter Men and Nine-penny men.

This method of stipulating specific re-examination days for the men from designated regiments clearly made the administration of the process much easier and from 1734, and despite the increase in the number of pensioners following the War of the Austrian Succession, the whole process was reduced to a consistent ten working days spread across a period of about six weeks. The majority of the time must have been spent in cross-checking affidavits against the registers.

Though the original, varied rates of pension that had been disbursed to different ranks and types of soldier, had been consolidated and reduced into a universal rate of five pence per day in 1713, in fact, certain categories of men continued to receive higher rates of pension. From the 1690s William III had been ready to provide particularly deserving soldiers with a letter that entitled them to one shilling a day. These men were designated King William's Seven Shilling Men as a reflection of their weekly rate,⁴⁸ but in subsequent reigns they were referred to as Queen's or King's Lettermen. Exactly what qualified soldiers for this increased pension is difficult to discover. The records of admission reveal no consistent pattern of chronic disability, dramatic loss of limbs or particular details of heroic service that mark out the recipients as especially worthy. However, the constant clamour for such letters resulted in the Lords Commissioners setting down their views to the Secretary-at-War in 1718.⁴⁹ Their opinion was that Lettermen should not exceed one hundred in number and that 'vacancies be filled by such persons as have merited [this increased pension] very much by their

English, Scots and Irish Establishments (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2013), p. 89.

⁴⁸ The first such to appear in the post 1715 records was Captain Dennis Brennan (DB 253).

⁴⁹ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, unfoliated 10 Nov 1718.

long or extraordinary services and that no one be made a Letterman under the degree of Corporal of Horse or Gentleman of [Horse] Guards or Sergeant or such as had formerly one shilling a day'. The word 'formerly' refers to the period before 1713.

Not surprisingly, service near to the sovereign in the Troops of Horse Guards or Horse Grenadier Guards or in the Foot Guards often resulted in notice being taken of an individual. It is also clear that patronage and special pleading featured in the process. The Minute books of the Commissioners' meetings are scattered with references to letters from the Secretary-at-War advising them that the king had signified his pleasure that a selected individual was to receive this special bounty. Occasionally a justification is given in the form of 'in consideration of his long and faithful sufferings', though more detail is absent. Private Rice Williams⁵⁰ was so noted in July 1716 and Private George Thompson of Carpenter's Dragoons was said to have given 'long and faithful service in North Britain in pursuit of the Rebels' when he received his letter in May 1717.⁵¹ The Commissioners themselves were ready to recommend men for this extra bounty if they had been useful in the details of the Hospital's business. Sergeant Matthew Plunkett, who had assisted in a fraud investigation, was so rewarded in 1724.⁵² The qualifications of other men are obscure however, and it would seem likely that several amongst the recipients recorded in the first few years of the Hanoverian period were receiving confirmations and renewals of entitlements bestowed by previous monarchs.

It was by no means always the case that Lettermen were already Out-pensioners who had been examined and accepted by the Hospital's Commissioners. Quite a number of those paid at the highest Out-pension rate were inserted into the pension lists seemingly without examination at all. Of the 380 Lettermen, 196 do not have any record of examination in the Admissions books that are extant from 1715. Some of

⁵⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 35, 22.7.1716, DB 265.

⁵¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 43, 8.5.1717, DB 274.

⁵² TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/25, f. 31, DB 309.

them may have been accepted onto the Out-pension during the Spanish war in the period for which no records exist, but this is unlikely to be the case with all of them.⁵³ In 275 cases it is impossible to discern any particular reason why the man should have been up-graded. In a few dozen cases the entries in the 'reason for discharge' section give indications that may have had a bearing on the matter. Seven recipients of the additional money were very ill or helpless, nine had suffered very serious wounds requiring amputations, eighteen were noted for their long service, often in combination with wounds, three were recorded as having the vote in the constituencies of their settlement, five had received injuries while engaged upon escort duties to the King or members of the royal family, two were favoured specifically for gallantry in action. In a number of cases, however, it appears that providing a small pension by attaching the man to Chelsea's pay bill was a convenient means by which the sovereign could reward the deserving, without increasing the numbers on the pension lists paid from dedicated, but limited, provision within the annual Army estimates. Private Gentleman John Chudleigh of 3rd Troop of Horse Guards 'lettered' in 1738 had received no examination at least as far back as 1715,⁵⁴ neither had Sergeant James Percival 'lettered' in December 1729.⁵⁵ About half of the Lettermen, however, were receiving an up-grade to their original pension. The means by which they achieved this are obscure, but it seems likely that men considering that they had a plausible case for a higher pension kept reminding those who might exercise some influence in their favour of their hopes and pretensions and that this persistence eventually paid off.

⁵³ The Lettermen have been recorded in the database from the following sources: TNA WO4/2 (1703) to 51 (1755) the Secretary-at-War's Out letters to the Hospital Commissioners signifying His Majesty's pleasure that X be admitted at the one shilling rate; WO120/1 to 5 the selective Admissions books arranged by regiment which record the names of Lettermen though without giving any details of their regiments, service or when appointed; WO250/459 (1715) to 460 (1755) the Hospital Journal, which confirms the receipt of the SaW letters on the matter.

⁵⁴ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/34, f. 543, 9.4.1738, DB 2375.

⁵⁵ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 90, 10.12.1729, DB 1054.

Of those men for whom it is possible to calculate the lapse of time between their examinations and their up-grading – 155 in total – sixty-seven had become lettermen within two years inclusive of the date of their first examination. Forty-eight men achieved their goal between three and five years inclusive of being pensioned. For twenty-three more, their increases came between six and ten years inclusive after their discharges, but seventeen aspirants had to wait from eleven to twenty-four years before receiving this mark of favour. It took almost seven years for Phillippe Tousey of 3rd Troop of Horse Guards after his discharge in January 1734, and Sergeant Thomas Carline of the Foot Guards had to wait ten years from 1724 to achieve his increase.⁵⁶ One man pressed his claim very hard. Corporal William Benifold of the Royal Regiment of Horse Guards extracted a King's Letter in 1730, though he was not examined by the Commissioners until February 1732.⁵⁷ The differences in date are not accounted for, but possibly he was too ill on discharge to present himself in London at the time of leaving his regiment. Sergeant Edward Peach of the 33rd Foot was called upon to exhibit exemplary patience in waiting twenty-four years from January 1718 to May 1742 before he was lettered.⁵⁸ He was a young man at discharge, being only thirty-five, though with fourteen years service throughout the Spanish Succession war, but by the time he had reached almost sixty he was in need of further support.

The remarkable thing about the process of becoming a Letterman is the persistence of the men concerned and their evident abilities to maintain links with patrons who could, eventually, succeed in presenting their case to the king and extracting a letter. Whilst the patrons of few of the recipients are known, nevertheless it shows that officers and others with influence considered the supplicants deserving of the prize and worthy of the efforts that they would have to expend on their behalf to get it. Trumpeter Johann Eller,⁵⁹ a native of Zelle - presumably Celle in

⁵⁶ Tousey TNA, WO116/3, 19.1.1734, DB 4212; Carline TNA, WO116/1, 15.5.1724, DB 1337.

⁵⁷ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/31 f. 40, 5.5.1730, DB 1373.

⁵⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 7.1.1718, DB 20287.

⁵⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 2.6.1746, DB 14503.

Westphalia - of Honeywood's Horse was ordered discharged and lettered by the Duke of Cumberland; James Keys⁶⁰ was recommended by Lord Carhurst, and Sergeant John Johnston⁶¹ by Lord Barrington. Some individuals gained the status of Letterman by peculiarities in their careers. Christian Welch or Walsh, 'a fat, jolly woman, rec'd several wounds ... in ye habit of a man ...' while serving in the Royal North British Dragoons, (the Scots Greys). She received her letter in July 1720 having been pensioned three years earlier.⁶² The most remarkable, however, must surely be William Hasland or Hiseland who was 'upwards of 111 years old and served ... in the Battle of Edgehill in the Reign of King Charles the First and in Flanders in the late wars in the Reigns of King William and Queen Anne'. He was pensioned on 15 February 1731 and lettered a month later.⁶³ In these last five cases the individuals were accorded the privilege immediately, but in the majority of cases it is made clear in the Secretary-at-War's letters that the recommendation was to a vacancy in the Letterman list to be filled only when one of the present holders should die. It is quite possible that some recipients never actually benefitted, as, despite having received a recommendation, they may have died before a place became available.

What is most notable is the disproportionate, though not surprising, allocation of King's Letters between the different types of units. Of the two hundred and sixty men whose units were recorded, eighty-six

⁶⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 20.12.1722, DB 10928.

⁶¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 3.10.1748, DB 17974.

⁶² TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/23, f. 17, 19.11.1717, DB 303. Her upgrading is recorded in Hospital Journal WO250/459, f. 64, 11.7.1720. For her biography see Sir John Fortescue, (ed.), *The Life and Adventures of Mrs. Christian Davies commonly called Mother Ross* by Daniel Defoe, (London, Peter Davies Ltd., 1928). The other famous female soldier, Hannah Snell, who served in Fraser's 2nd Marines and then in the 6th Foot and was wounded at Pondicherry in India, never received a King's Letter. TNA, WO116/4, 21.11.1750, DB 23962.

⁶³ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/32, f. 136, 15.2.1731, DB 20249. Portraits of Hiseland are owned by the Royal Hospital Museum and the Sloane Club. The pictures show him clasping a mortuary sword from which one might assume that he was a cavalryman in the Civil Wars. He died on 7 February 1732 in his 112th year - RHC, B/G 30 contains a transcript of the inscription on his tombstone. He was interred in the Hospital's burying ground.

belonged to the Troops of Horse Guards (31.8%) and a further ten men to the Horse Grenadier Guards. Forty-four men had served in the Horse (16.2%) and two in the Dragoon Guards, while only sixteen had been dragoons (5.9%), though the Dragoon branch was by far the most numerous of the types of cavalry when compared with the six Household Troops and the eight Horse regiments throughout most of the period under consideration. The Foot Guards accounted for 17.0% of Lettermen (forty-six instances) while the Marching Regiments of Foot mustered only sixty-six (24.4%), though it should be noted that there were only seven battalions of the former as against forty battalions of the latter before 1739 and many more that had been disbanded after 1713. Guardsmen were therefore more than five times more likely to receive Letters than ordinary infantrymen, either by having their services spontaneously recognized by influential individuals or by having more ready access to the necessary patronage contacts. The six relatively small mounted Guard formations claimed slightly over one-third of the Letters and, overall, cavalymen in their various forms took 58.5% of the Letters, though within this sub-group, dragoons were proportionately very poorly served.⁶⁴

In fact, all of the Private Gentlemen of the four Troops of Horse Guards received particularly favourable pension treatment. This was probably related to the fact that the Private Gentlemen paid for their positions in the troops. Such a situation was considered to be a significant honour and was sought after. Recruitment of the usual sort was not therefore necessary, and prospective entrants applied to the colonels of the troops, who were usually General Officers and always members of the nobility, for admittance. Fees of between £30 and £250 changed hands, and if any Private Gentleman was discharged without his consent, part of his purchase money was usually returned. It seems unlikely that those who did not wish to leave would have received a recommendation to the

⁶⁴ Survey conducted from the entire database of 25,026 with 380 Lettermen exhibiting varying degrees of completeness in their records. The percentages are worked out against the 270 men whose branch of service is recorded.

Hospital.⁶⁵ From 1722, provision was made to up-grade the pension status of Private Gentlemen of the Horse Guards to one that equated to that of Letterman, though the money to enable this was not taken from the Hospital funds. The additional money was generated by the king granting permission to maintain two fictitious names on the muster rolls of each troop, and the pay deriving from these non-existent men was passed over to Anthony Vezian, the third Clerk at the War Office. With the proceeds of thirty-two shillings a week, he was ordered to pay, at the rate of seven pence a day, fifty-nine superannuated Horse Guards who were already enjoying an Out-pension from the Royal Hospital. This additional income was to be delivered to the men monthly.⁶⁶ His warrant to continue this practice was renewed in February 1726 with the additional stipulation that any of the original recipients of this money who died were to be replaced on the list by similarly circumstanced Horse Guards who had been pensioned by Chelsea since the first warrant, though not exceeding the original number of fifty-nine. Candidates were to be inserted into vacancies in the order in which they had received their Chelsea Out-pensions.⁶⁷ Vezian himself was to receive seven pence per day for his care and trouble in discharging this duty. The warrant was re-issued by George II on 13 October 1727, with the additional clause that any money owing to a recipient at the time of his death was to be paid to his next-of-kin or to whoever had had the charge of burying him.⁶⁸

No further warrants to cover these payments appear to exist until Mr Edward Lloyd, also a clerk at the War Office, was empowered to continue them in August 1744, the money deriving from the same source as before.⁶⁹ In late 1746, however, the recording of fictitious names in the muster rolls was abolished and the Establishment for the Guards and Garrisons effective for 1747 records that instead the pay warrant for

⁶⁵ P. Sumner, 'The Clothing of the British Army in 1746' *JSAHR*, Vol. 23 (1945), p. 74.

⁶⁶ TNA, Warrants, WO26/16, ff. 217-218.

⁶⁷ TNA, Warrants, WO26/17, ff. 109-110 & 112.

⁶⁸ TNA, Warrants, WO26/17, f. 215.

⁶⁹ TNA, Warrants, WO26/20, f. 156, 17.8.1744.

the Horse Guards and the Horse Grenadier Guards was to include the money for six additional men per troop of the former and twenty-nine additional men per troop of the latter 'in order that the same allowances as previously may be continued'.⁷⁰ A renewal of the instruction was sent to William Pitt as Paymaster General by the Secretary-at-War in January 1747 after the disbandment of the 3rd and 4th Troops of Horse Guards in the previous month,⁷¹ and thereafter one hundred and thirty-two men were named as recipients. Those Private Gentlemen made redundant who could not be absorbed by the two remaining troops, or who were not fit enough to be found employment in other regiments, were all pensioned 'notwithstanding some of them may not be strictly entitled thereto ...'.⁷² The Half Pay List published in 1749 indicates that the practice was still being maintained.⁷³ In July of that year a new set of instructions was issued which reduced the available money for this purpose to the pay of only one of the six issues of pay maintained on the rolls of each troop. The supplementary seven pence was to be paid by the agents of the troops to thirteen specified men in each and no more Horse Guards who had been pensioned by Chelsea were to be added to the list until the produce of this single wage was sufficient to pay the number of men who might be entitled to it. Effectively this restricted the number of men on the superannuated list to six per troop. Until this number was achieved the over-plus required to pay the entitled men was to be found from the contingencies of the Army and reimbursed to the agents annually.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ TNA, WO24/259, 25.12.1746. The alteration to the warrant also includes the 41st Foot, the Royal Invalid Regiment. Not all of this money was to be paid out as supplements to pension which, of course, did not apply to the Invalids who received pay. Some of it was devoted to the Solicitors and Agents of these units.

⁷¹ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/43, f. 79, Henry Fox to William Pitt, 26.1.1747.

⁷² TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/43, f. 9, H. Fox to Hospital Commissioners, 8.1.1747.

⁷³ Anon, *A List of the Reduced Officers of His Majesty's Land-Forces and Marines Intitled to receive Half-Pay in Great Britain* (1749).

⁷⁴ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/46, ff. 283-287.

It is not known whether those Horse Guards who had been granted King's Letters, and who therefore received twelve pence a day from the Chelsea funds, were also entitled to receive the additional seven pence that was bestowed upon their comrades who were not Lettermen. There is no evidence to suggest that they did not receive one shilling and seven pence a day of combined pension, supplement and Letter money. The Horse Guards were additionally favoured because their widows received a large single payment of twenty pounds if their husbands died in service. The continuance of this practice, which had become customary amongst all four troops before 1747, was confirmed by the War Office in respect of the remaining two troops after the 3rd and 4th had been disbanded.⁷⁵

Also in 1722, additional pension provision was made for the sergeants and corporals of the Horse Grenadier Guards and for the sergeants of the Foot Guards. In July it was minuted that twenty-five additional Lettermen places were to be allocated exclusively for these soldiers.⁷⁶ In the following six months, however, the matter was reconsidered and by mid-December it had been decided that these increased pensions should be set at nine pence a day rather than a shilling.⁷⁷ In March 1723 it was resolved that the twenty-one sergeants who had already been placed on the pension at twelve pence should have their money reduced to nine pence, and that a further eleven recipients should join them.⁷⁸ In 1727 the number of these Nine Penny Men was increased to a maximum of fifty in order to accommodate more sergeants of the Foot Guards.⁷⁹ Further instruction on this subject was received from the Secretary-at-War in January 1729, when the Commissioners were informed that the additional nineteen places were only intended by the monarch for those sergeants of Foot Guards whom he had found unfit in the first inspection he had made after his accession, and that there was no

⁷⁵ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/44, f. 57, H. Fox to E. Sainthill, Paymaster of the Bounty to Officers' Widows, 23.9.1747.

⁷⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 70, 27 July 1722.

⁷⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 71, 13 Dec 1722.

⁷⁸ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 72, 9 & 12 March 1723.

⁷⁹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 82, 31 Oct 1727.

requirement to fill the number of places to the maximum. In the light of this, the Commissioners resolved that the number should again be reduced to thirty-one and that those sergeants pensioned at five pence should await a vacancy on the list caused by death.⁸⁰ However, a strict tally had clearly not been maintained of those admitted at this rate, because by December 1728 fifty-eight men were enjoying pension at nine pence a day.⁸¹

By the early 1720s therefore three rates of pension had been established and these rates did not change until after the period under consideration.

It would be natural to suppose that those Out-pensioners who lived within easy travelling distance of Chelsea would have had no need to engage with a dealer and that they would have responded to the announcement of payments being made at the Hospital to collect their money themselves. Such a procedure would have saved them from having to pay the dealer for the service he offered. Nevertheless, personal collection was not universally practiced even by those who lived in London because of the extensive time lag in the payment of the pension. For instance, Sergeant Rowland Owen who lived in St. James's parish, Westminster engaged with the dealer Daniel Wedge of St. Martin's in the Fields in December 1732 two years after being pensioned.⁸² Whether the pensioner engaged with a dealer or not presumably depended upon whether he could make a sufficient living without borrowing. If he was unable to, then there was no alternative but to resort to a money-lender.

⁸⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 86, 9 Jan 1729.

⁸¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 88. The total Out-pension numbers as reported in May 1729 up to December 1728 were 3,210 Five Penny men, 107 Letter men and 58 Nine Penny men.

⁸² TNA, WO116/2, 17.3.1730, DB 612.

The process of periodic examinations has been sufficiently dealt with, but it is here necessary to explain a difficulty which the announcements of these years seem to have ignored, and which created a good deal of trouble in the future.

The fact that the Out-pension was paid in arrears meant that whatever was said about non-appearers being struck off the lists, could not, in fact, be immediately put into effect. Dealers having extended loans to these men, they were still owed their money regardless of whether their clients had heeded the call-in or not. Some may not have heard of it at all, some may have been too ill to attend and some may have died in the interim, but they had all received money from the dealers who were certainly not going to forego repayment merely because the Hospital's administrative niceties had not been adhered to. Pensioners coming into these categories were referred to as those having 'broken time' if they had not appeared at the periodic reviews or if they had been sent to garrison at some point during a pay period. If they had died they were referred to as Dead Pays.

In January 1730 the dealer, John Henshaw, petitioned the Commissioners that he had loaned money to Robert Green of Forfar's Foot who, for non-appearance, had been left out of the pay book between Christmas 1725 and 24 June 1726 because he had been posted to the Invalid Regiment at Portsmouth in April 1726. Henshaw was therefore still owed Green's pension from December up to the time that he was taken back onto Army pay.⁸³ In March 1730 Thomas Bengar, Andrew Davis and John Henshaw petitioned to receive the money that they had extended to pensioners of Argyll's Horse who had subsequently been appointed as gunners in Scottish castles. Their new appointments had led to their being struck off the Chelsea books as they were 'otherways provided for by Government', but part of their pensions were still owed to their dealers up to the time of their new employments. Their names were duly ordered to be put back on the

⁸³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 91.

warrants for the time in question.⁸⁴ Similar considerations also applied to the pensioners themselves who objected to being left off the pay warrant merely because they had been sent to garrison. The agent to the Invalid companies had to make sure that when pension was issued, the money was correctly apportioned between the dealer and the Out-pensioner who had been drafted to an Invalid company.⁸⁵

Dead pays presented a similar problem with dealers being owed money in respect of the deceased whose name had to be put back on the warrant to cover the period up to the time of his death. The Hospital had attempted, early on, to regulate on Dead Pays. In February 1717 the Commissioners had laid down that the ten shillings allowance for the burials of Out-pensioners would only be paid to creditors if the certificates of death were presented within one month if the deceased had lived in London or within twenty miles, two months if beyond twenty miles from the capital and three months if in Ireland. These creditors, however, were likely to have been the landlords of the deceased and not necessarily their dealers.⁸⁶ They also put a temporary stop on any further claims to Dead Pays by closing the claimants' book in May. However, the fact that the pension was paid in arrears meant that reimbursement of money-lenders for the pensions of those who had died continued until the system was changed. James Caldwell and John Burroughs petitioned in respect of Horse Grenadiers James Broadson and Richard Skyrin in May 1729.⁸⁷ In June 1731, Barnabus Holbeche requested that the Commissioners honour the debt of the late Alexander Dunn of Leigh's Foot who died on 4 February 1729. He had, in fact, been left off the books as a non-appearer, from 24 June 1727, so Holbeche was owed his portion of twenty months pension money,

⁸⁴ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 92.

⁸⁵ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/92 unfoliated 21.1.1716 Kingsmill Eyre to Captain John Crosbie of the Scilly Isles Invalid Company giving a list of the sums due to 15 of his men, five of whom owed dealers, one owed a tavern keeper for lodging, one had his money paid to his wife, another to a woman by letter of attorney and seven of whom were owed pension for broken time.

⁸⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 41.

⁸⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 88.

which was duly allowed.⁸⁸ Cases of this kind appear in the Minute Book on a regular basis indicating how much care was required in the administration of payments by way of third parties and how dependent the Hospital's pay office was on the provision of information, particularly regarding deaths, from the dealers. The latter, of course, were entitled to all monies that they had advanced to the deceased, and it was by no means unknown for Out-pensioners to borrow more than one year's money at a time. If they died prematurely to their expectations, and in advance of the actuarial calculations that the dealer had made, the latter was the loser in respect of expectations paid beyond the pensioner's death.

⁸⁸ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 97.

Chapter 7

Frauds and Abuses

This chapter examines how effective the Hospital was in discovering and acting against those who took illicit advantage of the pension system. Such abuses arose from within its own staff, from the Out-pensioners themselves and from third parties - the dealers - through whom the pension was distributed.

Although the system of identification and certification of those claiming the pension was supposed to be sufficient to prevent such fraud, the Hospital's Commissioners were frequently regaled with allegations of abuses. The Board's responses throw light on the difficulties of controlling the procedure, the deficiencies in its own dissemination of the rules governing the pension, and the slow development of the concept of probity in the management of public funds.

The growth of government in the late seventeenth century and the enormous expansion in the public funds available for disbursement on its business naturally gave rise to hugely increased opportunities for the misappropriation of such monies. Allied to this availability, was the great expansion in the number of official bodies, and therefore office holders, high and low, through whose hands such monies needed to pass. Porter takes the view that it was fully expected that eighteenth-century officialdom would endeavour to recoup from the public purse that which it had been obliged to expend to get into the offices in which such opportunities were available.¹ It is clear, however, that not merely simple recompense but enrichment at public expense was the aim. Indeed, he suggests that the cruel logic of venality breeding peculation was inevitable in an age in which private gain at the expense of the 'public' or the under-dog was considered to be normal throughout the whole range of public officials.

¹ R. Porter, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 107 & 109.

The records of the Royal Hospital suggest that in the institution's early years such practices were not unknown, though it is very difficult to prove them in detail now and it was not, seemingly, much easier to bring them sufficiently to light even at the time to make them punishable. The pre-requisites for such crimes – opportunity and motive - were not lacking, and the ease with which very senior officials – Lord Ranelagh, the Paymaster General or the Paymaster of the Forces during most of the Spanish Succession War, James Brydges, later the 1st Duke of Chandos - for instance, had achieved their enrichment was undoubtedly an encouragement to enterprise amongst those lower down the scale.²

Within the official business of the Out-pension three types of abuse could be practiced: the first was fraudulent claims by the directing staff and others for the payment of non-existent pensioners. The second was claims of pension by old soldiers who were 'otherways provided for by Government', which alternative provision immediately disqualified the Out-pensioner from receiving the royal bounty. This ban against double payments probably applied from the very start of the pension, but it was specifically ruled against in February 1719 in the instructions that applied to men sending in affidavits.³ The third possible abuse was the fraudulent production of affidavits confirming that an Out-pensioner was still alive when, in fact, he was not. Such a methodology required either the connivance of the magistrate or his deception by the perpetrator of the fraud.

Unlike the Royal Hospital at Kilmainham outside Dublin, the Chelsea Hospital never published its own rule-book.⁴ It is therefore by no means clear that the disqualification of those re-employed in other government posts was ever explained to the old soldiers or their dealers. Indeed the

² Though Ranelagh was prosecuted for his conduct, Brydges was not. The latter's conduct has recently received detailed analysis and re-assessment in A. Graham, *Corruption, Party and Government in Britain 1702-1713* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 95-138.

³ London Gazette No. 5723, 21-24 February 1719.

⁴ *Abstract of the By-Laws, Rules and Orders made by the Governors of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II near Dublin* (Dublin: 1752).

rules by which the pension operated do not appear systematically in any document. The impression that comes across is that officialdom eventually formulated the rules, but failed absolutely to explain them to the parties involved. It is true however, as the preceding chapter has shown, that the administrative procedure of such a complex operation evolved with time and there is a strong sense in the official papers that, from high to low, the officials were learning-on-the-job with few precedents and only the most general guidance in their royal commission. Procedure became formalized therefore, when a natural and recognizable form of the correct methodology emerged through trial and error.

Whilst the age was one in which misappropriation of funds was considered normal, it also seems to have been common, for those who were not fortunate enough to participate in it directly, to see in the revelation thereof a means of private gain. A peculiar double standard was clearly being played out, not against a universally accepted moral norm, but against a background of acquisitive private interest. It would thus be wrong to see revelation of abuses as a manifestation of altruistic moral outrage at the dishonesty of public officials, though for purposes of argument it was often represented as such, for the concept of probity within public office cannot be said to have existed, or at least not at all widely.⁵ The motive behind revelation was not therefore rectification of the system. It was largely self-interest; seizing some advantage from privately acquired knowledge without vindictiveness against those perpetrating abuses and also without any active intention of reforming the system so as to make such abuses more difficult in future. If an insider's opportunity for substantial private gain was only available to

⁵ Holmes comments that by 1714 the majority of England's civil servants 'were, officially at least' forbidden to take fees and were expected to rely on their salaries. However, some government offices continued to use fees as a means of remunerating staff and as Chapter 8 reveals, work over-and-above official duties was charged for on a private basis. G. Holmes, *Augustan England - Professions, State and Society, 1680-1730* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982), p. 256.

some, that did not deter others from attempting to gain more modest, though equally private, advantage from the outside.

As early as 1710 Mrs Martha Bayley addressed a petition to 'the Right Honourable, the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses in parliament assembled' mentioning 'clandestine Practices ... relating to Receiving of Persons to the Benefit of the said Hospital, who never were in the service ... Also the continuing Persons on the book who had been dead above two years'. She asserted that the Lords Commissioners had looked into her accusations, 'But the Chief Offender being Distinguished in his Office there ... did thereby prevent the happy Issue which might otherwise have attended' her evidence.⁶ Though not mentioned by name in her petition, her accusations were against Secretary Crispe, but nothing appears to have come of them at that stage.

The offer of further disclosures of abuses was made in a letter signed A.B. to Major-General Tatton in December 1712, but despite being offered 'all fitting Encouragement and Protection' the writer appears not to have come forward with any revelations.⁷ The Commissioners themselves gave notice that the Hospital's Governor, Colonel Hales, would accept information regarding any invalids who were still on the pension, though lacking a proper qualification, in October 1713.⁸ This invitation gave rise to the petition of one John Archdeacon, received by the Governor in mid-January 1714,⁹ and others joined in with accusations so that by March 1715 a dozen names appeared in the minutes of Board meetings offering information about abuses.¹⁰

In the next several years the Hospital Journal is peppered with indications of accusations being made and reports being compiled, but no details of what was alleged have survived. No legal cases appear to

⁶ The Petition of Martha Bayley relating to the Several Grand abuses in Her Majesty's Hospital near Chelsea ..., (London: 1710).

⁷ London Gazette No.5080, 23-27 December 1712.

⁸ London Gazette No.5164, 13-17 October 1713.

⁹ London Gazette No.5192, 19-23 January 1714.

¹⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 2, 4.3.1714/15.

have been brought against Crispe or anyone else. In these circumstances it is difficult to know whether or not there was a problem or whether feelings of resentment at what might have been seen as preferential treatment prompted these accusations. Perhaps the fact that so many people were involved in the business as recipients engendered a feeling that the affair could not have been entirely above board and that abuses must have been perpetrated.

By late 1716, the Commissioners were prepared to set aside the first Wednesday of every month to hear such complaints, but also, tellingly, to take evidence from the pensioners 'from whom the said Informers have extorted Money, by threatening that they will be troublesome to them'.¹¹ These informers' sessions were deemed no longer to be necessary in July 1717, but it was not until 1722 that Crispe's name ceases to appear in the minutes. Whatever misdemeanours he may have been guilty of seem to have been swept aside, as he appears to have benefitted from the Act of Grace in 1717. This royal pardon was likely to have been due to the re-ascendancy of the Whigs and their desire not to have their mal-practices paraded in public, rather than to any genuine lack of guilt regarding the conduct of which he was accused. His rehabilitation, however, had commenced as early as July 1714 shortly after the Whigs returned to power when he had been appointed solicitor and agent to the twelve Invalid companies raised at that time.¹²

Concurrently with the continuing accusations against Crispe, the Commissioners began to receive information from a Sergeant Thomas Fox¹³ largely relating to Out-pensioners who had re-enlisted. He first appeared in 1717 making accusations against Henry Lucas of Meredith's Foot, but Lucas was vouched for by the regimental major and remained

¹¹ London Gazette, No.5495, 15-18 December 1716.

¹² TNA, Audit Office Letters of Attorney, AO15/64, f. 212.

¹³ Not traceable in the database and he must therefore have been taken onto the pension before 1715.

on the pension.¹⁴ Fox re-emerged, however, in 1726 claiming that the dealers, William King and George Hill, had been falsely claiming the pension of one Randolph Brice, though the dealers were able to disprove this as the latter had been struck off several years before.¹⁵ Fox was nothing if not persistent and in 1729 produced a long list of Out-pensions who had re-enlisted. Most of his accusations were proved to be false, but John Canham and Robert Wyrer acknowledged that they had re-engaged and 'did not think it a fault'. They were struck off the pension for their ignorance of the rules, and Fox was given a pound 'till he proves himself deserving of ye pension'.¹⁶ By December he was considered 'deserving', and was restored to the pension, having been struck off some time before for abusing the Under-Treasurer and the Secretary.¹⁷ His assiduousness in reporting his former comrades-in-arms was therefore motivated by personal gain.

At the Board's next meeting on 16 December 1729 another informant appeared, a Mr John Pigott of Lambeth who brought along Daniel Delavall. The latter, when an inmate of the Marshalsea prison, had been approached by a certain Luke Doyle who persuaded him to sign 'certificates', presumably affidavits in counterfeit of a magistrate. Doyle intended to have them registered by the Paymaster General and Delavall would be paid. The latter confessed that he had put his name to twenty or thirty such papers for 'in the condition he was then in in the Marshalsea, he would have done anything for six pounds per annum, what he was told he would get by it'.¹⁸ William O'Neill re-iterated the accusation against Doyle, but asserted that he had signed no such

¹⁴ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 46, 10.7.1717 & f. 47, 12.7.1717. Lucas appears in TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, DB 19,610, 18.4.1716.

¹⁵ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 78, 26.3.1726. Randolph Brice does not appear in the database.

¹⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 88, 11 & 18. 7.1729. Neither Canham nor Wyrer/Wyer appear in the database and must therefore have been admitted before 1715. Robert Weire of Stanhope's Dragoons petitioned to be restored to the pension in October 1730 and was re-admitted - WO250/459, f. 94.

¹⁷ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 90, 10.12.1729.

¹⁸ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, ff. 90-91, 16 & 23.12.1729.

papers. A check revealed that none of the affidavits had been registered in the office. Doyle was clearly a slippery character because when word got round of his attempted deception, four dealers came forward to plead that he not be struck from the pay warrant because they had each advanced him four years' worth of pension unbeknown to each other. They requested that his name be kept on the books until they had recouped their advances. Despite the fact that this amounted to sixteen years' worth of money, the Commissioners agreed.¹⁹

The fact that the Chelsea pension was distributed to soldiers who had settled in Ireland and who were therefore at a considerable distance and absolutely dependent upon the system of checks by means of affidavits, opened up opportunities for the perpetration of abuses. At their meeting on 6 February 1733 the Commissioners heard from a John Osborn that a certain Mrs Jane Lacy in Dublin, who was presumably acting as a dealer, was receiving pension money for several soldiers who were, in fact, dead.²⁰ Osborn himself was clearly in poor health for in April it was reported that he had died, but the Board ordered that no more money was to be paid to Mrs Lacy. Nothing more was heard of Lacy until November 1734 when Sergeant Matthew Plunkett²¹ and Private Robert Boyle advanced new accusations against her. It was said that Dudley Hughes, Mrs Lacy's clerk, had counterfeited the affidavit of John Ferguson who had died in 1730 and Plunkett asserted that the son of Brice MacDonald, who had been dead five years in February 1734, was still receiving his late father's money from Mrs Lacy. The money of other deceased pensioners - John Henning, Robert Hector and William Salmon - was also being collected.²² Boyle produced letters from Lacy,

¹⁹ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 93, 2.6.1730. Doyle does not appear in the database nor in the lists of those pre 1715 Out-pensioners called in for re-examination.

²⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 101, 6.2.1733.

²¹ TNA, SaW Out-letters, WO4/25, f. 31, SaW to Hospital Commissioners inserting Plunkett as a Letterman without examination, 18.5.1724, DB 309.

²² Henning is not traceable in the database and was presumably pensioned before 1715. Hector appears in TNA, Admissions Register,

who he confessed was his aunt, and from Hughes requesting him not to turn informer and asking him to persuade Plunkett likewise. The minutes recorded that '...by these letters there is cause for suspicion that these informers have themselves been concerned in this Fraud ...' and evidently the Commissioners thought that the revelations were being made only because Plunkett and Boyle considered that they were not receiving an adequate share of the proceeds.²³

In December Plunkett accused the dealer Mr Burnett of continuing to collect Bryan McCoy's pension, though the latter's widow said that he had been dead a year and that Mr Keen, another dealer, was still collecting money for the deceased Richard Lee.²⁴ The Commissioners took these accusations seriously, though the delay in issuing pension money may have been the cause of these post-mortem collections. Mrs McCoy may actually have been complaining that she did not receive the portion of her late husband's money that she might reasonably have expected, and that Burnett was keeping all of it. Boyle and Plunkett continued to make revelations to the Board into the summer of 1735,²⁵ by which time the former alleged that he had been dismissed from his regiment - 3rd Foot Guards - on account of his informing activities. However, by May 1736 enough evidence had been gathered against Dudley Hughes and a certain Dan McDonald to start a prosecution in Dublin and by October the latter had been punished in the pillory for his crimes, though it had cost the Hospital more than ninety pounds to bring the case.²⁶

In recognition of Boyle's assistance, and having verified the circumstances of his discharge from his regiment, 'ye Commissrs have thought fit to give him ye out-pension without a Recommendation [in

WO116/2, 30.4.1728, DB 6055 and Salmon in WO116/1, 21.4.1716, DB 19649.

²³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f.105, 2.11.1734.

²⁴ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f.105, 18.12.1734.

²⁵ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, ff. 179 - 180, 25.7.1735 & 12.8.1735.

²⁶ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, ff. 186 & 189, 13.5.1736 & 5.10.1736.

consequence of his] being turned out of ye Regt for being an informer when serving this Board ...'.²⁷

In August 1739 the Commissioners were approached by a certain Joshua Johnston making allegations of more abuses in the Out-pension taking place in Ireland and offering his assistance to bring the same to the Board's notice.²⁸ Nothing is known of Johnston's background, his qualifications for detecting these crimes or his reasons for offering his services. It seems likely that he had become aware of the Board's concerns in these matters and merely volunteered his services on a purely commercial basis. He was duly appointed Agent and Inspector of the Out-pensioners in Ireland and set to work. A warrant was signed including instructions as to how he was to conduct his enquiries, but no trace of it has been found. He submitted a report and several letters in March 1740, but consideration of them was deferred until he should send his General Report. On 12 May 1740 he attended the Board and presented this document, which the Secretary was instructed to peruse in order to set forth what savings had been made by his inspection and thereby to calculate what reward he should receive for it.²⁹ Regrettably no copy of the report exists. Three days later the Secretary reported that savings in excess of six hundred pounds had been identified and Johnston was accordingly offered 'a Gratuity of £300 including £138.13.9 which he hath expended besides his ... expenses in travelling [from Ireland] to explain' his findings.³⁰

From this first report, however, it was clear that Johnston's exposures would be challenged. One Luke Armstrong sent in a memorial against Mr Johnston that resulted in further consideration of the business being deferred to the next Board, which Armstrong was instructed to attend. He was a former sergeant in Clayton's Foot disabled in the hand by

²⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3,6.10.1736, DB 6739.

²⁸ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, ff. 213-4 31.8.1739.

²⁹ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 218 12.5.1740.

³⁰ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 220, 15.5.1740.

smugglers and placed on the Out-pension in 1728.³¹ Thereafter he acted as a dealer. He did not obey the summons to attend the next meeting on 24 May, and in order to gain compliance he was threatened with being struck off the books and the Under-Treasurer was instructed not to accept any more Powers of Attorney on behalf of his borrowers. Nevertheless the Commissioners told Johnston that the complaint must be looked into 'as this man would be always teasing ye Board if ye affair was not brought to an issue'.³² Johnston was paid one hundred pounds on account. There is no mention of Armstrong's attendance during June, but in early July a petition was received from William Folly of Tyrawley's Royal Fusiliers who had been struck off the Out-pension as an impostor as reported by Johnston based on malicious information supplied to the latter by Armstrong.³³ Folly had been the subject of similar accusations in 1730, but had been certified by his Colonel and re-instated.³⁴

Nothing further is heard of Johnston's work until August 1741 when he again proposed to the Board that he do more work on its behalf in Ireland and asked for two hundred pounds on account.³⁵ The Commissioners 'resolved to try what discoveries could be made there, he having already discovered a dozen persons who are dead for whom certificates had been sent of their being alive'. He was given one hundred pounds on account and a new set of instructions. In November he sent in another report and was duly ordered to advertise two further appearances by pensioners at Dublin on or before 14 January 1742.³⁶ Johnston was clearly used as the Board's mouthpiece in Ireland as, apart from his general work, he was required to find and communicate with individuals. One of these was former Sergeant Henry Cullen, who had

³¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.5.1728, DB 7981.

³² TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, ff. 221, 24.5.1740.

³³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 7.11.1715, DB 19419.

³⁴ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO 250/470, ff. 224-5, 4.7.1740.

³⁵ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 240, 18.8.1741.

³⁶ It is impossible to plot Johnston's call-in notices as no complete run of the Dublin Gazette appears to exist in the United Kingdom or the Republic of Ireland. The microfilm compiled from various runs held by several libraries and available at the British Library (Colindale) is missing 25 issues between mid-September 1741 and late February 1742.

embezzled three pounds and eight shillings from his regiment and committed other misdemeanours, and then absconded to Ireland on being ordered to go to join the Invalid service in garrison.³⁷ Johnston was told to find him and threaten him with being struck off, if he failed to return and report to the Invalid Regiment.³⁸ By April 1742 it was agreed that his pension be stopped until the sum had been repaid to Huske's Foot.³⁹

In July Johnston reported that he had found three Out-pensioners who had re-enlisted without advising Chelsea that they had done so. The Secretary was duly instructed to write to the agents of their regiments to acquaint the officers of their status, though nothing was said about asking for their dismissal or suspending them from the pension. A check was ordered against the books to ascertain which of the men reported dead by Johnston had had certificates sent in saying that they were alive 'in order to judge his merit'. The Under-Treasurer was ordered to advance him fifty pounds if required.⁴⁰ Evidently Johnston was reporting that he had uncovered significant abuses in the pension in Ireland, for on 5 August 1742, his report having been read, his diligence was approved and a warrant for three hundred and ninety-five pounds fourteen shillings and eight pence for his expenses and two hundred pounds for his trouble was approved 'explaining his services in the strongest manner'.

Within a matter of months, however, further challenges to Johnston's work were forthcoming. At the Board meeting on 4 November five pensioners reported by Johnston to be 'absent or otherwise' petitioned to be restored and were duly taken back being considered 'objects of compassion'.⁴¹ In June 1743 William Borden, who had been struck from the books since December 1739 and said by Johnston to be capable of earning his own living without the Out-pension, was restored and given

³⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 7.10.1741, DB 9828.

³⁸ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 243, 26.11.1741.

³⁹ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 245, 15.4.1742.

⁴⁰ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 251, 28.7.1742.

⁴¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 255, 4.11.1742.

his arrears.⁴² Despite these reversals, Johnston's information was still seen as being valuable because a warrant was approved for payment of two hundred pounds in full satisfaction of his services in November 1743.⁴³

In May 1744 another letter was considered from Johnston advising of yet more fraud in Dublin and asking for fifty pounds. The Board may by this time have become a little cautious of accepting at face value what he had to say, as it advised him that an adequate reward would be forthcoming when he presented his information.⁴⁴ However, more details were emerging of his not always being correct in his reports. Thomas Playsted had been reported by Johnston to be dead and was struck off the pay warrant from 1741 in the absence of any certificates of his still being alive.⁴⁵ In May 1744, however, Playsted sent in five certificates dated up to March 1744 and his dealer in London, George Armstrong, appeared before the Commissioners with two more and a recent letter asserting that they were all authentic. In consequence, he was restored to the pension and his arrears paid.⁴⁶ Two months later, however, Johnston re-appeared in London asserting that Playsted was indeed dead and the Board was forced to reconsider and suspended the pension. It took the precaution of instructing its Secretary to write to the rector of Playsted's last known parish requesting that he furnish them with a description of the man answering to that name and requested a certificate of his being alive or dead and in the latter case, the date of his decease.⁴⁷ Johnston, however, was not to be diverted so easily and produced a list of thirteen names of men who were dead and a further list of four Out-pensioners who had re-enlisted. The Board approved a payment of thirty pounds on 31 July.⁴⁸

⁴² TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 132, 1.6.1743.

⁴³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 134v, 9.11.1743.

⁴⁴ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 137, 4.5.1744.

⁴⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 19.1.1734, DB 4224.

⁴⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 138, 25.5.1744.

⁴⁷ As no letters sent in to the Hospital have survived, it is not known what the Rector reported.

⁴⁸ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 139, 13.7.1744.

Clearly the manpower requirements of the War of the Austrian Succession and the raising of many 'war service only' regiments was providing both opportunities and temptations to men who had recovered their strength on the Out-Pension to re-enlist while continuing to draw their pensions. The fact that payment was made in many cases by means of a third party, the dealer, made this arrangement possible as the men did not have to appear at the pay table in person. It seems that getting a Justice of the Peace to sign a certificate of their being alive was not a difficulty and that the stipulation that they were not in other government employ was either not understood, not enquired into or was ignored. It is also possible that there was genuine confusion as to what 'otherways provided for by Government' actually meant and that the governments in London and Dublin were commonly considered to be two separate institutions and not, effectively, one and the same. In August 1744, the Commissioners were advised by Major Basset of Sir John Bruce's Regiment that one Patrick Wade,⁴⁹ formerly of Blakeney's Foot and an Out-pensioner, was serving as a Sergeant in one of his regiment's companies and had been enlisted in March 1742.⁵⁰ The major zealously offered to confine the offender and Johnston was ordered to proceed to Ireland in order to prosecute him, taking, by way of evidence, affidavits from Wade made out before several Justices of the Peace in County Armagh between July 1743 and June 1744 affirming that he was not in government employment. Matters did not come quickly to a head, as it was November before Johnston reported that Wade had deserted, but 'by his [ie. Johnston's] industry and vigilance' had been retaken.⁵¹ He also asserted again that Playsted was an impostor and confirmed his reports of re-enlistments in respect of Nathaniel Clemson,⁵² late Wentworth's Foot, and James McKenzie,⁵³ late of Tyrrell's, the latter having served eighteen months in Folliott's and been discharged, then having been taken on again in the Royal Regiment of Foot since April

⁴⁹ TNA, Admission Register, WO116/3, 26.11.1741, DB 9961.

⁵⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 140, 21.8.1744.

⁵¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 141v, 26.11.1744.

⁵² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 11.12.1742, DB 10482.

⁵³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 4.7.174, DB 9400.

1744. George Jarvis⁵⁴, an Out-Pensioner of Columbine's, had re-enlisted in Folliot's three years ago and Dan Robinson, late of one of the Jamaica Independent Companies, had re-enlisted and been discharged from Bruce's Foot.⁵⁵ The latter had personally appeared at Chelsea two months previously, but the Commissioners decided to stop his pension until he re-appeared to account for himself. Johnston requested that he be permitted access to the muster rolls in the Commissary-General's office in Dublin in order to discover more re-enlistments and a letter was duly sent to Lord Tullamore asking that this facility be afforded him.

Meanwhile George Armstrong, Playsted's dealer, produced an affidavit sworn on 26 July 1744 before Alderman William Aldrich of Dublin⁵⁶ and letters proving that Playsted was still alive and in the face of this evidence the Board lifted the suspension on his payments.⁵⁷ In January, Johnston, then being back in London, was paid £282.10.4 and given a further £50 to send him back to Dublin to pursue the prosecution of Wade. It appears, however, that the case at Downpatrick Assizes could not be proven, partly as a result of witnesses being unwilling to attend; Lieutenant Lloyd failing to do so due to the costs involved, for which he was reprimanded by the Secretary-at-War.⁵⁸

However, even Johnston's own son, George, was unable to disguise some of his father's mistakes, finding and reporting that Walter Lawrence of Chudleigh's Foot was still alive in December 1744 and his pension was duly restored to him.⁵⁹ Patrick Savage, who had been reported dead on 13 June 1744, appeared in person before the Commissioners on 14 March 1745 and was restored. Nevertheless, Johnston continued his work and sent another report that was considered in May 1745 after which he was told to account for the

⁵⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.9.1730, DB 789.

⁵⁵ Not identifiable from the database either by name or by unit.

⁵⁶ www.From-Ireland, Dublin assembly Rolls 1741, consulted 16.11.2014.

⁵⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 141v-142, 26.11.1744.

⁵⁸ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 147, 13.9.1745. No letter of reprimand can be traced in the SaW Out-letters WO4/40.

⁵⁹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 143, 8.1.1745 and WO116/2, 17.3.1730, DB 625.

money paid to him by submitting proper vouchers for his expenditure.⁶⁰ But dead men continued to re-appear - Thomas Dennison of 27th Foot in June 1745 and John Gordon of Fraser's Marines in July.⁶¹ Edward Heron, reported dead and stopped in November 1743, presented himself during 1744 and was duly re-instated.⁶² Even Johnston was forced to admit some mistakes, reporting himself wrong in the case of Edward Catholy late of Windress's Foot.⁶³ The Commissioners themselves clearly felt it advisable to check some of what Johnston was telling them and, in respect of Alexander Fleming⁶⁴ of 1st Foot Guards, William Clarke⁶⁵ of Pearce's Foot and Alexander Murray⁶⁶ of Middleton's Regiment, convinced themselves that their ages, wounds and infirmities would not allow them to serve and therefore re-instated them.⁶⁷ John O'Neal⁶⁸ reported dead in July 1744 had to be admitted alive in a subsequent report and appeared for examination. Arthur Holyday,⁶⁹ late of Huske's Foot and reported re-enlisted in the Royal Regiment of Foot, presented himself having, admittedly, been rejected by his new unit and was duly restored from the date of the first report.⁷⁰ By

⁶⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 145v, 31.5.1745.

⁶¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, ff. 145v & 146, 31.5.1745 & 1.7.1745. Dennison TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 3.3.1736, DB 6356; Gordon TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.5.1742, DB 10196.

⁶² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 10.5.1732, DB 1455.

⁶³ Not identifiable in the database, but an Edmund Catholy of Windress's Foot appears in the call-in list in the London Gazette No. 5781, 12-15 September 1719. The regiment had been transferred to the Irish Establishment on 24 August 1712 - See W. Drenth, *A Regimental List of the Half Pay Officers for the Year 1714 on the English and Irish Establishments* (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2012), p. 40. Hereafter cited as Drenth, *Half Pay 1714*. Catholy was clearly pensioned before August 1712.

⁶⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 7.4.1737, DB 6857.

⁶⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 30.4.1728, DB 6001.

⁶⁶ This was almost certainly Alexander Murrow who was pensioned from Lord Mark Kerr's Foot - which became Brigadier John Middleton's Foot in May 1732 - in August 1728 - TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 8.8.1728, DB 5757. He was annotated in Johnston's report WO118/45 as 'Did not appear I believe Dead'.

⁶⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 146v, 30.7.1745.

⁶⁸ Johnston reported O'Neill as belonging to the 7th Dragoons. It would appear most likely that he was John O'Neill of the 7th Foot - TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 19.12.1727, DB 6201.

⁶⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 25.3.1742, DB 10051.

⁷⁰ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 148, 13.9.1745.

December 1745 when Johnston petitioned for more money to finish the prosecution of Patrick Wade, the Commissioners clearly felt that the end of the road had been reached and rejected his appeal.⁷¹ Three months later they finally put a stop to his enquiries insisting that he acknowledge his failure to convict Wade. In May 1746 Johnston submitted a statement of payments against a tally of the sums issued to him by warrants since 3 August 1744 amounting to £224.14.0 along with a petition for a further reward for his services. Consideration of the petition was adjourned, but a warrant for the sum demanded was signed.

The payment of May 1746 was the last that Johnston received and brought the total of sums paid to him to more than £1,581. It is impossible to calculate the amounts that were being falsely claimed from the pension either by fraudulent certification of dead pensioners, or by those who were receiving double payments from the government having re-enlisted in its service. It is clear, however, that, convinced by the argument submitted in the spring of 1740, that considerable savings could be made, the Commissioners were prepared to give Johnston a chance. His subsequent performance, though impressive in the short-term, turned out to be liberally peppered with inaccuracies in the medium term, as men incorrectly reported dead or re-enlisted were able to prove that neither circumstance applied to them. Precisely how Johnston acquired the information that he submitted in his reports cannot be known and it must be assumed that he provided his information in good faith. Even taking his original assertion that six hundred pounds worth of savings was possible, this would require the discovery of the unjustified payment of more than eighty pension-years worth of money at the full rate of seven pounds twelve shillings per year per individual.⁷²

⁷¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 149, 20.12.1745.

⁷² Nielsen, *Out-pensioners* mentions Johnston's activities in Chapter 3 Section 4. She represents him as a 'contracted gentleman' and suggests that the Commissioners employed 'contractors [who] were almost certainly regimental agents or their clerks' to undertake 'localized audits'. No details of the work Johnston undertook are given; no other

However, as there were two types of fraud going on, there were also two different types of beneficiaries of it. Those old soldiers who re-enlisted received, through their dealers, the normal discounted sums that all pensioners paid in this manner would have received – about six guineas. The more complex question is who was receiving the monies that were being paid in respect of those who were dead. As the only one of Johnston's reports that survives⁷³ is an annotated list of pensioners' names with their places of domicile, it is not clear whether it was London-based dealers who were getting false affidavits of their clients being alive made out in Ireland, which they then submitted to Chelsea in order to receive pay for dead men which they took to their own profit, or whether there existed in Dublin dealers operating as agents of London dealers who paid the pensions of Chelsea Out-pensioners resident in Ireland and to whom money intended for this purpose was transmitted by bills of exchange.

Without knowing who the dealers of the supposedly alive pensioners were, it is not possible to work out who was actually receiving their money, but it is interesting that Johnston at no point accused a specific dealer of reporting as alive those who were actually dead. It was the old soldiers themselves whom Johnston reported to be dead who had to prove, by sufficient affidavit or by personal appearance, that they were still alive. This is surely an indication that although their dealer had paid them up to a certain point, he would not pay them more, although he could see that they were alive, until they had also convinced Chelsea that they were alive in order that the Hospital would release funds to the dealer with which to pay them. It was clearly in the dealer's interest to assist the Out-Pensioner to convince Chelsea of his being still alive, but few representations appear to come from dealers contradicting

'contractors' are mentioned and no references are provided for these assertions.

⁷³ TNA, Report on the Kilmainham Pensioners, 1744 (incorrectly titled), WO118/45.

Johnston's reports and proving that their client had not died.⁷⁴ This indicates that Johnston was not looking at both sides of the payment relationship and that he was only looking at the ultimate recipient and not the payer. It was, however, clearly in the interests of both the dealer and the Out-Pensioner that the latter should prove his continued existence so that he would be entitled to his money from which the dealer would subtract his cut before passing on the discounted sum.

In the end at least twenty-five Out-Pensioners whom Johnston had reported to be either dead or re-enlisted turned out not to be and their pensions and arrears had to be restored to them.

By the late 1730s it had become clear to people concerned in the administration of the Out-pension that the system was being abused. John Woodman, himself a dealer, mounted a campaign for reform from June 1739, making complaints and observations to Henry Pelham, then Paymaster General. He was first mentioned in the Commissioners' records as being called to a Board meeting on 11 March 1740 when he was 'desired if he had any complaints to make of undue fees taken by any officers of the Hospital or of any oppression to the In-pensioners or the Out-pensioners to put them in writing'.⁷⁵ This he did only ten days later, but the Board referred the matter to another sitting.⁷⁶ Nothing more was heard of Woodman until January 1741 when he entered a complaint against the Under-Treasurer and the Secretary, which was referred to a full Board.⁷⁷ When the Commissioners found time to look into the business on 24 March, they concluded that the pensions that Woodman wished the Hospital to pay him, but which were queried in the books, were correctly stopped, though it was conceded that if his

⁷⁴ Here again the absence in the archive of any In-letters to the Hospital Secretary prevents further investigation.

⁷⁵ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/470, f. 217. No copy of Woodman's list of complaints appears to have survived.

⁷⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/470, f. 218.

⁷⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/470, ff. 233-4.

clients appeared in person at Chelsea, the checks would be removed. Two of his men were placed on the supplementary pay warrant, but some others, who had received money from him, but had not reported for garrison duty when called upon to do so, were to remain unpaid.⁷⁸ Woodman as dealer was therefore being punished for the failure of his clients to respond to the call-in, though he was still owed the money he had loaned to them and had no leverage by which to make his clients do the Board's bidding. The Commissioners also heard read several affidavits made by Out-pensioners and presented by the Under-Treasurer, alleging that Woodman was 'a very great Extortioner'. Overall they found that his accusations were 'false and Malicious' and ordered that a notice be put up in the Under-Treasurer's office that no new Out-pensioners were to engage with him and that no powers of attorney would be entered on his behalf in future.⁷⁹

These measures did not put Woodman out of business, as in November 1742, one Thomas Betts,⁸⁰ reportedly of the 2nd Foot Guards, complained to the Board about him refusing to account for his pension.⁸¹ The Under-Treasurer was admonished for having continued to admit Woodman and was ordered to pay him nothing until he had settled with Betts and to repeat the warning notice to new Out-pensioners not to engage with him as their dealer.⁸²

Woodman was finally forced to a position of capitulation by the Commissioners and agreed to give up his campaign against what he considered to be abuses by the Hospital's officers, to discharge all his

⁷⁸ Woodman can scarcely be blamed for his annoyance at this procedure as the Commissioners were clearly withholding money from pensioners as a means of forcing them to go to garrison. This was regardless of the fact that Woodman had a legitimate claim to that money, having already loaned it to the defaulters, and having no power to force his own clients to comply with the Board's orders.

⁷⁹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/470, ff. 234-5.

⁸⁰ Suspiciously, Betts is not identifiable in the database. It is possible that he was one of those men inserted into the pension lists without an examination, but the possibility that he was an old soldier paid to make complaints about Woodman cannot be entirely discounted.

⁸¹ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/470, f. 255.

⁸² TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, unfoliated, 5.11.1742.

clients and to have no further dealings with the Hospital. He petitioned for a final payment of £175.10.10 that was owed to him.⁸³ The Board agreed, and Woodman makes no further appearance in the records. He is of significance, however, because his book, whether accurate in its accusations or not, throws light upon how the relationship between dealers and Out-pensioners was conducted.⁸⁴

The work is peculiar in that Woodman wrote it, or had it written for him, in the form of an allegory, possibly, by avoiding the use of real names, attempting thereby to protect himself against suits for libel. Its title - *The Rat-catcher of Chelsea Colledge* - permitted him to portray himself as ridding the Hospital of abusive vermin who preyed upon the funds and manipulated their record-keeping in such a way as to deny old soldiers and their dealers the money to which they were entitled. His principal adversary in this struggle was Kingsmill Eyre, the Secretary and Agent of the Out-pensioners. As a dealer himself, Woodman was certainly not arguing for a complete abolition of the system of intermediaries through whom the pensioners received their money, but he was attacking Eyre's access to unfair gain. He accused him of turning a blind eye to the swindling of the under-officers and the dealers, so long as his own depredations went unchallenged. Woodman presented himself as fighting on behalf of the mice (the Out-pensioners) and as being supported in his endeavours by them.

It is perplexing that Woodman should have chosen Eyre as the object of his accusations, as it seems most unlikely that the Secretary was taking unfair advantage of his position. His letters are littered with assertions that he was punctilious in his administration and sought to make no profit from 'the old men' and he was equally concerned to defend the legitimate expectations of the dealers against swindling by the pensioners. Though it is impossible to know whether he was diverting a portion of the pension money into his own pocket or not, it did not save

⁸³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 135.

⁸⁴ J. Woodman, *The Rat-Catcher at Chelsea Colledge*, (London: 1740)

him from financial embarrassment and, in fact, he had been declared bankrupt in May 1738.⁸⁵

Woodman's manner of proceeding clearly alienated those whose public conduct was tainted, either directly or indirectly, by his accusations and they put up a united front against him and were able, in the short term, to negate his efforts.

Woodman's analysis of the system covered several points. He maintained that so long as there existed a system that permitted the buying and selling of the Out-pensions, there would always be 'tricking and defrauding therein'. The old soldiers were at the mercy of men of business – usurers and extortioners according to Woodman - whose intention was to make money out of them, and the Out-pensioners themselves were placed in the position of trying to get the better of those who would take advantage of them. Fair dealing on neither side was to be expected in these circumstances. Secondly, Woodman asserted that the true state of the pension and an accurate number of those who should receive it could not be known because of the misbehaviour of the Secretary's office and the partial and unfair manner in which the clerks accepted or refused the certificates sent in by men who claimed that they were pensioners. This related specifically to the refusal of the Chelsea Pay Office to disburse to their dealers the monies owing to Out-pensioners whose names were queried in the pay lists, either because there was some uncertainty of their still being alive or as a means of forcing the Out-pensioner into the Invalid service. He asserted that, in combination, such inconsistent, cavalier, unaccountable and unjustifiable proceedings made it impossible to know whether the warrant applying for money to pay the Out-pension was accurate or not. The implication was that if the warrant was inflated with fictitious or dead pensioners' names, or the names of the 'checked' whom the clerks had no intention of paying, the money remaining unclaimed found its

⁸⁵ London Gazette No. 7698 of 2-6 May 1738. 'Kingsmill Eyre, heretofore of Chelsea and now or late of Scotland Yard ... Dealer in iron and chapman' was called upon to surrender himself to the Commissioners for Bankruptcy on 12 June.

way into the pockets of the Chelsea staff. His third accusation was that the system of allowing Out-pensioners to take up money from their dealers in anticipation of their pensions 'for as long a time to come as they pleased' pandered to the avarice of both sides in the bargain; the old soldiers wishing, albeit at a discount, to realize as much cash-in-hand as they could, and the dealers wishing to extend the hospital's liability to pay them the money that they had advanced, including the proportion of profit built into the arrangement, regardless of any consideration of the likelihood of the old soldier continuing to live long enough to be eligible for the sum so advanced. He hypothesised that the liability having, by private arrangement, been entered into, the Hospital, though not a direct participant in the agreement, had no right to withdraw from it, even after the death of the pensioner.

Woodman further castigated the system for presenting these temptations to the participants rather than devising a method that would not be amenable to the abuses he lamented. He conceded that the up-grading of those men taken on the pension at five pence per day, but who were entitled to nine pence as a former Foot Guards sergeant or a shilling as a Letterman worked well; those who were waiting for vacancies to arise on these two lists always giving notice of the death of any pensioner into whose place they or their comrades above them in the lists, were eligible to move. He repeated his allegations that the clerks made £6,000 out of their abuses of the system and appealed for the setting up of a methodology that would permit dealers to make a fair five percent rate of interest on the money that they advanced.⁸⁶

In order to overcome the deficiencies of the system, Woodman made several proposals. He recommended that only dealers approved by the Commissioners should be permitted to enter into agreements with the Out-pensioners to conduct their business, and that they should only be paid their dues after having given a true account of those who were

⁸⁶ Apart from Government bonds, 5% was the maximum legal rate of interest - T.S. Ashton, *An Economic History of England - The 18th Century* (London: Methuen & Co.Ltd, 1972), p. 27.

their clients and where those pensioners resided. These details could be checked from the affidavits of their still being alive and entitled to the royal bounty that the Out-pensioners were ordered to submit through their local magistrates. He proposed that an inspector, with two clerks, be appointed to audit the business of the Secretary and the pay office clerks, particularly in relation to the accuracy of the pay list.

His most radical suggestion was that the Out-pensioners be paid on a much more frequent basis – every eight weeks - and that new rates of pension be introduced up to a maximum number of recipients for each sum. He suggested forty men at nine pence, 400 at six pence and 3,560 at four pence ha'penny, making a total of 4,000 Out-pensioners.

Revealingly he went on 'and if objection be made to this, I assert (what no one who knows the Humour of the Out Pensioners can deny) that of those pensioners there is not half of them who are inclined to be careful or frugal, and of those who are, not one of five who, by Industry, can make £6 for fifty-two weeks, paid at once, do him more service than £7 7 shillings for fifty-six weeks paid seven times: By which it appears, that all Pensioners have been Losers, and above Ten to One sufferers, by selling their pensions; especially for a Year, a Year and a half or two Years time or more at once.'⁸⁷ He suggested that this change could be introduced by act of Parliament.

In support of his arguments, Woodman presented a table of figures that detailed his business between 1729 and 1742. Though the titles of the headings to each column are not as comprehensible as might be wished, he showed that the sums discounted from the pensioners' money were not solely retained by the dealer and that the staff of the Hospital's pay office was creaming off a small proportion of the discount which, however, came to a considerable amount when calculated across the

⁸⁷ It should be noted here that Woodman's calculations are skewed by the fact that according to his projected payment periods of seven periods of eight weeks, he was basing his calculations on a 'year' of 392 days. For this period his rates of pension would result in gross payments of 7 guineas, £9.16.0 and 14 guineas. On the basis of a normal year of 365 days these gross sums would work out at £6.16.10 ½, £9.2.6 and £13.13.9.

whole of the sum allocated per year for the entire Out-pension. Woodman's figures are confusing to work with, as his client list changed frequently owing to the death of his Out-pensioners or to their moving to another dealer. None of the figures that he provides represents an exact sum for the pensions received from the start to the end of any year of an unchanging client list. Men engaged with him for their pensions at any time during the year in accordance with the dates of their examinations and might therefore be owed by the Hospital only a few weeks up to the next half yearly point at which their eligibility for a full six month's worth of money would start. As he did not include his client list in the book, it is also impossible to tell whether any of his pensioners were nine-penny men or Lettermen. The problems of his client list aside, he appears to indicate that a sum between four pence and six pence in every pound disbursed was being diverted to the clerks. These sums are less than those represented as the norm in a narrative of the system composed by the principal dealer, Andrew Highstreet - see below.

Woodman's complaint that the whole of the profit did not devolve to the dealers who put their money at risk sounds rather grasping. What he does show is that dealers could make a significant living once their client list had been built up. The maximum number of Out-pensioners with whom he dealt in any single year was sixty-four in 1736, but his year of maximum income had been in the preceding year, though he only had forty-seven clients. This presumably was because the majority of the men to whom he provided money during 1735 remained alive during the whole of the year and had joined his list before the end of the previous year. It also seems that the Chelsea clerks did not cream off their premium in 1735, so that the full sum of three hundred and six pounds drawn to pay his pensioners was handed over to Woodman and he disbursed £229.12.1 to them, retaining £76.7.11 for himself.⁸⁸ This was a very respectable sum when compared with the £66.18.4 annual salary

⁸⁸ If all of Woodman's Out-pensioners in that year were five-penny men, then his client list stood at 40 pensioners.

earned by an ensign in the Army.⁸⁹ It is, however, impossible from Woodman's figures to calculate exactly what each of his pensioners received. Whereas the full pension with no deductions should have netted each Out-pensioner seven pounds and twelve shillings, the fact that deductions were being made both by the Chelsea clerks and the dealer obscure exactly what each of them received. Of the full sum paid out by Woodman in 1735 - £229.12.1 – the largest average that each man could have received if they all received the same amount, was ninety-seven shillings. This would leave thirty-three shillings spare for broken time – one man for about four months. However, the payment of four pounds and seventeen shillings against a possible maximum income per head of seven pounds and twelve shillings indicates a discount divided between the clerks and the dealer of fifty-three shillings, ie. more than one-third of the entire annual pension per man.

It is also not clear whether a further deduction was made by the shop-keeper or whoever actually put the cash into the Out-pensioner's hand. In effect the pension may have been subject to three deductions, one each by the Chelsea clerks, the dealer and the provincial payer. Nor is it clear whether every pensioner was prepared to accept the same rate of discount and therefore whether each might have been receiving different amounts according to the entirely private arrangement that they had made with their dealer. It seems likely, however, that a dealer would have reduced his trouble by imposing a uniform rate of discount upon all of his clients. There is an implication in what Woodman recommended that each pensioner might reasonably expect a net pension of six pounds, though it is not clear whether this represents what each of his clients actually received or whether this was an ideal figure after allowing his discount, but not making any allowance for the Chelsea clerks.

⁸⁹ A. Guy, *Oeconomy and Discipline, Officership and Administration in the British Army 1714-1763* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p. 92.

Over the years that Woodman acted as a dealer from 1729 to early 1746, he sought to show that £3,482.14.11 had been called down by Chelsea as the gross sum to pay his pensioners between 1729 and 1742, but that only £2,761.12.11 was handed over to him with which to do so. The Chelsea staff thus retained £721.2.0. In the years up to 1738 Woodman always took his profit in the same year that he advanced the cash to his clients. However, from the year 1739, he had been persuaded to advance to them significantly more than he received with which to pay them. Between that year and 1742 he loaned £368.3.11 on the expectation of recovering this sum from future Out-pensions. In 1743 he appears to have entered into partnership with another dealer called Armytage and up to February 1746 the two of them paid out a further £1,320.5.10. By that date Woodman indicated that he had advanced to Out-pensioners £3,497.4.4, but that £1,523.11.1 deriving from money due to his clients had remained in the hands of the Hospital Pay Office during the years of his dealings with it. This represents a rate of retention by the pay office of approximately one-third of the total sum due.

It is difficult to know precisely what to make of Woodman's *exposé* of the system and his dealings with it. It seems likely that his dissatisfaction was the result of faults on all sides; his own for lending money in advance to Out-pensioners who died in his debt or whose conduct in respect of the Hospital's regulations resulted in them being struck off the pension or being queried so that their money was stopped and became impossible for him to collect. He was also wrong-footed by the Chelsea pay staff behaving in a confusing and high-handed manner, which he did not expect. His experience of dealing in the pension since 1729, however, should have made him thoroughly familiar with the method of its administration. His handling of the situation by publishing a book attempting to expose the Pay Office's misconduct was scarcely likely to incline the staff towards assisting in the solution of his problems.

A more measured explanation of the workings of the Out-pension and the dealers' parts in it, was composed by the Hospital itself with the advice of Andrew Highstreet, 'for many years the much greatest Dealer'. The document was an account of the methods used in the payment of the pension. It was compiled in 1749, though precisely why, is unknown, but it was clearly intended to describe, and perhaps to justify, the methods used.⁹⁰ It explains that when an Out-pensioner engaged with a dealer, both would come to the Pay Office and enter there a 'draught' - a letter of attorney - on the Chelsea Paymaster authorizing the dealer to collect the pensioner's money. The details of these draughts were transcribed into a register recording which dealer was acting for which pensioner.⁹¹ Any changes to a new dealer were noted on proof that the pensioner had settled his account with his previous lender. When, periodically, the warrant for the payment of the pension was signed by the Commissioners indicating the total sum to be drawn from the Treasury, two copies of the pay list were made, in one of which the pensioners' dealers were entered against their names along with the amount of money due to the pensioner at the next payment day. The other copy acted as a receipt book and was signed or crossed by those pensioners who collected their money in person or by the dealers in respect of the men on whose behalf they were collecting. Notice of pay-days was published in the *London Gazette* and the office functioned between seven o'clock in the morning and seven or eight o'clock at night paying out money. Out-pensioners appearing in person were dealt with between 10am and 2pm and 'receives his money to the utmost penny without fee or reward' and the dealers were paid during the remaining hours. Though men appearing in person received the full sum that was due to them, it must be remembered that the majority of Out-pensioners did not live within the London and its environs. Even those who did, were obliged to engage with dealers because the pension was paid in arrears.

⁹⁰ A Narrative of the Methods used in the Pay Office Chelsea in relation to the Out Pension, 1749, RHC Adm 63.

⁹¹ There is no trace of this document in the National Archives or the archive of the Royal Hospital.

The process of paying the pension involved the Under-Treasurer and two clerks finding the draught which each pensioner had entered, checking that it was signed, witnessed, dated and directed, cross-checking that the Out-pensioner was included in the current pay list and that he was entered against the dealer who was collecting his money, who then signed for the cash. The draughts were then filed in the order in which the Out-pensioners' names appeared in the list 'for the Auditor's more easy examining the accounts' and the receipted copy of the pay list was sworn before one of the Barons of the Exchequer as a true record of the amounts paid out to the persons on the list, or to their assigns.

'In consideration of this great care, Diligence, and trouble, each Dealer pays a fee of six shillings for every man for a whole year'. This had not always been the case, as Highstreet 'remembered that only five shillings was paid '25 years since (in 1725) ...there being not half the number of men on the Pension there is now, it chiefly lay among a few particular Dealers'. In addition, the First Clerk received from each dealer ten shillings and six pence for every £100 paid out on behalf of his clients and the two under-clerks got what the dealer 'thought proper'. Since about 1739 these sums had been fixed at ten shillings and six pence for the First Clerk and five shillings for the under-clerks. Over and above these fees, the dealers were said to give 'a handsome treat' on the final settling of their accounts. It seems likely that these deductions were carried against the money that the pensioners received from their dealers and did not significantly reduce the portion that the dealer took for himself.

The compiler of this account made particular note of a change that occurred in about 1744, when the number of Out-pensioners increased significantly and a group of new men entered the business of dealing in order to service the demand. From that time, dealers offered pensioners advances on their expectations, which had not been usual before. These semi-secured loans were to attract men away from the old dealers who

had, seemingly, been strict in allowing their pensioners 'but £3 and that one half year under another only'. The new lenders were not as generous in respect of their small accounts in treating the clerks, however, and it was soon after agreed amongst all engaged in the business that the fee of six shillings per man per year should be paid for the benefit of the Chelsea pay staff regardless of the number of clients that each had on their respective lists, and that no direct fees to the clerks should be paid. It was pointed out that the registration of each Out-pensioner against his dealer was an absolute necessity in order to prevent old soldiers from receiving advances from several dealers simultaneously and, either only signing a paper in respect of one of them, or appearing at the pay table in person on the first day of payment and collecting their money themselves, thereby preventing all of the lenders from collecting the sums owing to them.

When the system of paying pensions was taken out of the hands of the dealers in 1755, the latter were placed in a difficult position. Insufficient notice of this major change had been advertised to enable them to recover the sums that they had advanced and they printed a petition to Parliament in order to state their case in the hope of being compensated.⁹² At a stroke, the act of Parliament forbade any assigning to third parties of the pension money that would be paid after 25 December 1755 and also made null and void any assignments of pension that had been agreed in respect of monies that would be paid after 25 December 1754. Any pensioner therefore who had taken more than a year's pension in advance from his dealer before that date stood to gain, unless the dealer was prepared to go to law to recover his advance.

The document stated that less than ten percent of the £62,000 devoted to the Out-pension since 1750 had been collected in person by pensioners and that the vast majority had been advanced as cash by the dealers. It asserted that the normal discounted rate against the £7.12.1 of the full five pence per day pension was six guineas, and indicated that some

⁹² *The Case of the Agents for the Out-Pensioners of Chelsea-College* ND but 1756.

new pensioners had taken up their money in advance for up to three years. It also set out the risks that the dealers were subject to by explaining that if the Out-pensioner died, was taken back into government employment, civil or military including garrison duty, or if he was admitted into the Hospital, his pension ceased and was no longer available to discharge his debt. It went on to detail the additional sums dealers expended in order to provide this service. In addition to the legitimate claim of 5% interest over eighteen months on the money advanced (nine shillings five pence and a farthing), a further fifteen shillings and eleven pence ha'penny was paid on insurance of the pensioner's life, fees to the Chelsea staff, agency and postage leaving a surplus to answer all risks of eight pence and a farthing. As an argument for sympathy, it was well constructed and provides fascinating detail of what the ideal position was supposed to be. It may, however, be doubted that all dealers were quite so punctilious about covering their risks or leaving so little surplus, and that the seven shillings and seven pence insurance charge may well have been deducted from the pensioner's money rather than being taken from the dealer's cut. Such a distribution would have netted the dealer a total of seventeen shillings and a farthing for each pensioner on his books. From these figures, it is clear therefore that dealing in the Chelsea pension, whilst carrying certain risks and being subject to periods of longer than a year between pay-outs, did, nevertheless, guarantee at least a five percent return and, if greater risk was accepted, a substantially higher return.

Clearly government's unwillingness to pay the Out-pension from the moment the old soldier became a pensioner created a significant problem. This was compounded by its inability to provide cash promptly even against a deferred pay-out date and necessitated the intervention of an external source of money to keep the pensioners from starving. The evident disadvantages within the system was a problem that, for a considerable period, no one was willing to address. Equally clearly, however, it created circumstances in which both sides jockeyed to out-do the other. Woodman's statement that each side in the

arrangement was attempting to get the better of the other is amply borne out by the record, but it was only as attempts at trickery were devised by one side or the other that the system was modified to close off these opportunities.⁹³

Johnston's examinations illuminate the efforts of both pensioners and dealers to get the better of the authorities. Woodman's book purports to throw light on the attempts of the Chelsea staff to abuse both the pensioners and the dealers. 'A Narrative of the Method ...' lays out what the Hospital considered to be the normal method of paying the pension and the acceptable fees and expectations associated therewith. 'The Case of the Agents ...' sets out what the dealers considered to be the norm in the business, but so far the Out-pensioners themselves have remained largely silent in their commentary on the business. It cannot be imagined that the recipients of the royal bounty were, in fact, any less busy in trying to secure as much advantage as possible either from their usurers or from the government as the following examples will demonstrate.

We have already seen that in June 1730 four dealers – Charles King, George Barclay, Mr. Garton and Mr. Fogg - complained that Luke Doyle of Gow's Regiment⁹⁴ had borrowed advances of four years' pension money from each of them and then absconded.⁹⁵

⁹³ A central theme of Hitchcock and Shoemaker is that the poor exercised 'agency' in manipulating and exploiting the various relief and penalty systems that were put in place in order to gain maximum advantage from them or to defeat the purposes for which they had been introduced. In respect of the Out-pension the relationship between dealers and pensioners exemplifies this activity. See T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 17-23.

⁹⁴ Doyle is unidentifiable from the database, though it is possible that he was pensioned before the extant Admissions Registers commence. The author has not been able to find a regiment entitled Gow's serving in the British Army between 1690 and 1730. Brigadier Gore's Foot existed between 1707 and 1712 - Drenth, *Half Pay 1714* p. 62.

⁹⁵ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/93, unfoliated, 2.6.1730.

Similarly problems arose when men were plucked from the Out-pension and sent to garrison. Nathaniel Dunbaven of Guize's Foot was prized out of his home in Warrington in his seventieth year and sent to garrison in Carlisle.⁹⁶ Not surprisingly he was in debt to his dealer, Mr William Abbot, to the sum of three pounds, which the company commander at Carlisle was obliged to recover from Dunbaven's pay as an Invalid soldier at the rate of six pence per week so that the debt could be paid off.⁹⁷ Sergeant John Price was likewise in debt to his dealer when he was ordered to the Scilly Isles from Dublin having been five years on the pension.⁹⁸ His pay was stopped at one shilling a week until the debt was paid.⁹⁹ It is not clear in the above cases that the pensioners concerned were deliberately trying to defraud their dealers because it is not known whether they volunteered for Invalid service or were simply called to perform it.

It was a different matter for those who did volunteer to go to a garrison because it was often the case that these men were deliberately trying to avoid repaying their debts. The Secretary, only too aware of this ruse, took a different course of action in such circumstances. In respect of John Bewdley¹⁰⁰ of Wolfe's Marines, he refused to allow him to volunteer into the Invalid company in his home town - Carlisle - until after 24 June 1743, as he had taken up his pension in advance to that date and, as he explained, the dealer would lose if he were allowed to do so.¹⁰¹ In a letter to Captain Robertson at Chester, Kingsmill Eyre expanded upon the point that he was not willing to send men to garrison if they volunteered for particular companies, as he was aware that they often did this in order to deceive their dealers. The Secretary had evidently learnt that resolving the problems such practices created

⁹⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 19.11.1741, DB 9936.

⁹⁷ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/94, f. 131, K. Eyre to Capt. Gilpin, 26.4.1742.

⁹⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 9.6.1737, DB 6902.

⁹⁹ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/94, f. 175, K. Eyre to Capt. Jefferyson, 8.11.1742.

¹⁰⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.6.1742, DB 10235.

¹⁰¹ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/94, f. 193, K. Eyre to Capt. Gignoux, 29.1.1743.

required much effort.¹⁰² Lieutenant Cowley at Carlisle was similarly advised against taking Robert Scott, 'as it would be the greatest hardship to the Dealer to admit the man into your company ...', though he took no notice of the Secretary's wisdom.¹⁰³ The pensioners' ploy was connected with the fact that once sent to Garrison, the soldier was taken off the pension from the date of his appointment to the Invalid service and returned to the Army pay roll. As this money had not been signed away to any dealer, the former pensioner clearly hoped that he would be able to retain the sum that he had borrowed while at the same time receiving the pay that was due to him for his service in an Invalid company. The Chelsea staff took what measures they could to circumvent this deception, but it was evidently one of the ways that the Out-pensioners used to swindle their dealers.

As we have already noted, some pensioners, either through ignorance or deliberately, attempted to cheat the government by re-engaging in its service while continuing to collect the royal bounty. Fielding Empson, late of Evans's Horse, continued to receive his pension for ten years up to 1742 despite having re-engaged in Ligonier's Horse in Ireland.¹⁰⁴ Empson might have been genuinely ignorant of the ruling that disqualified him, but it is unlikely that William Lake was similarly unaware. His return to government service was as the Adjutant of Kilmainham Hospital outside Dublin at a salary of fifteen pounds per annum and it is inconceivable that he was unaware of the rules. Having been pensioned out of the 3rd Troop of Horse Guards by Chelsea in 1732, he continued to receive his money until his misconduct was

¹⁰² TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/94, f. 196, K. Eyre to Capt. Robertson, 4.3.1743.

¹⁰³ TNA, Hospital Out-letters, WO246/94, f. 215 & 219, P. Fury to Lt Cowley, 31.12.1743.

¹⁰⁴ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 252, 5.8.1742; Admissions Register WO116/2, DB 1398, 7.4.1732 and SaW Out-letters, WO4/37, f. 390 to Ligonier outlining Empson's crime and stating that he should not be recommended to the pension whenever he was discharged.

revealed by Johnston and he was struck off Chelsea's books in July 1744.¹⁰⁵

The ambitious and complex nature of the pension business evidently offered opportunities for abuse that none of the parties were entirely capable of resisting. Judged by the standards of the day, however, the system seems to have run pretty smoothly, though the absence of any in-letters, which may have contained complaints or objections, prevent certainty on this point. Improvement was, nevertheless, possible, and the next chapter will explore how that was achieved.

¹⁰⁵ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 139; Admissions Register, WO116/2, DB 1372, 3.2.1732 and Johnston's Report WO118/45, p. 2. Lake may have considered that he was being paid by the Irish Exchequer for his work at Kilmainham and that this did not conflict with his receiving a Chelsea pension from the British Exchequer.

Chapter 8

The Reform of the Out-pension

Though founded with the most laudable charitable intent, the Royal Hospital was obliged, soon after it was set up, to concede to a system of paying the majority of Out-pensions over which it had very little control, because no system or personnel existed within government to undertake the work. By the middle of the eighteenth century not only was it clear that reform was required, but the development of government since the 1680s was perceived to have provided a means by which it could attempt to assume this burden by judicious diversion of the administrative capabilities and personnel at its disposal. This chapter examines the great reform of the Out-pension and the measures that were hopefully put in place to ensure its payment by government officials.

The preceding chapter has indicated that the system, which allowed the Out-pensioners to sell their pensions and to receive their money through third parties at a discounted rate, was unsatisfactory. Apart from being open to abuse by both sides, the old soldiers did not receive the full value of the royal bounty, which negated the charitable effect of this benevolence. Its usefulness was further diluted by the fact that for those who did not engage with dealers, it was paid in arrears and whatever sustaining effect it was intended to have at a moment when the old soldier was entering upon a new and unfamiliar phase of his life, the benefits were thereby long deferred. Payment in arrears combined with the need to continue to pay men who were already dead because, by extension, the Hospital was responsible for the loans that the pensioners had taken out, added complications to the arrangements. The system did, nevertheless function, and although the pressures of the War of the Austrian Succession seem to have encouraged irregular dealings, it was not to be expected that a reform of the pension would happen during a major war.

As we have seen, despite the financial demands of the war, the government was able to make funds available to the Hospital with the

same regularity during the 1740s as had prevailed through most of the preceding decade. During the Austrian War therefore, and despite a large increase in the number of soldiers accepted onto the pension, the institution did not fall into debt in the same way as it had during the Spanish War.

By the late 1740s, however, it had become clear that a change in the system of payment was highly desirable in the interests not only of justice to the pensioner, but to overcome the various difficulties that payment in arrears entailed. Although it might have been expected that such a movement for reform would have emanated from the Treasury, it was in fact the Paymaster General, William Pitt, who was responsible for it. It shows not only his grasp of the deficiencies and injustices of the existing system, but also his understanding of the wider sphere of government finance and how the capabilities of the Excise Office had increased in the preceding decades.

It is impossible to know whether Pitt had read *The Ratcatcher at Chelsea Colledge* or how much information he had gleaned about Johnston's investigations in Ireland that were examined in Chapter 7. He was appointed Paymaster General of the Forces on 7 May 1746 by which time these episodes were several years in the past. Nevertheless it is clear that it was not long before he became aware of the problems within the Out-pension payment system and his papers are scattered with financial calculations going as far back as 1703.¹ Two documents, however, are of the utmost importance in following Pitt's thinking on the subject of reform.

The first is a long letter dealing with the payment method in Ireland. It is not certain that it was originally addressed to Pitt because what survives in his papers appears to be a transcription and has neither a salutation nor a farewell and it is therefore impossible to know who was the original recipient or who the correspondent.² It is possible that the

¹ TNA, Chatham Papers, PRO30/8/77.

² TNA, Chatham Papers, PRO30/8/77, f. 137.

writer may have been Joshua Johnston and the original recipient, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The full text of the letter is given in Appendix 8-1.

The content rehearses familiar facts and opinions; that the dealers extorted too much from the pensioners; that payment in arrears frequently caused the borrower to have to apply to his dealer for a further loan to tide him over until new pension money should become available; that pensions continued to be claimed in respect of those who had died and that the dealers were keepers of 'Alehouses & Brandyshops so yt [that] no truth or honesty can be Expected of them'. The correspondent clearly had a large network of contacts and he cited testimony from 'the Remote parts of the Kingdom'. Equally, he was not merely complaining about what he saw, but put forward a scheme of improvement, with calculations of costs and suggestions as to where the money should come from to implement it. He was also of opinion that his information and suggestions would not be unwelcome to the Duke of Cumberland as Captain-General of the British Army. The letter appears to date from 1752.

This correspondence prompted thinking on Pitt's part and, if he had not done so before, may have induced him to enquire into what difficulties had afflicted the pension in the past. By October of the following year, he had formulated a scheme that would rectify the problems and set the pension on an equitable and efficient footing for the future.³ These proposals appear in the papers of Lord Chancellor Hardwick and are given in Appendix 8-2. They lay out the various dates at which the dealers were to be excluded from the system; project a payment method that would provide the pension in advance rather than in arrears; describe the senior officials who would be required to administer it, with their modes of behaviour and remuneration, and contain notes on the source of the money from which fees to its administrators would derive. It is interesting to note that the final annual figure that Pitt

³ British Library, Hardwick Papers - correspondence between the Lord Chancellor and the Duke of Newcastle, Add. MS. 33053, f. 87.

intended each Out-pensioner to receive - £7.4.6 - was precisely the same as the highest rate recommended by his anonymous Irish correspondent. It is also interesting that the function of paying pensioners was to be taken out of the hands of the Chelsea staff, whose role was restricted to ensuring the accuracy of the administrative procedure, but was not to include disbursing any money directly. However, at this stage no precise detail as to disbursement arrangements was specified. What was also missing from Pitt's scheme was any mention of the source of the government money, in the form of ready cash, with which to make these payments in advance.

Since the Out-pension had, *per force*, come into existence in 1686, there had been a revolution in the way government had collected its revenues. Until the Restoration, this work had been put out to tax-farmers who, in return for supplying ready money to the government, had been empowered to gather taxes. Even after the expenses of employing their own staff to undertake this work and whatever costs had been absorbed for administration, the activity threw up a worthwhile profit. The desire of Charles II to boost crown finances in distinction to those grants to the king's government that parliament was prepared to allow, prompted reforms in the administration of tax-gathering which brought the activity directly under the control of the executive. No longer was administration to be restricted by the discount that tax-farmers claimed in return for undertaking this most basic function of government business on its behalf.

The impetus of the financial revolution encouraged by Charles II was hugely increased by the commitment to a role in continental Europe that the accession of William III brought in its train. England became by far the most efficient state of the *Ancien Régime* in terms of harnessing the wealth of the country potentially to serve the intentions of the executive. However, with the Glorious Revolution came the bridling of the

developing independence of the crown to act in a way unacceptable to the legislature.⁴

The principal support of government finance was the Excise and after 1714 it, rather than the Land Tax or the Customs, provided a larger proportion of government income than either of the others. In 1737 it provided about 57% and only in three years between 1714 and 1755 did it contribute less than 40% of income.⁵ By the Restoration settlement half of its proceeds was granted to the king during his life and the other half in perpetuity to him and his heirs in compensation for the crown's loss of feudal dues after 1649. These arrangements were abolished in 1787 when the Civil List was instituted. The Excise was farmed until 1683, though brought under tighter control from 1677.⁶ The service operated throughout England and Wales, and after the Act of Union of 1707, in Scotland as well, though under a separate Excise Board.⁷ It was responsible for the assessment and collection of taxes on all sorts of commodities manufactured within the country. The tax had been introduced at the start of the English Civil War and, despite its unpopularity, had been continued at the Restoration and was, in effect, an equivalent tax to customs duties levied on produce brought into the country from abroad. Originally levied on alcoholic beverages, excise duties were extended to various indispensable consumer necessities: soap, paper, candles, salt, leather and glass as well as certain luxury goods - metallic thread and carriages. Excise officials were divided into three classes - Officers, Supervisors and Collectors. Officers visited the premises in which manufacturing took place to measure the volume of production upon which the tax was to be levied and to ascertain that no equipment capable of production was unregistered by the manufacturer.

⁴ I here follow J. Brewer, *The Sinews of Power* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), Chapter 3, and P. Jupp, *The Governing of Britain 1688-1848. The Executive, Parliament and the People* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 50-53.

⁵ Brewer, *Sinews of Power* Table 4.3, p. 98.

⁶ Brewer, *Sinews of Power* p. 93.

⁷ webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk - WWW.hmrc.gov.uk/history/hmce.htm consulted 22.1.2015 citing Gilbert Denton, NKBH Library.

Their powers of entry, inspection and control of whatever manufacturing process was being performed were draconian and were maintained in the face of the English right to privacy.⁸ Supervisors made sure that their officers performed their duties conscientiously and did not enter into agreements with manufacturers to conceal produce or equipment thereby rendering it unknown for the purposes of tax assessment. Neither of these grades handled the dues payable by manufacturers of excisable goods; their role being ultimately to report to the collectors how much duty each manufacturer was liable for according to his actual production within a given period. These sums were paid to the Collector himself during his progress round his collection area every six weeks. It was his function to gather in and account for this money at the end of every round and remit it to the Commissioners of the Excise in London. Brewer states that the Excise Office became 'a byword for administrative efficiency'.⁹

Excluding London, there were fifty Collectors of Excise in the counties between 1714 and 1755.¹⁰ These officials regularly found themselves with very large sums of cash in their custody. The role was one of considerable responsibility and potential danger, and each collector was provided with secure premises in which to lodge his takings prior to them being sent to London.¹¹ In an age when it was no simple and safe matter securely to transport coin around the country, this was a business that had to be carefully managed. It was undertaken by 'returners' who, on paying very heavy sureties to the Commissioners of Excise, were employed to transport the cash from the provinces to London. It is

⁸ Brewer, *Sinews of Power* p. 113.

⁹ Brewer, *Sinews of Power* p. 68.

¹⁰ Brewer, *Sinews of Power* Table 4.1, pp. 104-105. It is not clear whether Brewer included Westminster as part of London or Middlesex and whether he was calculating for England and Wales or Scotland as well. Probably the former. There were no Collectors in London; producers paid their dues direct into the Excise Office.

¹¹ J. Owens, *Plain Papers relating to the Excise Branch of the Internal Revenue Department from 1621 to 1878, or A History of the Excise* (Linlithgow: 1879), p. 56. B.R. Leftwich, *A History of the Excise* (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1908), pp. 47-48 indicates that one John Phillips, Collector for Middlesex was robbed in 1693 of £198.2.7.

notable that this was a duty that did not fall to the Army, though armed escorts must have been provided for these transfers and the legal position of these personnel, in the event of having to repel an attack with fatal force, must have posed considerable judicial problems.

It was upon the Excise Collectors that the duty of paying the Out-pension was to fall.

By the autumn of 1754 Pitt had fully formulated his scheme for the administrative reform of the Chelsea Out-pension and it was briefly discussed by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury on 16 October 1754 when they took his paper into their consideration.¹² On approving it, they instructed the secretaries to the Treasury to confer with Peregrine Furye, the Chelsea Secretary, concerning 'the method of carrying the Scheme into execution.'

The Bill for the Relief of the Out-Pensioners of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea was introduced to the House of Commons by Pitt, on 19 November 1754. It was read a second time on the following day and the House resolved to form itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the matter on 22nd, when some amendments were made to it. On 25 November the amendments were read and a further one was added. The engrossed Bill was read a third time on 28th, amended again and passed, and Pitt was instructed 'to carry the Bill to the Lords and desire their Concurrence'. It received the Royal assent on 19 December.¹³

¹² TNA, T29/32 Treasury Board Minutes f. 238.

¹³ TNA, ZHC1/47 Votes of the House of Commons, London, 1754. The Bill was introduced five days after the second session of the Parliament of 1754-61 commenced. Sir Frederick M. Powicke & E.B. Fryde (Eds), *Handbook of British Chronology* 3rd Ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) p. 541.

The Act rehearsed the hardships the pensioners suffered by being paid in arrears whereby they were 'necessitated to take up money for present subsistence on credit ... on terms many times oppressive and usurious, to the extreme detriment of these meritorious Objects of the Royal Bounty'. It remarked that this also reflected badly on the 'generous provision of Parliament' and provided 'unwarrantable emoluments' to those who took advantage of their necessities. It declared null and void any loan arrangements made in respect of soldiers admitted to the pension after 25 December 1754 and provided that all admitted thereafter would receive, in advance, that portion of the pension outstanding up to the date of the next half-yearly payment. Thereafter the pension would be paid on the half-year date in advance. These dates were 24 June and 24 December. All who had been pensioned before 25 December 1754, would continue to receive their pensions according to the old arrangements for a year and would be transferred to the new system from 25 December 1755. Any loans from dealers entered into in the past that extended beyond that date were declared null and void. The pensioners were still obliged, of course, to appear in person to re-affirm their eligibility for payment or to send affidavits of their still being alive as they had for many years. The act stipulated that an Agent was to be appointed to receive monies from the Treasurer of the Hospital with which to pay the pensions, and it provided for the Lords of the Treasury to supply the said Treasurer with funds for this purpose and mentioned what receipts and acquitances they should require for the money. It made no specific mention of what source of government revenue the money was to come from. It permitted poundage at the rate of one shilling in every pound to be withheld from the total pension sum to be devoted to whatever purpose the king should specify by warrant, and it firmly stated that after poundage the full amount of each pension was to be paid to each soldier without further deduction by the Agent on pain of dismissal.¹⁴

¹⁴ *The Statutes at Large*, Vol. 7, 1746 - 1756, London, 1770 - 27 Geo II c. 1, 2nd Session. Poundage of one shilling per pound on a full pension of £7.12.1 made for a deduction of seven shillings and seven pence leaving £7.4.6 clear pension.

It is clear that the measure was not controversial and that it passed both Houses of Parliament with the minimum of dissent.

It is necessary at this stage to return to the Excise because it was upon the shoulders of the Collectors that the obligation to provide the payments in the regions fell. It is notable, however, that no discussion at all appears to have taken place amongst the Excise Commissioners as to how it was to be achieved; their Minute books being totally devoid of any such deliberations.¹⁵ Similarly, none of their surviving out-letter books contain anything on the subject and none of the numerous published works on how Excise men were to undertake their duties makes any mention of the work involved or what procedure was to be followed. It is inconceivable that instructions were not sent to the fifty collectors in England and Wales, as also to those in Scotland, but no instructions, printed or manuscript, have survived.¹⁶ Highly regrettable though this is, it can only be taken as an indication of the confidence that the Hospital and the Excise Commissioners placed in the competence and 'professionalism' of the collectors that they would be able to shoulder yet another straightforward, but intricate, task.

The absence of any record of discussion or agreement is very surprising as it seems unlikely that Peregrine Furye and the Excise secretaries would have been permitted to work out a payment methodology involving the diversion of excise takings without the Board's approbation. Nor are there any instructions as to how collectors were to account for the money that was diverted to the Out-pensioners instead

¹⁵ TNA, Minutes of the Excise Board, CUST47/209, 210 and 211.

¹⁶ An explanation for the absence of any instructions to Collectors may be found in TNA, Treasury Minute Book, T29/56, p. 502 in which, on 20 July 1785 the Excise Commissioners explained that 'they cannot give any orders for the payment of the Out Pension of Chelsea Hospital to their Collectors as their securities for the due Remittance of the Duties of Excise would be totally vacated [invalidated] thereby'. The operative word is 'orders' because it is clear that the Collectors were permitted to pay the pension, though were not ordered to do so.

of being remitted to London. The Excise had already given proof that it was resistant to the idea of other parts of government using the money that it had collected before it had passed through the Excise treasurer's hands. In July 1739 and again in March 1748 it had raised objections to instructions from the Treasury concerning the making of money in the hands of Collectors available to regimental paymasters in England.¹⁷ Such a proceeding would, it was said, upset the arrangements of the returners, and the Commissioners were concerned that they would only have a bill against a regimental agent as a means of retrieving their money. These historical precedents were exhibited again in 1763, when a similarly convenient arrangement was requested, by the War Office, on behalf of the paymaster of the 36th Foot. Co-operation was again declined. The cases are not exactly comparable, however, in that loans to Army paymasters had to be reclaimed, while disbursements to Army pensioners would be repaid out of the money that Parliament had allocated by way of the Treasury to the Hospital. Whether this was simply a 'book transfer', rather than a physical transfer of cash, is unclear, but for the purposes of accounting the Excise Commissioners would have required that the money disbursed to the Out-pensioners be credited back into its account by some means. It is nevertheless interesting to note that the Excise Board seem to have raised no objection to the diversion of some of its money to the pensioners in the way proposed.

Although no contemporary explanation of the payment method as introduced in 1755 appears to survive, it is possible to discover both the source of the money and the methodologies that applied to the procedure. The changes brought about by the Act certainly caused confusion among those pensioners who had previously received their money at intervals from the agents of dealers who were responsible for disbursements of cash in the provinces. As we have shown in the previous chapter, it also caused much resentment amongst the dealers. To long-standing pensioners it must certainly have been pleasantly

¹⁷ TNA, Entry Book of Excise correspondence with the Treasury, CUST48/16, unfoliated, 26.8.1763.

unfamiliar to have cash constantly available and that there was no requirement to wait for it, because it would be paid in advance. However, what is not clear is how any new Out-pensioner, who needed to get back home from London to some distant village in Devon, Flintshire or Cumberland, was to subsist himself on his journey thither, because there is no indication that any money was issued to him in London to enable him to undertake the journey. His discharge papers from the Hospital may have served to secure him accommodation in public houses during his journey, but food and drink would not have been supplied. New Out-pensioners were, however, assured of their money by the inclusion of a note in red ink at the end of the list of each examination day with the wording 'Warrant signed this Day for the payment of the Pension in advance to 24th June' during the first half of the year, and up to 24 December during the second half.¹⁸ It is probable that such pensioners were expected to linger for a few days in London and then to walk out to Chelsea, there to receive the first instalment of their pension, which would subsist them during their journey homeward.

The new system, of course, required a modification to the periodic announcements that had previously appeared in the *London Gazette* indicating that the Treasury had made available the next instalment of pension money. After 1755 such notices only applied to those Out-pensioners living in or within twenty-five miles of London who were to collect their money from the Hospital. No such issue of money was made by a London-based source in respect of men in the counties because none was required, the money being already in the provinces and ready to be disbursed. The first notice under the new payment system stated that '... all other Out-pensioners ... will have Notice in this Paper, where to apply for their said Pensions, as soon as lists can be made out for that Purpose'.¹⁹ In fact, no such notice indicating where and from whom provincial pensioners were to collect their money appeared in any issue of the Gazette up to the end of December 1757.

¹⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/5.

¹⁹ London Gazette No. 9540, 23-27 December 1755.

However, as we have noted, the local functionaries upon whom this duty devolved were, in fact, the Collectors of the Excise.

The presence of these officials with readily available government cash in every county of Great Britain made them the obvious choice to act as the local paymasters of the Out-Pensioners who resided in their areas. The imposition of this new function upon the Collectors was clearly arranged very quickly after the Relief Act was passed, though lack of notification meant that their role was not understood. It was not, therefore, to be expected that the new method would start to operate without some difficulties, though the first indications are not found until June 1756. In that month Mr Furrye, the Chelsea Secretary, was mentioning Collectors of Excise as the dispensers of out-pensions to various gentlemen correspondents who had written to enquire from whom their illiterate Out-pensioner neighbours were to obtain their money.²⁰ Private Dan Morgan²¹ was so concerned about his pension that he persuaded the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Lisburn to write to the Hospital and his Lordship was duly assured that the Excise Collector at Cardigan would see the importunate private duly satisfied. The problem of non-payment was clearly compounded by the failure of pensioners promptly to comply with the requirements of the periodic notifications to prove that they were still alive and not otherwise provided for by government, by getting their local Justice of the Peace to submit an affidavit to that effect to the Paymaster General.

A new requirement introduced to this long-standing procedure after 1755 was that the Out-pensioners were to be given 'Counterparts or Duplicates of the said Certificates ... in order to be exhibited to such Persons as shall be authorized to pay them their pension in advance'.²² Failure to submit an affidavit resulted in a 'cheque' being placed against

²⁰ TNA, Hospital Letter Books, WO246/95, unfoliated 22 June, 19 & 27 Aug, 2 & 4 Sept 1756.

²¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 2.1.1749, DB 21320.

²² London Gazette No. 9486, 17-21 June 1755. Note that the certificates were to be shown to 'such person' though it is not stated who those persons were.

the pensioner's name and local paymasters were not permitted to disburse funds until that stop had been removed by the Hospital's officials. In order to facilitate the production of this essential paperwork, in November 1756, the Commissioners ordered the Hospital Secretary to have a large stock of blank affidavits printed.²³ They also instructed the Agent to the Out-pensioners to take them into use himself and distribute them to his assistants in Scotland and Ireland. Each of these deputies was to 'give the fullest information he can to the said Out Pensioners, as often as they come to receive their pensions, as to the filling up of those affidavits'.²⁴ The only printed affidavit that seems to have survived is that made out in favour of Corporal William Herd of the 5th Foot who was pensioned in 1783. It is accompanied by a document issued to him by the Royal Hospital, which certifies that he is an Out-pensioner and details his service and the reasons for his discharge. Though a very rare survivor, such paperwork was evidently issued to every pensioner both before the 1755 reform and after it. Indeed, it defies logic to believe that pensioners could have functioned without such certificates both in terms of travelling home in uniform - how would they prove that they were not deserters? - and in respect of positively identifying themselves during their bi-annual visits to magistrates to procure affidavits. Eccles is therefore mistaken in her suggestion that 'Chelsea Out-pensioners do not seem to have been issued official certificates to prove their credentials'.²⁵

This account of various details calls for an exploration in depth of the payment procedure, though it is only possible to do so from a report of 1829.²⁶ The system, however, was operating at that time in almost

²³ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/460, unfoliated, 18.11.1756.

²⁴ W.Y. Carman, 'William Herd of the 5th Foot', *JSAHR*, Vol. 32, 1954, pp. 119-122. It is most unlikely that the paperwork of 1783 differed in any significant respect from that of 1756.

²⁵ A. Eccles, *Vagrancy in Law and Practice under the Old Poor Law* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 77. See TNA, SaW's Out-letters, WO4/16, SaW to Mayor of St. Albans and Mr Duncomb concerning the Attorney General's opinion of the legality of the SaW's protection certificates, 16, 20 & 22.10.1713, ff. 30, 33 & 34.

²⁶ *Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and to state the Mode of Keeping the Official Accounts in the Principal Departments connected with*

exactly the same way as it had since its introduction. All of the elements in terms of the verifications by affidavit, the compilation of lists, the division and distribution of the necessary paperwork are described and it is clear that this document records the procedure that, with few modifications since, had been instituted in 1755. The Paymaster General's office acted as a collection point for the thousands of affidavits from Out-pensioners resident further than twenty-five miles from the capital that flowed into London after each publication of the requirement for pensioners to declare on oath that they were still alive. These affidavits permitted the office to compile figures of the numbers of men in the counties who were still alive and who were therefore due the different rates of pension, and from that information notionally to calculate the overall sum required to discharge the pensions in respect of men already on the Out-pension for the forthcoming half-year. A further sum was added in respect of the London-area pensioners who were expected to collect their money from Chelsea in person and an additional sum must have been added to this total for disbursement to those men who would be received onto the pension during the forthcoming half-year.

The affidavits were then transferred to the secretariat at Chelsea where, each was checked against the records of admission in respect of the name, age, reason for discharge and abode of the pensioner. The men's names were arranged regimentally on a warrant, which the Commissioners signed to authorise the payment of the pension, and these lists and the warrant were given over to the Agent for the Out-pensioners. For those new pensioners who were only entitled to part of the payment due up to the next half-year, the Agent calculated how many days' money that represented and noted it. He compiled a list of the London and surrounding area pensioners and then made up lists of provincial recipients according to the Excise Collection district in which the men lived. These districts changed slightly over time, but they roughly equated to counties, with the exception of Wales, small counties

the Receipts and Expenditures for the Public Service etc etc 9th February 1829 (London: House of Commons, 1829), p. 266 et seq.

in England - Rutland, the Isle of Ely - or large areas such as the Ridings of Yorkshire, or areas of the country in which commercial production of excisable goods was large enough to justify a sub-division. Appendix 8-3 gives a list of Excise Collections in 1758 with modifications introduced in 1764. The knowledge of the geography of the country built up by the Agent, assisted by the Chelsea clerks, must have been considerable, because although the Admissions registers frequently noted the pensioner's village after 1739, they did not invariably indicate the nearest market town. The requirement to mention on their affidavits 'the next Market town adjacent' to their abode first appeared in the instructions in June 1755.²⁷

On the lists by Collection area, the pensioners' names were arranged in regimental order and were accompanied by a set of receipts - one for each pensioner. These bundles of papers were despatched to each Collector. During the Collector's rounds of his district, pensioners would apply to him for their money, presenting their counterpart affidavits so that he could verify their identities and they signed or made their mark on their receipt for the cash that he handed over. This was witnessed by a third party and signed by the Collector himself. Presumably the Collector's route round his district was well known, and his arrival in any town would have been anticipated on a particular day once in every six-week progress. Out-pensioners could therefore wait upon him at each half-year point when they were due some money. If the first instalment of pension was not issued as 'journey subsistence money', to those who had only recently been accepted onto the pension, it would have taken a little while for the Agent, in accordance with the warrant signed after each examination, to compile a set of papers for this first partial payment and get them to the Collector concerned. The pensioner would then have had to ascertain the most convenient location where he might call upon him to receive his money. However, for purely practical reasons, it seems likely that the first instalment would have been issued before the new pensioner left London.

²⁷ London Gazette No. 9486, 17-21 June 1755.

The Agent must also have included on the lists the names of those who lived in a Collector's area, but who had not sent in an affidavit in response to the notice. These names would be inserted with a cheque against them and it was clearly part of the Collector's duty to remind the claimant what was required of him by way of paperwork before he could receive his money. In due course, several such failures to make declarations of still being alive would result in the man definitely being considered dead, unless very good evidence was produced to the contrary. However this was done, no Out-pensioner arriving on the door-step of his local Collector would be paid until he had submitted the necessary affidavit. It may be imagined what choice and impolite words may have emanated from those who had neglected the administrative necessities and were greeted with the news that no money would be forthcoming without submission of an affidavit. Nevertheless the Chelsea Secretary did assure his correspondents that submission of the document would result in the availability of the pension money at the Collector's next round, so only a very few weeks would elapse before it became available.²⁸

When his round was completed, the Collector returned all of the receipts to the Agent who compiled from them a tally of the total sum paid out and arranged them in the order in which they had appeared in the original pay warrant. He presumably noted those receipts that were still blank indicating either a missed payment or that the intended recipient appeared to have died since the last half-year.

After each of their rounds the Collectors were instructed to remit their takings to the Treasurer of Excise in London within a very brief period and to submit their accounts quarterly within ten days of the due dates -

²⁸ TNA, Hospital Letter Books, WO246/95, unfoliated 19.8.1756. The certainty of eventual payment chimes with Muldrew's point that credit in relation to the poor only existed if there was a belief in ultimate repayment. The Out-pension gave creditworthiness to its recipients so that they could survive without cash for a certain period. C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in early Modern England* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1998), p. 303.

25 December, 25 March, 24 June and 29 September.²⁹ They must therefore have included an entry to account for the sum that they had actually paid to the Out-pensioners, and this sum would be deducted from the money that the Agent had been allocated and credited back to the Board of Excise. The parliamentary report indicates that the Agent held an account at the Bank of England in which the money issued to him by the Hospital Treasurer was deposited.³⁰ From this account, the Agent drew the cash that he required to pay the London and district pensioners and also the newly-admitted pensioners who required journey subsistence money. The transfer of funds to reimburse the Excise was, presumably, settled by a draft against the Agent's account or simply by a ledger transfer.

The advantage of Collectors issuing money to Out-pensioners in their localities was that they would become familiar with their clients, be much more easily able to spot an imposter, may have observed any decline in their health and would thereby act as a further check that the man they were paying was indeed the person entitled to the money. Doubtless if a Collector was informed by the man's comrades that a particular Out-pensioner had died, he would send back a note of such death to assist the Agent in his record-keeping. Payment in advance did mean, of course, that the widow, children or assigns of any pensioner who died shortly after receiving his money would retain the residue of his Out-pension, but such charity was in accordance with the spirit of the royal bounty. The sole disadvantage of the change to the payment system was that it put a stop to Out-pensioners taking, albeit at a discount, several years' worth of money as some had done from their dealers. The ability of an old soldier to set up in business may, therefore, have been adversely effected, though the creditworthiness conferred by having a government pension must have made up for this loss.

²⁹ J. Owens, *Plain Papers relating to the Excise Branch ...* p. 15.

³⁰ This argument rests on the evidence of the 1829 enquiry.

The convenience and the logic of this system of payment make it tempting to believe that the procedure worked faultlessly. In fact this was not so, though evidence of the actual method of operation does not appear until three decades after the reform. Exactly why difficulties came to light in the mid 1780s is unclear, but it may have been connected with the very large numbers of men who, in the wake of the Seven Years War and the American Revolutionary War, had become recipients of the royal bounty.³¹

By February 1785 the Commissioners were aware that the Collectors of Excise in Scotland were claiming a shilling from each pensioner on delivery of their money.³² During that year, though it was not resolved until 1788, a legal case was brought by former Sergeant John Lawson of the 22nd Foot against the Collector of Excise in Glasgow, one Duncan Campbell, alleging that the latter demanded from pensioners a shilling and a ha'penny from every recipient for each half-yearly payment. Lawson cited the Relief Act as the grounds for his refusal to pay this imposition and brought the case before the Glasgow magistrates. From statements contained in various depositions by both sides it is clear that since the new payment method had been introduced in 1755, all Scottish Collectors had required this fee and that the Chelsea Agents in Edinburgh, initially Richard Dauber or Dabbar, who was also the Excise commissioner for Scotland, followed by Mr Cardonnel and, at the time of the action, Edward Broughton, were aware of the imposition and regarded it as 'usual'.

Campbell argued that he was not a deputy or sub-agent of the Royal Hospital and that he was 'disposed to accommodate these people, by paying them voluntarily and not in consequence of an order'.³³ It was stated that Dabbar had 'applied to' his collectors in 1755 to pay the

³¹ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/477, unfoliated, 11.8. 1785 indicated that by 1763 Out-pensioner numbers stood at 5,351 and that by 1785 there were 20,000 Out-pensioners. These figures do not precisely equate with those provided by Hutt who gives 8,877 in 1763 and 20,705 in 1785.

³² TNA, Chelsea Board Papers, WO250/1, 14.2.1785.

³³ See Footnote 16 above.

pension and that they had agreed subject to receiving a small fee. This practice had been continued thereafter. It was also argued that the imposition was a small one in comparison with the costs to Scottish pensioners of their having to travel to London to collect their pensions without deduction and they could also avail themselves of fee-less pensions at Broughton's office in Edinburgh.

The position was resolved by acceptance of the argument that the Collectors gave the service as a 'favour'; that they were not paid to provide it by their own Board nor did they receive anything from the Hospital for doing so and it could not therefore be argued that they acted in the role of agent in the meaning of the Act, which applied only to employees of the Hospital.³⁴

Whether prompted by this Scottish case or not, the Chelsea Commissioners felt themselves obliged to enquire whether impositions of a like kind were being made in South Britain and they found that similar fees were indeed being charged by Collectors in the rest of the country. By June they were stating that no such deductions should be made, but they conceded that such compensation as was judged reasonable by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury should be allowed to the Collectors. The latter were to be advised that the matter was under consideration and the Chelsea Commissioners expressed the desire that the Secretary of the Excise tell them so.³⁵ It is clear that Chelsea was not prepared or able to pay the Collectors; that the Excise Board did not feel it had the authority to do so and that the Treasury was seen as the final arbiter as to whether government money could be disbursed in return for the service that was being provided.

By July pressure to resolve the matter was increasing because, having made the last pension payment without deductions, the Scottish Excise office had made a claim against the Chelsea Agent in Edinburgh of

³⁴ British Library, Information for Duncan Campbell, Collector of Excise in Glasgow ... against John Lawson, late Sergeant in the 22nd Foot, one of the Out Pensioners of Chelsea Hospital, Edinburgh, 1788.

³⁵ TNA, Chelsea Board Papers, WO250/1, 21.6.1785.

£186.5.0 presumably to recompense their Collectors. The Hospital felt that it had to honour this 'debt' and a warrant to pay it was prepared, but the execution of it was noted as 'Postponed'.³⁶

An entry in the Hospital Minute Book dated 8 December 1785 confirms that 'the Collectors have been accustomed to receive for that service 1 shilling for each Payment ever since the year 1756 when that Mode of Payment was first established' and the Commissioners were 'of opinion that the same allowance should continue to be made to them'.³⁷ The Commissioners recommended that a charge to cover this fee be inserted into the annual estimate for the pension and that the Treasury should provide the money required. At its meeting on 14 December the Treasury concurred with the Chelsea Commissioners' request and instructed that the Secretary-at-War be asked to insert into the estimate to parliament of the charge of the Chelsea Hospital the sum required for the Collectors 'at the rate of one shilling for each payment'. He was also desired to 'charge ... the like allowance of one shilling to [be paid to] the said Collectors' in future.³⁸

What the Scottish case, and government's subsequent concurrence in the claims of all Collectors, indicates is the limit of what the London authorities were able to impose upon their officials in the provinces. Though enlisting the voluntary aid of the Collectors to pay the pension was an ingenious idea, it demonstrates government's deployment of staff resources on the basis of anticipated goodwill. The Board of Excise undoubtedly governed its house with an iron hand and this degree of control was, without doubt, the key to its success, but it was clearly unwilling to discipline its staff if they sought compensation for an additional burden of work undertaken on behalf of another government

³⁶ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/477, unfoliated, 14.7.1785.

³⁷ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/477, unfoliated, 8.12.1785.

³⁸ TNA, Treasury Minute Book, T29/57, ff. 109-110, 14.12.1785. It is assumed that the sum allocated to the War Office budget for this purpose was transferred to the Excise budget and paid out as a 'pay supplement' by the Excise to its Collectors.

body as a favour.³⁹ Though small in scale, this episode is a telling indicator of how far unquestioning obedience to the requests of central authority could be expected to extend.⁴⁰

Although the payment system instituted in 1755 in Great Britain relied heavily on the Excise Collectors, such a convenient set of public officials was not available in Ireland.⁴¹ Though mention is made of the Chelsea Agent having agents or deputies in Ireland in 1756, there is no indication of who, how many or what type of person was employed there in the Hospital records.⁴² In fact, the Agent in Ireland was one Alexander Mangin,⁴³ who announced his agency in the *Dublin Gazette* in July 1756 by saying that he was 'directed to require all Out-pensioners of Chelsea Hospital residing in Dublin or the adjacent villages, personally to appear before me ... in Anne Street near the Linen Hall on or before' 1 July.⁴⁴ No definition of the distance from the capital to be understood by the word 'adjacent' was given, nor were any instructions offered to those living further afield. His first notice of disbursement of pensions for the period 25 June to 24 December 1756 was made on 3 August and thereafter summonses by Mangin appeared regularly.⁴⁵ Pensioners living in the remoter parts of Ireland, of course, made out affidavits before their local

³⁹ J. Brewer, 'Servants of the Public - Servants of the Crown. Officialdom of Eighteenth Century English Central Government' in *Rethinking Leviathan - The Eighteenth Century State in Britain and Germany* J. Brewer & E. Hellmuth, (eds), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 127-147 (p. 140).

⁴⁰ It may also be taken as another example of 'agency' - the manipulation of an administrative system - though in this instance by those having the upper hand rather than the inferior position. See T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 17-23.

⁴¹ The introductory notes to TNA, CUST 112 indicates that prior to 1801 Ireland had a Revenue Board that dealt with Excise matters, but its mode of operation remains obscure.

⁴² TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/460, unfoliated, 18.11.1756.

⁴³ www.lisburn.com/books/huguenots (consulted 12.2.2015) indicates that Mangin was born in 1736 of a mercantile and military family. ancestry.com/~lelandva/pierreidaulnis0004.htm indicates that he was buried in the French cemetery, Dublin in 1802.

⁴⁴ *Dublin Gazette* No. 611, 3-6 July 1756.

⁴⁵ *Dublin Gazette* Nos. 680 & 723 (1757), 779 & 828 (1758), 883 & 931 (1759) etc.

JPs, but these were sent directly to London, not to Dublin. None of Mangin's notices gave instructions as to who was entitled to collect the pensions of men who lived many miles from the capital or what procedure they should follow. It can only be assumed, unless Mangin himself employed provincial deputies, that pensioners made arrangements by letter of attorney with parties in Dublin to collect their cash, which was transferred by letter of credit to a source from which they could receive it in Cork, Galway, Wexford or their nearest market town. By 1786, the system had been changed so that the affidavits were to be sent to the Chelsea Agent in Dublin before being forwarded to London, and he was thereby directly informed where his recipients resided.⁴⁶ In 1757, Mangin had required of his clients that 'when the Death of any Out-pensioner comes to their Knowledge, [they are] immediately to acquaint me of it', and henceforth that instruction appeared in all his notices.⁴⁷

By 1807, in a document that refers back to the 1780s, it was stated that the keepers of the Post Offices - the Postmasters - in those large towns in Ireland where such offices existed, acted as the local paymasters of the Chelsea pensioners.⁴⁸ In the period before the Union of 1801, however, these officials did not have ready access to government money deriving from the revenues of Great Britain, and they therefore had to draw by bills of exchange on the account of the Chelsea Agent in Dublin for the necessary funds from London in order to pay the pensioners. In 1760 there were forty-five Letter Offices in provincial Ireland in addition to the main Post Office in Dublin.⁴⁹

It is regrettable in the light of the interesting picture Johnston's report painted of Chelsea's pensioners in Ireland that so little can be found about them after 1755. Nevertheless, it would appear that the benefits of

⁴⁶ Dublin Gazette No. 4802, 19-22 Aug 1786.

⁴⁷ Dublin Gazette No. 723, 31 Jul-3 Aug 1757.

⁴⁸ TNA, Warrants, WO26/40, ff. 157 - 179.

⁴⁹ M. Reynolds, *A History of the Irish Post Office* (Dublin: MacDonnell Whyte Ltd., 1983), p. 23.

Pitt's great re-organization were felt in Ireland as much as they were in Great Britain.

Chapter 9

On being an Out-pensioner

Entry onto the Out-pension of Chelsea Hospital would have constituted the start of a new phase in the former soldier's life, and one which would have posed considerable challenges and, perhaps, barely surmountable difficulties. These may have arisen from simple unfamiliarity with a less ordered and controlled way of life, but, in many cases, would have been greatly increased by whatever ailments, injuries or wounds had led to the man being discharged from his regiment. On the other hand, welcome opportunities hitherto denied him would have been available - marriage and a family or the ability to set up in business. However, a fundamental challenge would have been how, despite the assistance of the Out-pension, the man was going to live out the rest of his days as a civilian.

It seems logical to end this examination of the Chelsea Out-pension system by asking the question 'what effect did it have on the lives of those 'Meritorious Objects' who received the royal bounty?' In particular, as the award was a monetary one, was it possible to live on the pension, and if not what further resources were necessary to sustain the pensioner during his declining years, and where were they to come from? These questions, however, are easier posed than answered for, in many respects, the return of the old soldier to his place in civilian society rendered him invisible; he merged back into the social strata from which he had come, in many cases, several decades previously, and is largely untraceable thereafter. His neighbours may well have known a little of his history, but not much record now survives that definitely enables him to be identified as a special case amongst his contemporaries.

Any examination along these lines should start with the necessities of life - food, accommodation and clothing - and their costs. All of these, of course, were new concerns to the pensioner who had been supplied with them by the sergeants of his company under the management of his

captain during his service. While Joseph Hanway asserted in 1766 that the 'mass of people' lived on less than five pounds a year his reference was only to the money economy and did not include the provision in kind that formed part of the payment of many employments in the form of board, subsistence and washing. Nor was Hanway including that part of livelihood that was still operated on the reciprocity of obligation, little different from barter 'where money was not the primary means of exchange'.¹ Rule's calculation that a family of five could be fed on a shilling or eighteen pence a day required more than eighteen pounds income per annum citing Defoe who, in 1730, estimated a weekly income of four to five shillings 'will barely purchase bread and cheese and clothes for his family'.² Wrightson suggested that between £11 and £16 per annum would have been common incomes in the south and from £8 to £12 for agricultural and general labourers in the north, so calculation of what was actually required is problematic.³

Fortunately during the first half of the eighteenth century failures of the harvest were rare. The 1720s and '30s were cheap decades⁴ and bread prices, according to Rudé, rarely exceeded a penny ha'penny per pound. It was considered the norm that bread consumption, by far the principal part of the diet of the labouring classes, would amount to about eighteen ounces per day.⁵ The cheapest beer at the beginning of the century was 2d per quart⁶ and by the 1740s strong beer sold at 3d a quart. Gin was cheaper and sufficient for inebriation could be had in London for one penny. Butchers' meat in the country was an expensive commodity because most livestock was driven to the towns or to London for

¹ C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1998), p. 101.

² J. Rule, *Albion's People: English Society 1714-1815* (London: Longman, 1992) p. 124.

³ K. Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities - Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 2002), pp. 317-318

⁴ S. King, *Poverty and Welfare in England 1700-1850 - A Regional Perspective* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 133. Hereafter cited as King, *Poverty and Welfare*.

⁵ G. Rudé, *Hanoverian London 1714-1808* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1971), p. 90.

⁶ A quart was two pints or approximately a litre in metric measure.

slaughter where greater profits were to be made. In 1754 in rural Ireland, good beef could be had at two pence Irish per pound⁷ (about a penny three farthings Sterling), but meat constituted a small part of the working-man's diet and formed the flavouring basis of potage rather than the primary component of a dish. Nevertheless expenditure on food took up to 80% of the incomes of the working classes.⁸ Former soldiers being reduced largely to carbohydrates would regret the loss of the more balanced diet with a higher protein content that they had received, albeit with a deduction from their pay, while in the ranks.⁹

Once released from the assurance of living in public houses, discharged soldiers would be thrown onto their own resources to find a roof over their heads. Some would have had siblings on whom they could rely in the first few weeks. Those unlucky enough to have been injured or wounded while they were still teenagers, probably returned to their parents' homes, and some may have looked, initially at least, to the charity of friends or neighbours to offer some assistance. It was not unknown for soldiers to receive furloughs from their regiments to enable them to visit their kith and kin and a very few probably contrived to send messages or have letters written for them that enabled some contact to be maintained with home. However, many Out-pensioners were likely to have become completely cut off from their places of birth and re-establishing themselves in their natal parish must have been difficult.¹⁰ A man who joined the 2nd Foot in early 1730 was unlikely to

⁷ A. Cormack, & A. Jones, *The Journal of Corporal William Todd 1745-1762* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2001), p. 11.

⁸ R.W. Malcolmson, *Life and Labour in England, 1700-1780* (London: Hutchinson Publishing Group, 1981), p. 112. Hereafter cited as Malcolmson, *Life and Labour*.

⁹ Precisely how much protein was normal in a soldier's diet is difficult to ascertain. Childs opined that William III's soldiers 'marched on 1,700 calories and 40 grammes of protein a day' J. Childs, *The Nine Years War and the British Army 1688-1697 - The Operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), p. 50. Beef, pork and cheese were listed by R.E. Scouller, *The Armies of Queen Anne* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 232-233.

¹⁰ For the problem of the acceptance back into a community of someone absent for many years See S. Hindle, *Technologies of identification under*

have been able to maintain much, if any, contact with family or friends who could welcome him home when his Regiment was relieved from the garrison of Gibraltar nineteen years later. Any soldier of the 17th Foot who survived the boredom of serving on Minorca for twenty-four years continuously from 1725 was likely to find almost no one in his village who remembered his departure.¹¹ As we will see, however, an Out-pensioner's place of legal settlement remained of great importance to him, no matter how long he had been separated from it, because only there did he have any claim on relief if he was unable to look after himself. Such settling back could not have been helped by the fact that, as we have seen in Chapter 4, significant percentages of the Out-pensioners were doing so having been away for twenty years or more and having attained at least sixty years of age.

If the pensioner wished to remain in the capital, annual rent for a house in a poor area of London, such as East Smithfield with its constant bustle of animals, could be approximately four pounds eight shillings, though this would assure the tenant enough space to set up a business as well as living quarters. In 1725, far cheaper lodgings could be had round Holborn and Covent Garden: a garret or a furnished room for a shilling or eighteen pence per week.¹² *In extremis* a bed in a shared room in the capital could be had for twopence a night. Rudé reckoned that in a poor London district rent would be between two shillings and three shillings and six pence a week.¹³ In the country, however, rents were much lower. Stephen King says that on the basis of rent paid, those expending

the Old Poor Law, 2008, University of Warwick Institutional repository (on-line resources), p. 24.

¹¹ J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), p. 18. Any such contact would have depended upon the literacy of the soldier and his access to, and ability to afford, postal services. Laslett in *The World we have lost - Further Explored* p. 232 indicates that in a sample taken between 1754 and 1784 59% of soldiers could sign their name, though it may be doubted whether this is a true indicator of functional literacy.

¹² M.D. George, *London Life in the XVIIIth Century* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd, 1930), p. 93

¹³ Rudé, *Hanoverian London* pp. 15 & 87.

fifteen shillings a year in the period 1700-1740 were considered poor.¹⁴ However, as both Porter and Hitchcock point out, the urban poor were often living in lean-tos and cellars and the rural poor in shacks of wattle and daub and paying rent for the privilege.¹⁵ While common land was still available for habitation, and the parish authorities were sympathetic, the resourceful might build a hovel to live in that would make them beholden to no one.¹⁶ Writing of a somewhat earlier period, Laslett asserted that 'landlords and overseers of the poor would erect [a cottage] as a matter of course' as the costs of such structures were low.¹⁷ Malcolmson offers a different view, pointing out that as the century advanced it became increasingly difficult for cottagers to maintain an existence.¹⁸ It seems likely that service in the Army urbanized those who engaged in it no matter where they had come from, as soldiers undoubtedly spent the majority of their time in towns and large villages because there was nowhere else they could be accommodated. This trend was doubtless encouraged in respect of Out-pensioners because of the convenience of collecting pension money either from a local merchant up to 1755 or from the collector of Excise thereafter.

Though the soldier would be discharged with the uniform clothing that he had paid for, such a suit would be unlikely to last him long. It seems probable that before leaving their regiments, some soldiers might have sold back to their captains part-worn clothing in good condition and received, as replacements, garments from among the stock laid aside at the last re-clothing. In this way recruits would have been better supplied in their first year and those discharged received a few shillings to ease the journey to their examination. The allowance made by the

¹⁴ King, *Poverty and Welfare* p. 130.

¹⁵ R. Porter, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Penguin Books, 1990), p. 215. T. Hitchcock, *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004) Chapter 2.

¹⁶ J.L. Hammond & B. Hammond, *The Village Labourer 1760-1832* (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1911; repr. Gloucester, Alan Sutton Publishing, 1987), p. 31.

¹⁷ P. Laslett, *The World we have lost - Further Explored* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2000), p. 97.

¹⁸ Malcolmson, *Life and Labour*, Chapter 6.

Militia Act of 1758¹⁹ to provide a private soldier with a coat and hat was one pound and six shillings, which increased to one pound and ten shillings in 1759. Civilian clothing would have been less elaborate, but would not have attracted the discount that applied to buying uniforms in bulk from a contractor. The entire clothing - coat, breeches, waistcoat, cap, stockings and shoes - of each of the six Pioneers of the Artillery Company of the City of Norwich cost two pounds and eight shillings in 1745 and as no discount-for-quantity applied to these garments issued to the lowliest members of the Corps, this appears to be a realistic figure for a complete outfit.²⁰ By the mid-century, and probably long before, there was a thriving market in second-hand clothes; clothing was simply too expensive to discard and, when made of wool rather than cotton, too durable for it not to be worn until it fell apart.²¹ Styles provides the budget from the Latham household, small yeoman farmers, which eventually included up to eight children. Out of a yearly expenditure in the period 1724 to 1741 of three pounds two shillings and nine pence on clothes, fibre for weaving, footwear, mending and making up, a little over sixteen shillings went on footwear and about thirty-five shillings on cloth, garments and making up. Though clothing would be purchased on a very intermittent basis and was therefore not a regular item of expenditure, on average it required about a shilling a week.²²

It is clear from this brief survey that the Out-pension received through their dealers at a maximum rate of six guineas annually constituted only a contribution towards the continued existence of those who received it, and that to approach a level higher than the barest subsistence required additional resources. This was even more necessary in respect of those men who might already have families or for pensioners who married and fathered children after their discharge. The increase in payment

¹⁹ An Act for applying the Money ... towards defraying the Charge of Pay and Clothing for the Militia, 32 Geo. II c. 20.

²⁰ A. Cormack, 'The Artillery Company of the City of Norwich', *JSAHR*, Vol. 80, 2002, pp. 181-185.

²¹ J. Styles, *The Dress of the People - everyday fashion in Eighteenth century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), p. 174.

²² Styles, *Dress of the People* pp. 230-235 & 349.

after 1755 would have made a welcome difference, though barely a significant one.

It is notable from the records of examination for pension that most soldiers - 14,320 out of the sample - declared that they had practised a trade before enlisting. Appendix 9-1 indicates what those trades were and the numbers of men who professed them.²³ These declarations bear witness to the almost universal practice of boys being put to apprenticeships in their young teenage years either by their parents or, forcibly, by the Poor Law authorities of the parishes in which they were born.²⁴ Whether such apprenticeships ultimately equipped the child with all the skills of his trade or whether the lad was simply used as cheap labour and received no instruction that would secure a long-term benefit depended upon the conscientiousness of the master, the care of the parents and the application of the subject. Where care was exercised, the results were beneficial, but children of paupers who were disposed of by the overseers of the poor to a master in another parish merely to rid themselves of the future burden of dependent hands were unlikely to come away with useful skills. Whether diligently learned or not, either the attractions of their masters' trades were insufficient to retain those men who went for a soldier, or adverse economic conditions had forced them into military employment. The fact that the Army drew its recruits predominantly from the labouring and artisan classes, as Appendix 9-1 indicates, meant that the products of both good and bad apprenticeships were to be found in its ranks.

Those men who had continued to practise their skills in the service of their regiments - barbers, shoe makers, tailors, cordwainers, saddlers, collar makers, farriers, armourers, gentlemen's servants - may well have been able to resume their initial employments after discharge. Those

²³ The data presented in this appendix adds significantly to that discussed by R. Floud, K. Wachter & A. Gregory, *Height, Health and History - Nutritional status in the United Kingdom, 1750-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 108.

²⁴ George, *London Life* p. 224 et seq. Female children were treated no differently.

whose skills were not usable directly by their regiments may have had some opportunity to continue to practise in their off-duty time,²⁵ but much of this work was probably simple labouring. Those who were unable to exercise their skills would have been considerably out of practice after long years away from their loom or bench. Indeed, the uncongenial tedium of industrial handwork would undoubtedly have accounted for some of them joining the army initially, and they would be unlikely to wish to take it up again, though dire necessity might force them to it. Others, who may have wished to, were no longer able to do so owing to the injuries they had received. Drummer John Higden,²⁶ 'lamed in the right hand' was unlikely to resume making shoes nor were fellow shoe-makers Francis Russell, John Gardner or James Cowand who had all lost the use of that hand.²⁷ Thomas Baldwin,²⁸ John Dayley²⁹ and William Dawson³⁰ were also never going to make barrels again having been similarly afflicted. In total 866 men from the entire sample had experienced some damage to their right hands and a further 777 had suffered injuries, wounds or illnesses affecting their right arms. Ninety-one of these men were right hand or arm amputees. For those men not so blighted, some (with or without reluctance) doubtless returned to their craft, which may have become more congenial in the absence of the

²⁵ John Childs in 'The Army and the State in Britain and Germany in the Eighteenth Century' in J. Brewer & E. Hellmuth, (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan - The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford: OUP, 1999), pp. 53-70. asserts p. 60 that opportunities for civilian employment by soldiers were not hard to come by. G.A. Stepler, *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793*, (Unpublished PhD, Oxford, 1984) indicates that men of the Foot Guards worked unloading ships on the Thames wharfs and James Wolfe in *Instructions to Young Officers* gave orders that no man was to work without his commanding officer's permission and even when permitted, was never to be seen wearing his apron with his uniform coat. The injuries caused by accidents of an industrial nature commented upon in Chapter 5 also attest to the continuation of civilian occupations while serving in the ranks, though usually on military buildings or fortifications. It is difficult nevertheless to assess with accuracy how well prepared an old soldier might be for civilian work at the time of his discharge.

²⁶ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 9.11.1743, DB 11472.

²⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, Russell, 10.12.1744, DB 12536; Gardner, 18.1.1745, DB 12860; Cowand 12.12.1744, DB 12604.

²⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 8.10.1741, DB 9857.

²⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 27.11.1747, DB 16510.

³⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 28.11.1745, DB 13704.

restlessness of youth. However, their long separation from normal civilian life and, in most cases the delay enforced by Army service in their production of families, may well have militated against the success of their return to cottage industry, for, as Rule has pointed out, it was the family as a collective producing unit that prospered in the 'putting out' system that prevailed in manufacturing before 1750.³¹ What is certain is that some form of paid work, if at all possible, was necessary for all Out-pensioners. This conclusion runs counter to the only statement put forward by Hitchcock and Shoemaker implying that 'disabled soldiers' were dealt with by 'associational charities' and no longer needed assistance from the Poor Law.³² The insufficiency of the Out-pension ensured that this could not be so.

Against this necessity, however, we must consider the age data presented in Chapter 4 which shows that about half of the pensioners were aged fifty or more at the time of discharge and that significant numbers were sixty or older. Manual labour for perhaps a decade, for those not critically wounded and whose health was recoverable to some degree, would have been possible, but it seems likely that old age would have advanced rapidly. The experience of work against a background of failing health and increasing weakness must have been similar in the early eighteenth century to the scenario discussed by Sokoll in relation to the early nineteenth century.³³

Biographical details of Out-pensioners that can assist us in producing a picture of their later lives are scarce. Corporal William Todd served for

³¹ J. Rule, *The Vital Century: England's Developing Economy 1714-1815* (London: Longman, 1992), p. 18.

³² T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 165.

³³ T. Sokoll, 'Old Age in Poverty: The Record of Essex Pauper Letters, 1780-1834', pp. 144-145 in T. Hitchcock, P. King & P. Sharpe, (eds) *Chronicling Poverty - the voices and strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1997)

less than the twenty-year minimum period, but was discharged as worn out at the conclusion of the Seven Years War. He gives no indication of whether he resumed a similar job to the one he had in 1745 as a clerk to the builders of the local turnpike road, but he did marry and produced at least one child. He also collected his pension for twenty-seven years after discharge, not dying until 1791. His entry in the burial register of Sculcoates parish in the East Riding noted him as a pauper and still gave his calling as a soldier, though there is no indication that he had entered an Invalid company in the Hull garrison after 1763.³⁴ More definite information is known about Thomas Brown, 'the Hero of Dettingen'.³⁵ Having been wounded in the battle and rewarded by George II by being transferred to the 1st Troop of Horse Guards before he was pensioned, Brown was also made a Letterman. In consequence he enjoyed the maximum pension income that an other rank could achieve. This, and perhaps some income derived from the Boitard print of his exploit,³⁶ enabled him to establish a public house in his home town of Yarm, north Yorkshire. Brown's misfortunes persisted, however. By June 1745 he was incapable of repaying a loan he had taken from a fellow Out-pensioner, John Skelton of the 3rd Troop of Horse Guards and was obliged to transfer his shilling-a-day entitlement as a Letterman to Skelton in order to pay his debt, while he reverted to five pence a day.³⁷ Brown's injuries, however, were so severe as to be incapable of healing and he had drunk himself to death by January 1746.

A fuller account of a pensioner's life is also available for Sergeant Donald MacLeod. He joined the 1st Foot, the Royal Regiment in 1702,

³⁴ A. Cormack & A. Jones, (eds), *The Journal of Corporal William Todd, 1745-1763* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2001), pp. xiii - xviii.

³⁵ A. Cormack, 'The Sword of Private Thomas Brown of Bland's Dragoons, Dettingen, 1743', *JSAHR*, Vol. 87, 2009, pp. 99-107.

³⁶ I am grateful to Mr Nigel Talbot of Grosvenor Prints, Covent Garden for the suggestion that Brown's portrait print by Louis Pierre Boitard may have been published by subscription, part of the proceeds from sales being for his benefit. Such arrangements were sometimes made to take both commercial and beneficial advantage of the short-term celebrity of a military hero.

³⁷ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/459, f. 146.

resigned from it to join the Highland Independent Companies - later the Black Watch - in 1720, and served until 1759 when, having been wounded at the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, he returned to England in the same ship as Wolfe's preserved body and was pensioned. A man of considerable energy, he recruited for Campbell's and Keith's Highland regiments in the following year and acted as Paymaster Sergeant in the latter regiment in Germany until 1763. It is not known whether, being 'otherways provided for by Government', he forewent his Out-pension during these years. Having by that time reached the age of 75, he returned to his original trade as a stone mason, but 'use of the mell threatened to open his wounds again' and he was obliged to live with his new wife in a house he had purchased in Chelsea. However, his sense of adventure and duty had clearly not deserted him for at the start of the American Rebellion he sailed to New York and engaged as a Drill Sergeant, being maintained by Sir Henry Clinton, until he returned home in 1777. He again worked as a mason in Inverness for nine years until 1789 and at that stage was placed on the Letterman list for a vacancy for which he was still waiting in 1791, his 103rd year.³⁸

Like MacLeod, Ralph Bowles' attraction to soldiering was very strong. He joined up aged nineteen in 1707 and when rejected for pension in 1720 he had lost his right thumb, but was considered fit enough to carry on. He was pensioned from Barrell's Foot in 1736 and sent to garrison. Released in 1740, he clearly re-enlisted during the Austrian War and was examined for the third time in February 1747 and finally pensioned with a stated service of thirty-three years.³⁹

These are the fullest stories of the post-pension lives of soldiers that can be told, but further brief details may be gleaned from court records.

³⁸ *Memoirs of the Life and gallant Exploits of the Old Highlander, Sergeant Donald MacLeod ...* (London: 1791).

³⁹ The disparity between Bowles' supposed date of birth and length of service is unexplained. Perhaps he originally joined up in 1704. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 9.7.1720, DB 20893; WO116/3, 3.3.1736, DB 5462 and WO116/3, 27.2.1747, DB 15709.

John Knight, 'a pentioner to Chelsea Hospitall' had travelled about the country with his wife since February 1732 'selling of Moustrapps in order to the bettering their liveing in the world' until Mary Knight was convicted at Aylesbury two months later of stealing pewter plates from a victualler.⁴⁰ Edward Wentland, a Grenadier of the 1st Foot Guards, recounted in his last conversation with the Ordinary of Newgate that during his service '... when he was not on Duty, he wrought about the East India Men, coal ships and Other Business on the River [Thames]: and maintain'd himself and Family very well. About four Years ago he was admitted an Out-pensioner of Chelsea hospital, and followed his old Ways of Business, and wanted for nothing ...'. However, he was accused of street robbery with his wife, convicted and, though protesting his innocence to the last, he was hanged at Tyburn in May 1732.⁴¹ Edward Saunders, also of the 1st Foot Guards, and discharged aged sixty in 1726 lived in a booth or hut that he had erected beside the London road by Rickley Wood near Bletchley. How he made his living is not known, but he ran foul of someone in January 1741/2 and was murdered along with his nine year old companion, George Foster.⁴² Former Dragoon James Ball may have taken up tanning again when he returned to Tetbury, but from necessity or inclination he supplemented his larder by poaching. He was complained of as 'a great destroyer of game' by the gentry of the neighbouring county - Wiltshire - and the Board instructed its secretary that he should be considered for garrison duty.⁴³

⁴⁰ I am grateful to the late Dr John Screen for this reference. *Buckinghamshire County Council. Calendar to the Sessions records* Vol. VIII. 1730-33. Addenda 1663-1720. [no place, no date]. There are two possible John Knights in the Admissions Registers pensioned in 1730; one in January (DB 368) aged 57 and the other pensioned in December 1730 (DB 900) aged 46.

⁴¹ Old Bailey Proceedings On-line (www.oldbaileyonline.org, Version 7.0, Ordinary of Newgate's Account 22nd May 1732 Ref. OA17320522. Consulted 16.12.2011. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 14.3.1729 DB 4098 in which he appears as Venland.

⁴² London Gazette No. 8097, 27 Feb - 2 March 1742. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 26.9.1726, DB 8229.

⁴³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 18.10.1745, DB 13231.

Other pensioners were more fortunate in their later lives. James Gilray, the father of the artist but himself a blacksmith, served in the 4th Dragoons and lost his right arm at Fontenoy, being pensioned in the following year. As a strict Calvinist from Lanarkshire he was acceptable to and employed by the Moravian Brethren, an extreme Protestant sect, and supplemented his pension by acting as sexton of their Chelsea burying ground until his death in 1799.⁴⁴ Some of those discharged made remarkable recoveries after they were pensioned. Gentleman Horse Guard Ludowick Cathcart, discharged as 'wholely disabled, lost the use of his limbs' in 1733, was put back on the pension lists having missed his attendance and sent no affidavit in 1738 because he was in the East Indies!⁴⁵ John Frazier of the 5th Foot pensioned after injury in the Gibraltar siege was presumably also working for the Honourable East India Company when he was noted as 'on the Malabar coast' when he was restored to the pay warrant in May 1736.⁴⁶ Some men seem to have declined to take their pensions at discharge, but found themselves in need of them later in life. John Wryford, discharged in 1712 aged sixty with injuries to his hands, was exceptionally admitted to the pension ten years later 'having endeavoured to get his bread at weaving which his fingers won't now permit'.⁴⁷ John Mitchael of the 7th Dragoons, a 'little pale Black man' initially dismissed for pension as his application was too late, was accepted in July 1717 having 'wrought as long as he was able & served well'.⁴⁸ John Wishall neglected to send affidavits for several years, but was obliged to apply for re-admission as he could 'no longer earn his bread as he has done for many years past'. He was duly taken back from Christmas 1745.⁴⁹ Sam Bullock returned to his trade as a farrier after discharge in 1746, a duty he had probably performed in Ligonier's Horse, and omitted to send affidavits, which

⁴⁴ I am grateful to Mr Stephen Wood for this reference. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* Vol. 22, p. 298. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/4, 13.3.1746, DB 14153.

⁴⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 22.10.1733, DB 1887.

⁴⁶ TNA, Hospital Minute Book, WO250/470, f. 186 and Admissions Register, WO116/2, 20.5.1729, DB 3026.

⁴⁷ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 25.10.1722, DB 10826.

⁴⁸ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 17.7.1717, DB 19995.

⁴⁹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 19.12.1734, DB 4547.

resulted in him being struck off the pay warrant. He was restored on his colonel vouching for him and pleading his ignorance of procedure.⁵⁰

The post-service occupations of yet others can be found when they or their widows applied for poor relief. A particularly rich vein of such records survives for the parish of Chelsea, where pensioners' wives tried to settle when their husbands became In-pensioners. Gentleman Trooper Edward Holland of the Horse Guards took the lease of the *Red Lion* public house in King Street, Westminster, for five years after his discharge.⁵¹ Jonathan Rowlatt of the 3rd Horse married a widow and became a distiller in Old Brentford for about twenty years before entering the Hospital as an In-pensioner.⁵² Private Woodcock, threw up his apprenticeship to a miller and served eleven years before being disabled by illness in the West Indies. From 1742 to 1758 he scraped a living, but by then he was a vagrant and was taken into the Chelsea workhouse in 1762.⁵³ Further afield, Sergeant Hiddersich or Hadderstick returned to his home town of Stafford and resumed his trade as a baker. He was also appointed an overseer of the poor and was paid for baking by the parish authorities.⁵⁴ In 1719 Thomas Widowson returned to his tailor's bench in Nottingham, but was disturbed in 1728 by being called into the Invalid service. The Mayor of Nottingham protested that his wife and five small children would become a burden on the parish and the Secretary-at-War took the case to the king who excused him garrison duty being of opinion that he should

⁵⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 12.2.1746, DB 13981.

⁵¹ T. Hitchcock & J. Black (eds), *Chelsea Settlement and Bastardy Examinations, 1733-1766* (London: London Records Society, 1999), Nos. 156 & 203. (Hereafter cited as CSBE.) TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 5.8.1728, DB 5621.

⁵² CSBE Nos. 355 & 357. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 23.4.1726, DB 8151.

⁵³ CSBE No. 417. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 7.5.1742, DB 10092.

⁵⁴ Stafford Record Office, D(W)0/8/18 Overseers of the Poor account book, St Mary's and St Chad's, 1735-1744. I am grateful to Miss Valerie Gannon for this reference. TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 24.6.1736, DB 6633.

'continue with them and follow his trade ... where he is known'.⁵⁵ The managers of the workhouse in Perth applied for Robert Hunt of Holmes' 31st Foot even before he had been pensioned, saying that they would employ him to teach the children in their care to spin cotton. The Commissioners agreed that when he was released they would not send him to an Invalid company so that he might take up this offer of employment.⁵⁶

All of these examples indicate that Out-pensioners would continue to work if at all possible and, as we have seen in Chapter 4, this was absolutely in accordance with the expectations of the era. As Ottaway points out 'pauper letters reveal a strong determination to make your own living, to support yourself and your family'.⁵⁷ While some pensioners made the transition back to civilian working easily, the exhausted, the chronically ill and the maimed would have found life much more difficult, though the pension - small and irregular as it was - made a contribution to the construction of the 'economy of makeshifts' by which they lived. This concept of a self-help survival strategy has become an accepted part of the explanation of how the poor managed their affairs and it doubtless applied to military pensioners as much as to others. In essence the poor were obliged to assemble a package of remunerative tasks each day that would ensure them sufficient income or nourishment for the survival of that day. In the absence of a full-time job, any activity that was rewarded in cash or kind contributed to this package - running errands; holding a gentleman's horse; sweeping a crossing; doing seasonal agricultural work; petty theft; scavenging or begging. Not inconsiderable sums could be secured by claiming a parish bounty on vermin.⁵⁸ As Tomkins and King have said 'in England

⁵⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 8.5.1719, DB 20818 and WO4/29 SaW Out-letters, ff. 45 & 48.

⁵⁶ TNA, Hospital Journal, WO250/460, unfoliated, 11.8.1756.

⁵⁷ S. R. Ottaway, *The decline of Life. Old Age in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.86.

⁵⁸ R. Lovegrove, *Silent Fields - The long decline of a nation's wildlife* (Oxford: OUP, 2007). Bounties were paid by parishes from the mid sixteenth century into the first decades of the nineteenth century for a large selection of birds and mammals that were regarded as agricultural pests:

the phrase [the economy of makeshifts] has become a convenient shorthand to represent all of the ways [by] which ... the labouring poor made ends meet...'.⁵⁹

As we have seen in Chapter 4, former soldiers, whether pensioners or not, were assisted in re-establishing themselves in their civilian lives by being permitted to set up in business anywhere they chose, so long as they could maintain themselves. However, even this concession was resented in some places and the Secretary-at-War had to write to the Mayor of Chester to ensure Sergeant Tolson's right to earn his living.⁶⁰ He had set himself up in the city, though he had been born in Cockermouth, Cumberland, and was being subjected to 'causeless attacks' by the parish authorities. The mayor duly intervened on his behalf. Robert Appleyard, born in Leeds, required similar help in 1749 after sixteen years on the pension, when his house and garden were taken from him and converted to a workhouse by the overseers of the poor in Batley. The precise circumstances were not explained, but Appleyard lost his case and was compensated by being made an In-pensioner at Chelsea, though he died, aged seventy-eight, in May of the following year.⁶¹

These instances of the War Office's willingness to concern itself in pensioners' affairs were mirrored in a somewhat more manipulative light in regard to those who possessed the Parliamentary vote. Though decidedly limited, the franchise was nevertheless vested in members of the artisan classes usually by virtue of being Freemen of their towns or if they rented property of specified value or were rated for particular local taxes. The Chelsea Commissioners, being politicians, or at least

4d for the head of a hedgehog (pp. 186-191); 1d for a Kingfisher (pp. 144-145) or a Magpie (pp. 148-150); 2d for a Green Woodpecker (pp. 140-143).

⁵⁹ S. King & A. Tomkins (eds), *The Poor in England 1700-1850. An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), p. 13.

⁶⁰ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 1.2.1749, DB 21,941 and SaW Out-letters, WO4/50, f. 385.

⁶¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 23.5.1733, DB 1743, SaW Out-letters, WO4/46, f. 199 and Royal Hospital Burial Register RG 4/4330.

thoroughly familiar with politics, would have been well aware of whether a man held the franchise or not and the fact was noted in the Admissions Registers. Fifty-eight men in the sample were so noted from thirty-two different towns and cities. Management being the foundation of political activity in the eighteenth century, all six of the Out-pensioner voters in Nottingham received letters in January 1754 soliciting their support for the candidature of Lord Howe in the forthcoming election. William Caulton and John Salmond were unwise enough not to heed the suggestion that they vote in the required manner and were punished by being sent to garrison at Pendennis Castle in Cornwall in March.⁶² They were excused and allowed to return home in October. Persuasion of an even less subtle kind was exercised over an unidentifiable Marine discharged after the West Indies campaign in 1742 whose papers were detained by an attorney of Taunton in order that the pensioner should vote according to his directions. On the lawyer's death twenty-six years later, the papers were surrendered to the Marine who applied for the £197.14.2 worth of pension that he had been denied by this procedure. The Commissioners duly entered him on the pay roll for the entire sum in 1769.⁶³

Fragmentary though they are, these scattered details illustrate the trials and tribulations of the lives of some Out-pensioners. Exactly how many - like Todd - returned home or established themselves elsewhere and, receiving their pension from time to time, steered a course of sufficiency, perhaps of mild prosperity, into their closing days cannot be known. Nor is it possible to know how many fell upon desperate times (like Knight) were incapable of adjusting to civilian life, resorted to crime or were unable to find work or stick to it when found. The wars of the late twentieth-early twenty-first centuries have given ample examples of

⁶² TNA, Admissions Register, Caulton WO116/4, 15.7.1751, DB 24128 and Salmond WO116/3, 7.11.1745, DB 13311 & Chelsea Secretary Letter Book, WO246/94, unfoliated, 8.1.1754, 9.3.1754 and 24.10.1754.

⁶³ TNA, Estimates of Expenses for the Out-pension, WO245/2, unfoliated.

those for whom, though bearing no physical scars, adjustment to civilian normality has proved next to impossible and has resulted in street-living or suicide. Although the intensity of eighteenth-century conflicts was, , except in siege warfare, certainly not as severe as modern wars, it would be unrealistic to suppose that a form of post-traumatic stress disorder was not suffered by some of the recipients of the Royal Bounty and Chapter 5 indicates that eighty-three men when examined were noted as deranged in their senses. What proportion of all Out-pensioners eventually needed to have recourse to poor relief, and were therefore obliged to return to their parish of settlement from which alone they could receive support in cash or in kind likewise cannot be known. It is indicative, however, that Hitchcock and Black in their study of those who applied for relief in the parish of Chelsea recorded six abandoned wives of Out-pensioners, usually burdened with children, their menfolk having departed to attempt to make it alone without encumbrances; they also document eight Out-pensioners and twenty In-pensioners who were unable to support their dependants and twenty-four widows of In- or Out-pensioners whose husbands had left them in desperate circumstances.⁶⁴ Those who had absconded must have informed the Hospital or their dealers where they would settle in order to receive their money, but clearly whatever support they expected in addition to their pensions was not considered sufficient to look after a wife and children. What is clear is that the receipt of a Chelsea Out-pension did not disqualify a man from receiving parish relief, and the overseers were doubtless aware that, twice a year, this or that former old soldier would require slightly less from them than at other times.

Innes represents the provision of outdoor relief as a system that had embedded itself into English parochial management since its introduction in the Poor Laws of Elizabeth I, and as a natural expectation of Englishmen - both those who received it and those who paid the rates to provide it. Hitchcock and Shoemaker argue that it was

⁶⁴ Compiled from all of the entries in T. Hitchcock & J. Black (eds), *Chelsea Settlement and Bastardy Examinations, 1733-1766* (London: London Records Society, 1999)

seen as an inalienable right and that the poor negotiated its grant from this standpoint.⁶⁵ Steven King is not so sanguine in his reading of this provision and it is clear that the manner and the degree of generosity with which it was delivered varied considerably in different parts of the country. The south and east were relatively generous, the north and west more pinching in its provision. King asserts that the difference in average weekly pensions varied by 50%: northern recipients receiving six pence while those in the south received a shilling.⁶⁶ To some degree this was accounted for by a general regional difference in living standards, but it is quite clear that Poor Law payments were very variable according to individual need and deservedness as well as location. It is also possible that a man might be supported by a parish in which he had no right of settlement on the basis of a 'friendly pass'. This was an unofficial agreement of reciprocal aid between parishes in respect of persons whose settlement was in a parish in which they did not reside. Hitchcock and Shoemaker opine that 'it is possible that [friendly passes] substantially pre-date the mid eighteenth century.'⁶⁷

As Pitt's correspondent remarked, however, it was unlikely that the half-yearly windfall of royal bounty would be husbanded in such a way as to last as long as it was intended to, so additional aid would certainly have been required. It is clear that this was not always in the usual form of out-door poor relief, as other funds, which were not tied specifically to the parish, were available. We have noted in Chapter 3 the burdens placed upon districts within Essex in respect of maimed soldiers or mariners who, landing at Harwich, required assistance while traversing the county in order to get to London. Despite the failure to renew the legislation to support maimed servicemen in 1679, local rates to support disabled soldiers or sailors continued to be levied well into the eighteenth century and appear to have been used to supplement other sources of income, thereby contributing to the economy of makeshifts that some former soldiers relied upon.

⁶⁵ T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives*, Chapter 2 Section 4 - Reconfiguring poor relief.

⁶⁶ King, *Poverty and Welfare* p. 190.

⁶⁷ T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives*, p. 296.

Whether it was a regular tax or one that was imposed when required is unclear, but Shaw⁶⁸ indicates that it was to be levied at a rate of not less than two pence and not more than ten pence per week per parish, though Burn says that it was left to the discretion of the Justices and was not usually imposed.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the accounts for 1738 and 1739 covering eighteen Hundreds in north and east Norfolk indicate that seventy-three men in the former year and sixty-nine in the latter year were in receipt of pensions drawn from this fund.⁷⁰ Most men received two pounds per annum, but six received three pounds, two received four pounds, five received thirty shillings and the same number received fifty shillings. The reasons for these variations were not stated, but were presumably related either to the size of the man's family or to the degree of his incapacity to work. Though the recipients were listed by name, the interpretation of the data is fraught with difficulty when attempting to match the Norfolk entries to names in the Chelsea registers. The problem of common names predominates, but also the fact that no histories of the individuals were given and it is therefore impossible to know whether a man was a sailor or a soldier. If the latter, the man may never have been recommended for a Chelsea Out-pension because of a poor disciplinary record, insufficient length of service or an injury, wound or medical condition which was not deemed serious enough to warrant a pension. These caveats aside, it is possible with fair certainty to identify five recipients whose names appear in the registers of the Royal Hospital. Robert Baldwin, a weaver from Norwich, had been rejected for pension after only two years service in the 1st Foot Guards in 1725,⁷¹ Sergeant Andrew Alcock, wounded during his service and then disabled in the leg while working on the Scottish roads received a maimed pension for just short of two years until his death in Spring

⁶⁸ J. Shaw, *The Practical Justice of Peace and parish and Ward Officer* 5th Ed. 2 Vols., (London: 1751), Vol. 2, p. 218..

⁶⁹ R. Burn, *The Justice of the Peace and Parish Officer* 2nd Ed., 2 Vols., London:1756), Vol. 2, p. 453.

⁷⁰ Norfolk County Record Office, Maimed Soldiers and Mariners Fund Accounts 1738 & 1739, BUL 4/12.

⁷¹ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/1, 30.11.1725, DB8944.

1738;⁷² Richard Rust commenced his maimed pension on the completion of his Invalid service in 1738;⁷³ George Cotton a dim-sighted and rheumatic shoe-maker from Walsingham was on the list in both years⁷⁴ and Thomas Denny, excused garrison duty in 1731 because he was so injured after his service at Gibraltar, was in receipt of a maimed pension for both years.⁷⁵

All of these men, except Baldwin, were therefore supplementing their Chelsea Out-pensions with local provision for disabled soldiers. As Chapter 5 has proved, considerable numbers of men emerged from their military service in a disabled condition and, though eighteenth-century industrial and farming practices must have contributed to the total disabled population, both the Army and the Royal Navy must have been responsible for a significant proportion of them. However, it is noteworthy that examination of the plight of former soldiers and their post-disablement lives feature barely at all in recent studies of disability in the eighteenth century.⁷⁶ Turner comments that conduct books of the time gave a little advice on managing their predicament to the greatest pecuniary advantage by encouraging those so afflicted to 'give us the story of his [missing] right leg' or to make jokes about their disabilities so as not to play too obviously or repellently on the sensibilities of those who might give them alms. Nevertheless there was no discussion at the time, and seemingly little interest now, in exploring how men were to cope after losing limbs to Great Britain's enemies. It is hoped that this dissertation may encourage research in that field. The difficulties of those who found themselves in this position were somewhat relieved by the Out-pension, but, as Thomas Brown's case indicates, the measure of that relief was slight in comparison with the need.

⁷² TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 3.3.1736, DB 5467.

⁷³ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 3.4.1728, DB 5996.

⁷⁴ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/3, 23.6.1736, DB 6547.

⁷⁵ TNA, Admissions Register, WO116/2, 23.2.1731, DB 1063.

⁷⁶ D.M. Turner, *Disability in Eighteenth Century England - Imagining Physical Impairment* (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 19-21, 125 & 149.

The Out-pensioners of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea therefore constitute a fascinating sub-set of the labouring poor, and one for which, particularly during their military service, abundant and quite detailed records survive. It is evident, however, that once having passed the threshold back into civilian life with the promise of a pension to support them for the remainder of their days, they become very difficult to discern amongst the crowd of their fellow citizens.

Conclusion

This investigation arose out of a number of questions concerning the fate of old soldiers in the distant past and was partly prompted by the debates over the Government's 'duty of care' to such servants at the time of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the middle of the first decade of the 21st century. The extent of that duty has expanded enormously since the late 17th century, as have the resources - administrative, medical, financial, philosophical and emotional - that are devoted to it. This enquiry has sought to answer the questions that were of concern from the 1680s onwards, when the simple discarding of long-serving soldiers had been proved to be both unwise politically and unbecoming in a monarch who needed to project an image of benevolence to servants of the State and a magnanimity reflective not only of his personal *gloire*, but demonstrative of the nation's power and recognisance of its indebtedness. It adheres very closely to the explanation and interpretation of contemporary evidence and examines in detail what actually happened, why and how. It differs to a significant degree in its handling of the subject from Nielsen's approach as it is based on the examination of these factors from a military history standpoint and one which also encompasses the administration of the Out-pension in all its detail up to the major reform of 1755.¹

The dissertation is therefore divided into two separate strands through the first five decades of the eighteenth century; the military historical story relating to the soldiers themselves - how, why and to what degree they became unfit for service - and the administrative story explaining how - in an age devoid of easy communications, probity in public office, instant availability of cash and readily available information to verify an individual's identity - the complex procedure of paying a pension to residents throughout the British Isles could be undertaken.

¹ Nielsen, C.L., *Chelsea Out-Pensioners: Image and Reality in Eighteenth-Century and early Nineteenth-Century Social Care*, Newcastle, 2014. Hereafter Nielsen, *Out-pensioners*.

The soldiers who were examined for the Chelsea Out-pension have been recorded in a database of more than 25,000 entries that has provided significant insights into their social and geographical origins, trades, ages at recruitment and discharge and length of service. Wider research has explained why they entered the Army and upon what terms, but the database must be returned to in order to explain what prompted their departures and to expose what wear-and-tear the military life imposed upon those who pursued it. Crucially the question has been addressed as to why only a certain proportion of the many tens of thousands of soldiers who served between 1715 and 1755 qualified for recommendation to the special status of a Chelsea Out-pensioner. The gift of the royal bounty was not by any means an automatic entitlement bestowed upon all soldiers at the end of their service and, although the physical - and length of service - qualifications were fully explained at the time, there remains some obscurity as to the fundamental qualification that entitled men to this privilege. I indicate that this key factor was the possession of a faultless disciplinary record during the entirety of the recipient's service.

The dissertation goes on to examine the administration of the system and the procedures that were put in place to confirm, so far as possible, that those who collected the pension were indeed the same men who had served their country and had been approved for this special honour. It is clear that this verification process was of more concern to the administrators, and to the State, than the beneficial effect of the dispensing of cash to the worthy and the disabled. Much intellectual effort and adequate human resources were put into the former function, while, for the first forty years of the pension, almost no resources were invested in the distribution of the charity, which was left to unregulated private enterprise. This defect, naturally, gave rise to administrative problems and accusations of abuses of the scheme, which required investigation and alteration of procedure in an attempt to stamp them out.² Even when reform was made, it is clear that government was

² Though the Out-pension is not mentioned in T. Hitchcock & R. Shoemaker, *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City*,

unwilling to recruit a dedicated set of civil servants to administer payments to the pensioners, and that it relied upon a section of the existing tax-collecting service to perform the payment function as a favour to both the pensioners and to the authorities that requested it. In these circumstances the continuation of personal gain, initially at the expense of the recipients, by the administrators was bound to continue, though at a very much lower level than previously. This small detail points up the fact that despite the mobilization of vast fiscal resources to achieve victory, the State showed itself reluctant to devote much smaller sums to ensure the efficient delivery of welfare payments to those who had achieved, at great personal cost, the State's aims. It proves the contention that the role of government was largely to project power abroad and highlights limitations in the reach of central government into the provinces. It reinforces Joanna Innes' argument that there was no 'hitherto unrecognized, permanently active chain of command reaching from the centre down into the localities'.³ This argument runs counter to the hypothesis recently advanced by S. Pincus & J. Robinson.⁴

It is clear that the Chelsea Out-pension was never intended to be a support that would allow its recipients to live out the rest of their lives in modest comfort and security. Even for those who benefitted from the special payments made to the Troops of Horse Guards and the King's Lettermen, the pension was not enough to maintain a wife and family and probably insufficient to pay for the basic necessities of food, clothing and accommodation for the old soldier himself. It must be firmly understood that it was never intended for the support of wives and families nor had it any continuance after the death of the soldier on

1690-1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), their concept of 'agency' pp. 17-23 - by which they mean the manipulation and alteration of a regulatory system for their own greater benefit by the recipients - an adjustment not intended or anticipated by those who imposed the system - is useful in the consideration of alleged abuses of the pension system.

³ J. Innes, *Inferior Politics - Social Problems and Social Policies in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 3.

⁴ S. Pincus & J. Robinson, 'Challenging the Fiscal-Military Hegemony: The British Case' in A. Graham & P. Walsh, (eds), *The British Fiscal-Military States, 1660-c.1783* (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 229-261.

whom it was bestowed. Notions of the extension of favourable treatment to dependents such as those encapsulated in Nielsen's phrases 'The Britains' troubles were, in part, directly caused by the Hospital ...' and 'The Hospital's disregard for Out-pensioners' families ...' must therefore be put aside as inappropriate to the thinking of the era examined in this dissertation.⁵

Unless particularly fortunate therefore, all Out-pensioners were obliged to resume whatever work they were capable of, or, if incapable through disability, to seek assistance from the traditional social welfare system set up under the Elizabethan Poor Laws or from other local provision. The final chapter therefore charts, in so far as records of individuals absorbed back into civil society permits, the continuing challenge faced even by those fortunate enough to have been accorded the royal bounty. It highlights as has never been done before, a special section of the pauper population that was most likely to need this additional assistance. However, it must also prompt consideration of the burden placed upon the Poor Law resources by those equally badly affected by their military service, whose disciplinary infringements meant that they were discharged without pension. While the extensive literature on the poor by King, Hindle, Tomkins, Hitchcock and others that has been referenced in these pages provides a plausible background to the likely experience of Out-pensioners, further work needs to be done in order to find specific examples of the relationships that existed between Out-pensioners and the Poor Law authorities.⁶ This is, however, beyond the scope of the present work

What then is the picture that emerges from this narrative and analysis? Though much has been written on the development of the fiscal-military state in the 18th century, the examination of the Chelsea Out-pension as an exemplar of Great Britain's development in this field exhibits only

⁵ Nielsen Out-pensioners, Introduction, Section 1.1.

⁶ See Chapter 9, Footnotes 4, 10, 32, 33 & 59.

some intersections with that story.⁷ Certainly the pension would not have been payable at all if the nation's financial management and revenue-collecting resources had been inadequate.⁸ It therefore benefitted from the abandonment of tax farming in the 1670s and the development of direct and, crucially, efficient tax collection, particularly of excise duties. It was traditional, however, in deriving a significant proportion of its income from charges made on its pay by means of poundage and by the deduction of one day's pay per year from all ranks throughout the Army. In a real sense therefore, soldiers paid for their own potential future access to welfare provision from Chelsea through these contributions. Nevertheless, it was always the case that Parliament was obliged to supplement this income and thus was able to keep a watching brief on the scheme. Does it therefore exhibit the characteristics that would be expected of an early eighteenth-century organisation?

The answer to this question must be in the affirmative because although, as Conway states 'military expenditure boosted state apparatus and its capacity for action' the state also 'showed not the least qualm in drawing on private spheres or attracting the collaboration of other institutions if the objective could be achieved more efficiently'.⁹ The pension, in fact, shows both of these characteristics, though not precisely in the positive

⁷ C. Storrs, (ed.), *The Fiscal-Military State in Eighteenth Century Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009); S. Conway, *War, State and Society in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: OUP, 2006); J. Brewer & E. Hellmuth (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford: OUP, 1999); J. Brewer, *The Sinews of Power, War, Money and the English State 1688-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); R.F. Sanchez, *War, State and Development. Fiscal-Military States in the Eighteenth Century* (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2007).

⁸ Fundamentally all government activity from the late seventeenth century rested upon 'the financial revolution' as explained by Dickson and Roseveare and its further amplification by Brewer.

⁹ S. Conway & R.T. Sanchez (eds), *The Spending of States - Military expenditure during the long eighteenth century: patterns, organisation and consequences, 1650-1815* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2011), p. 17); H.V. Bowen & A. Gonzalez (eds), *Mobilizing Resources for War: Britain and Spain at Work during the Early Modern Period* (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2006).

manner in which Conway envisages them. Having sprung unplanned from an institution whose responsibilities were considered likely to be quite small and exclusively to be dealt with in-house, the legitimate expectations of soldiers, and perhaps the fear of the government if it failed satisfactorily to meet them, led to an unanticipated expansion of demand, the detailed provision of which was entirely outside the capabilities of the state when it arose. The records of the decade after 1713 therefore show a scheme in evolution whose execution was initially improvised.

The pension can be seen as an excellent example of the adaptation of the principles of the contractor state to the requirements of a widespread but small-scale operation. Although central government had, as a result of the Glorious Revolution, acquired many of the reins of executive direction and, in a financial sense, all of the control, the expansion of its human resources to enable it practically to apply that control lagged significantly behind. Having created, or at least by its neglect encouraged, a system to spring up out of necessity, government was obliged to surrender the central purpose of its function - the payment of the relief - into the hands of unofficial agents - the dealers. The pension is not therefore an example of the contractor state in operation as such because no contract or any other form of supervision or accountability existed between the dealers and the government. The arrangements were, until 1755, entirely conducted on the basis of personal agreements between grasping commercial interests and impotent, and in many cases, unworldly recipients. This, of course, subjected the arrangements, at the very least to variability and at worst to gross abuse, but as we have seen, it was several decades before any action was taken to rectify this situation. It is nevertheless true that if the dealers had not stepped into the breach, the good intentions of Charles II would probably not have been achieved at all. Only in so far as this was yet another function which government farmed out does the Out-pension resemble, in some degree, the workings of the 'Contractor State'.

After 1754, the administration of the Chelsea pension constitutes an excellent example of the deployment onto a regional problem of capabilities that central government had developed for an entirely different purpose - taking money in, not paying it out. However, this extension of administrative apparatus was not projected by order but was done on the basis of the Excise Collectors doing a 'favour' for which they were not paid. In time-honoured fashion, they initially secured recompense for themselves by requiring the Out-pensioners to pay them fees for the delivery of this service. Only when the authorities discovered the practice was official payment regularised. This harks backwards to conventional practices, not forwards towards Government efficiency and the *dictat* of Westminster. What it does show, however, is a characteristic pragmatism coupled with flexibility, and confidence that the staff undertaking the role, would adhere to the rules and conform honestly and efficiently to London's desire, rather than its direction. It shows both the 'reach of government' and the lack of control over that 'reach' simultaneously.

But what of the Out-pensioners themselves? It comes as no surprise that the profession of soldiering took a terrible toll on those who engaged in it. Much work has been done in recent years on the health of the Military and the efforts that were made to improve it,¹⁰ but this research is often presented either in the form of grand schemes for hospitals or

¹⁰ E.G. von Arni, *Hospital Care and the British Standing Army, 1660-1714* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006); M. McCrae, *Saving the Army. The Life of Sir John Pringle* (Edinburgh: Birlinn Ltd, 2014); P. Kopperman, (Ed.) 'Regimental Practice' by John Buchanan, M.D., *An Eighteenth Century Medical Diary and Manual* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012); G.L. Hudson, (ed), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* Welcome Series in the History of Medicine, (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2007); E. Charters, *Disease, War and the Imperial State, The Welfare of the British Armed Forces during the Seven Years War* (London: Chicago University Press, 2014).

worthy efforts towards amelioration against a background of complete incomprehension of the real causes of disease and significant ignorance of how the human body worked. Though this dissertation is not intended to add directly to either of those arguments, it does present a major statistical examination of the incidence of wounds, injuries and illnesses with which the Army had to deal as best it could. It also contributes to the research on the incidence of disability, age and patterns of employment, and reinforces the established view that for the labouring classes the continuance of work into old age was essential, however inappropriate an occupation soldiering might seem for the elderly. It therefore provides context to the work of Turner, Ottaway and the numerous authors on the Poor Law.

In respect of a very limited portion of the early eighteenth-century working population within a particular profession, this research presents the most detailed survey that can be achieved. It attempts to provide not merely information, but also some insight into the life of the British common soldier of the period during and after his service. It is a view of a special group, some of whose attributes, particularly after returning to civilian life, would have been typical of all of their fellows. It posits that through their suffering, their discipline and their service, the Chelsea Out-pensioners were truly 'meritorious objects of the Royal Bounty'.

Appendices

Int-1 Secretaries-at-War 1683-1755	330
2-1 Soldiers lodging their discharge certificates and recommendations to the Royal Hospital at the War Office 1705-1712.	331
3-1 Dates of the Chelsea Commissioners' Examination Boards with the total number per year.	337
5-1 Reasons for Discharge - Cavalry	343
5-2 Reasons for Discharge - Foot Guards	347
5-3 Reasons for Discharge - Marching Foot	351
5-4 Reasons for Discharge - Marines	355
6-1 Dates of payment of the Out-pension, 1713-1755.	357
8-1 Reform of the Out-pension payment system.	361
8-2 Idea of a scheme to be enacted for the relief of the Out-pensioners of Chelsea from the oppression of money lenders by a new plan of payments of the Out Pension.	365
8-3 List of Excise Collections, 1764-5.	367
9-1 List of Trades professed by soldiers before enlistment.	369
9-2 List of Trades ranked according to the numbers of soldiers who professed them.	381

Appendix Introduction - 1

Secretaries-at-War 1683 - 1755

William Blathwayt	August 1683
Henry St. John, Lord Bolingbroke	April 1704
Sir Robert Walpole	February 1708
George Granville, Lord Lansdowne	September 1710
Sir William Windham	June 1712
Francis Gwyn	August 1713
William Pulteney, Earl of Bath	September 1714
James Craggs, Jnr	April 1717
C. Wandesford, Viscount Castlecomer	March 1718
Robert Pringle	May 1718
George Treby	December 1718
Hon. Henry Pelham	April 1724
Sir William Strickland	June 1730
Sir William Yonge	May 1735
Henry Fox	April 1746
William Wildman, Viscount Barrington	October 1755

Appendix 2-1

Soldiers lodging their discharge certificates and recommendations to the Royal Hospital at the War Office 1705-1712 compiled from the Secretary-at-War's Out-letters (TNA, WO 4) notifying the Chelsea Commissioners.

No = number, CumMth = Cumulative by month, CumAn = Cumulative annually, Total = the total over the entire period.

Folio	Date	No	CumMth	CumAn	Total
-------	------	----	--------	-------	-------

WO4/3

Starts at 20th May 1704. There are no discharge lists until

193	22.3.05				'Inclosed petitions & certificates'
-----	---------	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

WO4/4

3	18.9.05	2			
39	19.11.05	2			
51	10.12.05	18			
66	17.12.05	2			
71	21.12.05	5			
84	29.12.05	5		34	
90	5.1.06	several			
111	12.2.06	several			
123	19.1.06	2			
128	23.1.06	several			
146	6.2.06	14			
150	7.2.06	several			
157	13.2.06	8			
159	14.2.06	6			
173	22.2.06	5			
179	25.2.06	4			
181	27.2.06	4	43		
188	4.3.06	1			
203	22.3.06	2			
215	27.3.06	1	4		
220	1.4.06	5			
222	8.4.06	1			
229	17.4.06	7			
238	29.4.06	6	19		
243	6.5.06	5			
252	15.5.06	7			
264	25.5.06	2	14		
287	15.6.06	2			
289	19.6.06	1			
298	25.6.06	3			
300	28.6.06	3	9		
307	4.7.06	2			

317	10.7.06	1		
323	18.7.06	5		
329	23.7.06	1	9	
331	1.8.06	8		
332	2.8.06	1		
WO4/5				
3	17.8.06	1		
4	24.8.06	1	11	
17	28.9.06	1	1	
20	1.10.06	15		
30	23.10.06	31		
39	28.10.06	1		
43	31.10.06	3	50	
71	21.11.06	1		
75	24.11.06	9	10	
82	3.12.06	1		
89	10.12.06	36		
94	11.12.06	37		
95	11.12.06	50		
97	13.12.06	6		
98	14.12.06	7		
101	18.12.06	4		
103	20.12.06	6	147	317
112	2.1.07	9		
118	9.1.07	10		
123	15.1.07	7		
127	18.1.07	2		
127	20.1.07	3		
131	22.1.07	6		
137	29.1.07	3	40	
143	11.2.07	4		
148	15.2.07	some		
152	19.2.07	2		
154	19.2.07	3		
158	24.2.07	2	11+	
172	5.3.07	1		
174	6.3.07	1		
177	10.3.07	7		
182	13.3.07	3		
188	17.3.07	6		
191	31.3.07	4	22	
212	16.4.07	8		
216	25.4.07	3	11	
226	2.5.07	2		
228	5.5.07	several		
237	12.5.07	7		
249	19.5.07	17		
254	28.5.07	9	35+	
259	4.6.07	14		
267	11.6.07	2		

269	19.6.07	14	30	
284	4.7.07	14		
294	11.7.07	34		
305	22.7.07	2	50	
313	9.8.07	2		
333	30.8.07	4	6	
WO4/6				
2	2.9.07	1		
10	10.9.07	6		
19	26.9.07	6		
20	30.9.07	2	15	
26	7.10.07	1		
27	16.10.07	29		
37	31.10.07	8	38	
39	4.11.07	19		
40	5.11.07	15		
44	7.11.07	43		
46	11.11.07	22		
47	11.11.07	1		
51	17.11.07	11		
57	25.11.07	5	116	
60	1.12.07	14		
62	3.12.07	10		
69	10.12.07	5		
75	20.12.07	7		
79	24.12.07	6	42	416
87	6.1.08	18		
109	24.1.08	3	21	
113	2.2.08	3		
121	11.2.08	number not given		
125	20.2.08	2		
127	24.2.08	6		
WO4/7				
1	26.2.08	5		
6	28.2.08	6	22	
37	17.3.08	8		
47	22.3.08	4	12	
63	13.4.08	2		
67	16.4.08	3		
85	21.4.08	41	46	
115	4.5.08	7		
127	13.5.08	48		
140	20.5.08	3		
142	26.5.08	17	75	
152	3.6.08	8		
170	17.6.08	5		
184	24.6.08	7	20	

198	1.7.08	7		
215	8.7.08	8		
237	22.7.08	5		
249	29.7.08	10	30	
257	4.8.08	6		
279	26.8.08	5	11	
303	9.9.08	4		
313	16.9.08	11		
324	23.9.08	5		
WO4/8				
3	30.9.08	6	26	
16	14.10.08	7		
21	21.10.08	2	9	
37	11.11.08	4		
41	18.11.08	5	9	
52	2.12.08	10		
56	16.12.08	5	15	296
74	6.1.09	12		
86	20.1.09	12		
89	27.1.09	20	44	
97	3.2.09	14		
103	10.2.09	13		
116	20.2.09	6		
123	25.2.09	9	42	
137	3.3.09	9		
147	10.3.09	20		
149	11.3.09	10		
159	16.3.09	61		
195	31.3.09	165	265	
252	14.4.09	14		
281	28.4.09	23	37	
304	4.5.09	14		
322	12.5.09	15		
336	20.5.09	14	43	
WO4/9				
27	9.6.09	29		
40	16.6.09	49		
56	22.6.09	25		
69	30.6.09	34	137	
75	6.7.09	37		
101	13.7.09	12		
108	21.7.09	16		
115	27.7.09	16	81	
125	4.8.09	24		
129	10.8.09	10		
135	18.8.09	14		
142	25.8.09	18	66	
151	1.9.09	37		
161	8.9.09	29		

171	14.9.09	18		
179	22.9.09	75		
186	29.9.09	9	168	
203	6.10.09	17		
215	13.10.09	39		
238	26.10.09	14	70	
241	3.11.09	14		
243	10.11.09	55		
249	24.11.09	27	96	
257	1.12.09	43		
262	8.12.09	26		
270	15.12.09	26		
296	22.12.09	107	202	1,251

301	4.1.10	46		
321	27.1.10	133	179	
337	9.2.10	57		
352	16.2.10	26	83	
367	2.3.10	23		
380	9.3.10	41		
406	23.3.10	33	97	

No reports in April & May 1710.

WO4/11

78	8.6.10	257		
91	15.6.10	37		
105	22.6.10	56		
112	29.6.10	51	401	
121	6.7.10	40		
134	20.7.10	60	100	
146	4.8.10	71		
159	24.8.10	56	127	

WO4/10

8	26.10.10	70	70	
28	23.11.10	38	38	
50	7.12.10	82		
61	14.12.10	23		
71	21.12.10	14	119	1,215

92-3	4.1.11	113		
139	25.1.11	43	156	
175	8.2.11	40	40	

No reports for most of February and all of the months to late August 1711.

WO4/12

240	30.8.11	16	16	
-----	---------	----	----	--

No reports for September, October and most of November 1711.

WO4/13

5	22.11.11	19		
13	29.11.11	60	79	
22	6.12.11	136		
37	20.12.11	53	189	380

No reports for January to June 1712.

WO4/14

18	10.7.12	10		
24	29.7.12	27	37	
59	14.8.12	32	32	
160	25.10.12	62	62	
162	6.11.12	117		
174	13.11.12	111		
176	20.11.12	52		
186	27.11.12	56	336	3,909

WO4/15, 16 and 17 contain no invalid lists.

Appendix 3-1

Dates of the Chelsea Commissioners' Examination Boards with the total number per year.

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
1715										3 rd & 5 th	7 th		2*
1716	31 st	4 th , 11 th	14 th , 19 th	18 th , 21 st , 28 th	12 th	5 th , 9 th , 21 st	9 th , 13 th , 24 th					3 rd , 10 th , 19 th , 21 st	19
1717	9 th	6 th ,			15 th , 22 nd	7 th	12 th , 17 th				18 th , 19 th , 25 th	16 th , 17 th , 20 th 21 st , 23 rd	15
1718	7 th , 9 th , 11 th , 27 th , 31 st	5 th , 13 th	17 th	21 st , 25 th	16 th							13 th , 22 nd	13
1719	12 th , 19 th			8 th , 11 th , 16 th , 17 th , 22 nd , 25 th , 28 th , 30 th								23 rd	12
1720	19 th ,		14 th ,				9 th , 11 th , 21 st				14 th	12 th	7
1721	9 th		31 st		16 th , 23 rd	15 th	21 st		13 th , 14 th			15 th , 18 th	10

1722		14 th , 15 th		17 th , 21 st	9 th , 11 th		2 nd , 12 th , 13 th , 21 st			16 th , 18 th , 25 th	14 th	6 th , 13 th , 20 th	17
1723	26 th	28 th	9 th , 12 th	5 th	24 th		12 th			16 th , 23 rd		19 th	10
1724		11 th , 14 th		22 nd	15 th	25 th	2 nd , 28 th	6 th			10 th , 12 th	11 th	11
1725		6 th		20 th , 27 th	4 th	1 st	30 th				30 th		6
1726		10 th		20 th , 23 rd	6 th	3 rd	21 st		28 th	25 th		14 th	9
1727	9 th		28 th	14 th	19 th		11 th	1 st , 10 th		31 st	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 7 th , 20 th	19 th	14
1728	12 th , 19 th		18 th , 20 th	30 th	1 st , 28 th	5 th , 19 th		5 th , 8 th			7 th , 8 th		13
1729	3 rd , 10 th		14 th , 17 th	18 th	6 th , 16 th , 20 th	3 rd , 5 th	18 th , 22 nd	15 th			12 th , 13 th	2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , 9 th , 10 th , 16 th , 17 th , 18 th	23
1730	9 th , 10 th , 29 th	5 th , 19 th	17 th	16 th		2 nd			10 th	13 th		9 th , 10 th , 14 th	13
1731		23 rd , 26 th		2 nd , 30 th		15 th	29 th	31 st		15 th , 29 th	24 th		10
1732	11 th	3 rd		14 th	10 th		18 th		29 th		10 th		7
1733		6 th		18 th	1 st , 23 rd	8 th		14 th , 15 th		22 nd			8

1734	19 th		8 th	2 nd		8 th	10 th	27 th			2 nd	18 th , 19 th	9
1735			11 th	24 th , 25 th	13 th , 24 th		24 th , 25 th	12 th		31 st			9
1736	31 st	2 nd , 3 rd , 5 th , 9 th , 10 th , 12 th , 16 th	3 rd , 12 th	22 nd	13 th	23 rd , 24 th , 26 th				5 th , 6 th			17
1737	21 st , 28 th		4 th	7 th	6 th	9 th	18 th , 19 th				1 st		9
1738	18 th , 20 th				10 th		1 st			24 th , 25 th			6
1739	19 th , 20 th		30 th		17 th			31 st	7 th		12 th		7
1740			1 st , 11 th , 12 th , 21 st		15 th	1 st	4 th	12 th			4 th , 6 th , 7 th		11
1741	26 th , 28 th		24 th		28 th	26 th		11 th , 18 th		1 st , 7 th , 8 th	19 th , 26 th	15 th	13
1742			23 rd , 25 th	15 th	7 th , 27 th , 28 th	17 th , 18 th , 24 th	28 th	5 th			3 rd , 4 th	9 th , 11 th	15
1743	25 th , 27 th	24 th		20 th , 29 th	18 th , 25 th	29 th		24 th			9 th , 30 th	14 th	12
1744	3 rd , 6 th , 7 th , 31 st	2 nd	1 st , 6 th	5 th	4 th , 8 th , 24 th	13 th , 14 th	13 th , 14 th , 31 st	2 nd , 21 st , 30 th	18 th		8 th , 26 th	10 th , 12 th , 14 th , 20 th	26

1745	18 th		14 th ,		3 rd , 6 th , 31 st	28 th	2 nd , 30 th		13 th	18 th , 21 st	7 th , 9 th , 12 th , 13 th , 28 th	19 th , 20 th , 23 rd	19
1746	24 th	12 th , 14 th	13 th , 14 th	11 th	14 th , 16 th , 28 th	2 nd , 25 th , 27 th	18 th	6 th	9 th	16 th , 17 th	7 th , 28 th	19 th , 25 th **	20
1747	9 th , 16 th , 21 st , 28 th	27 th		1 st , 29 th	18 th	19 th , 20 th	31 st	17 th		2 nd , 5 th , 7 th	6 th , 9 th , 27 th	2 nd , 18 th	20
1748	6 th , 8 th , 11 th	3 rd , 18 th	16 th , 18 th	4 th , 15 th , 20 th		10 th , 17 th	15 th , 16 th	5 th	28 th , 30 th	3 rd , 7 th	4 th , 11 th , 17 th , 18 th , 21 st , 23 rd , 28 th , 30 th	5 th , 12 th , 14 th , 16 th , 19 th , 23 rd	33
1749	2 nd , 6 th , 11 th , 13 th , 23 rd , 25 th , 27 th	1 st , 8 th , 10 th , 13 th , 23 rd	6 th , 21 st	12 th , 26 th	26 th	2 nd , 30 th	28 th	4 th , 11 th , 16 th		5 th , 9 th , 11 th , 17 th	24 th	19 th	29
1750	31 st			4 th , 11 th	11 th , 15 th	19 th			6 th		21 st		8
1751	16 th			24 th		7 th	15 th			9 th		11 th , 17 th	7

1752			6 th	2 nd		24 th		19 th			20 th	6 th , 13 th	7
1753	10 th , 17 th	8 th	14 th		9 th	13 th		8 th		3 rd	1 st , 14 th	7 th	11
1754	9 th	27 th			1 st	14 th		16 th	6 th	3 rd	1 st , 29 th	18 th	10
1755	9 th		21 st			3 rd , 27 th			12 th	29 th		8 th	7
	Jan	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	

* Although two dates are given in October 1715, it is not clear from the register which men were examined on which days. The entry may have been retrospective and cumulative.

**Having been disbanded on 23rd December 1746, the men pensioned from the 3rd and 4th Troops of Horse Guards were taken onto the registers without examination with effect from 25th December 1746 in accordance with the Secretary-at-War's letter of 8th January 1747.

Appendix 5-1 Reasons for Discharge - Cavalry

The table shows the percentages of **Cavalry** in each year discharged under the following general headings with the percentage of those rejected for pension. In addition a line is added to show the percentages of those whose injuries were caused by their own or their comrades' horses. Below Dismissed is a 'check line' that will equal approximately 100%.

Cause of Discharge	1716	1717	1718	1719	1720	1721	1722	1723	1724	1725	1726
Ill	9.5	10.2	1.3	8.9	4.9	11.1	12.5	10.1	7.8	6.9	11.3
Wounded & ill	2.1	0	10.8	11.4	1.6	8.8	3.8	2.8	7.8	9.3	5.6
Injured & ill	3.2	0	0	2.2	14.7	4.4	2.3	11.5	6.2	6.9	9.4
Injured	26.5	18.3	10.8	14.9	18.0	24.4	21.5	17.3	12.5	16.2	18.8
Wounded only	22.3	30.6	37.8	34.4	32.7	33.3	36.9	36.2	42.1	37.2	32.0
Wounded & injured	10.6	14.2	13.5	9.1	3.2	6.6	2.3	5.7	7.8	9.3	3.7
Wounded & decayed	1.0	0	0	1.1	0	2.2	2.3	0	1.5	0	0
Decayed	1.0	0	0	2.2	1.6	0	2.3	2.8	1.5	0	1.8
Superannuated no longer able to serve	0	2.0	0	0	0	0	10.7	2.8	0	0	3.7
Worn out	14.8	22.4	14.8	4.5	9.8	2.2	4.6	5.7	7.8	6.9	9.4
Dismissed	8.5	2.0	10.8	10.3	13.1	6.6	0.7	4.3	4.6	6.9	3.7
	99.5	99.7	99.8	99.0	99.6	99.6	99.9	99.2	97.6	99.6	99.4
Total in year	94	49	74	87	61	45	130	69	64	43	53
Injured by horse accidents	3.0	10.2	1.3	6.8	13.1	15.5	9.3	20.2	10.9	20.9	20.7

Cause of Discharge	1727	1728	1729	1730	1731	1732	1733	1734	1735	1736	1737
Ill	8.0	9.7	12.3	10.0	8.1	18.1	21.0	16.9	14.2	19.7	15.5
Wounded & ill	4.8	6.1	2.5	5.7	11.7	5.4	2.1	0.8	5.3	3.7	4.8
Injured & ill	6.5	7.0	2.5	9.2	14.7	10.9	7.3	8.0	10.7	3.7	7.7
Injured	8.0	31.8	26.6	22.1	19.6	40.0	34.7	41.0	25.0	49.3	50.4
Wounded only	45.1	28.3	38.9	30.7	32.7	9.0	17.8	14.2	17.8	7.4	10.6
Wounded & injured	12.9	7.9	9.0	12.8	6.5	7.2	6.3	0.8	3.5	3.7	2.9
Wounded & decayed	0	0	0	0.7	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	1.6	0.8	0	1.4	0	1.8	2.1	0	0	2.4	1.9
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	1.6	2.6	1.2	0.7	1.6	3.6	3.1	11.6	5.3	1.2	3.8
Worn out	4.8	2.6	5.8	2.8	1.6	3.6	5.2	3.5	10.7	7.4	0
Dismissed	6.5	2.6	0.6	3.5	1.6	0	0	2.6	7.1	1.2	1.9
	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.6	99.7	99.6	99.6	99.4	99.6	99.7	99.5
Total in year	62	113	154	140	61	55	95	112	56	81	103
Injured by horse accidents	12.9	33.6	27.5	30.7	24.5	34.5	29.0	40.1	40.0	37.0	40.7

Cause of Discharge	1738	1739	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748
Ill	19.6	14.2	21.9	25.8	30.5	35.3	43.0	42.7	48.4	48.7	41.6
Wounded & ill	1.8	3.5	0	2.3	1.0	5.3	1.9	1.7	1.3	0	1.6
Injured & ill	7.1	16.0	19.5	10.5	11.5	5.3	6.2	2.5	0.4	1.9	2.3
Injured	58.9	51.7	39.0	37.6	35.7	36.9	24.4	18.8	23.6	31.5	16.3
Wounded only	3.5	3.5	4.8	11.7	8.4	9.2	12.9	22.2	17.4	13.7	6.1
Wounded & injured	0	1.7	4.8	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.4	1.7	2.6	0.4	0.7
Wounded & decayed	0	3.5	0	0	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	1.7	0	2.4	1.1	1.0	0.7	1.9	4.2	1.3	0.4	1.6
Superannuated/ no longer able to serve	1.7	1.7	0	4.7	7.3	1.5	1.4	0	0.8	0.4	1.4
Worn out	3.5	0	4.8	0	0	1.5	3.3	5.1	3.5	2.4	13.9
Dismissed	1.7	3.5	2.4	4.7	2.1	3.0	4.3	0.8	0.4	0	14.1
	99.5	99.3	99.6	99.5	99.5	99.4	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.6
Total in year	56	56	41	85	95	130	209	117	224	203	423
Injured by horse accidents	50.9	42.8	24.3	28.2	32.6	29.2	14.3	9.1	6.25	7.7	8.8

Cause of Discharge	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753	1754	1755
Ill	57.2	51.8	54.7	59.2	48.5	54.9	47.1
Wounded & ill	0.6	0	0	3.7	1.4	5.6	0
Injured & ill	2.4	0	2.3	1.8	4.4	1.4	5.6
Injured	15.6	33.3	19.0	16.6	22.0	22.5	37.7
Wounded only	5.4	3.7	4.7	0	0	0	3.7
Wounded & injured	0	3.7	2.1	3.7	0	0	0
Wounded & decayed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Superannuated/ no longer able to serve	0	0	0	0	1.4	2.8	1.8
Worn out	4.2	7.4	9.5	14.8	22.0	11.2	0
Dismissed	12.6	0	7.1	0	0	1.4	3.7
	99.2	99.9	99.1	99.8	99.7	99.8	99.6
Total in year	166	27	42	54	68	71	53
Injured by horse accidents	4.2	11.1	14.2	5.5	7.3	11.2	24.5

Appendix 5-2 Reasons for Discharge - Foot Guards

The table shows the percentages of **Foot Guards** in each year discharged under the following general headings with the percentage of those rejected for pension. Below Dismissed is a 'check line' that will equal approximately 100%.

Cause of Discharge	1716	1717	1718	1719	1720	1721	1722	1723	1724	1725	1726
Ill	19.2	6.5	8.3	3.2	5.5	10.4	22.2	14.6	10.9	16.3	16.2
Wounded & ill	11.5	5.3	6.25	0	11.0	6.0	6.9	4.6	7.5	9.0	6.3
Injured & ill	1.9	4.7	4.0	3.2	0	5.2	1.3	5.3	5.6	9.0	6.3
Injured	19.2	16.5	16.6	35.4	33.0	13.0	22.2	20.0	17.0	19.0	13.5
Wounded only	15.3	27.8	39.5	35.4	44.0	38.2	29.1	36.0	28.4	26.3	22.5
Wounded & injured	0	4.7	8.3	6.4	0	10.4	6.9	9.2	9.4	8.1	10.8
Wounded & decayed	0	1.18	0	3.2	0	2.6	2.7	1.5	2.3	0.9	0
Decayed	1.9	4.7	2.0	0	0	1.7	0	3.0	2.3	0	0
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	11.5*	0.59	0	0	0	1.7	1.3	0.7	3.3	0	8.1
Worn out	0	9.4	8.3	6.4	0	4.3	2.7	2.3	10.4	1.8	6.3
Dismissed	17.3	18.3	6.25	6.4	5.5	5.2	0	0.7	1.8	10.0	9.9
	97.8	99.6	99.5	99.6	99.0	98.7	95.3	97.9	98.9	100.4	99.9
Total in year	52	169	48	31	18	115	72	130	211	110	111

* Three men superannuated, plus one a 'miserable object' and pensioned out of humanity and two men who were put on the pension list in order that their widows could receive monies due to them as their entry into pension had been back-dated.

Cause of Discharge	1727	1728	1729	1730	1731	1732	1733	1734	1735	1736	1737
Ill	20.5	13.2	21.1	14.7	23.8	33.8	40.6	27.4	29.5	31.6	24.7
Wounded & ill	11.5	12.3	10.5	7.3	14.9	11.7	5.0	5.4	4.2	6.8	8.2
Injured & ill	8.9	4.1	8.3	13.9	17.9	13.2	16.9	15.3	9.8	13.6	12.9
Injured	16.6	21.4	21.4	28.6	13.4	11.7	22.0	24.1	21.1	21.2	20.0
Wounded only	8.9	14.8	18.9	17.2	7.4	11.7	6.7	10.9	16.9	8.4	7.0
Wounded & injured	6.4	10.7	10.5	7.3	7.4	7.3	5.0	3.2	4.2	5.6	4.7
Wounded & decayed	5.1	2.4	1.5	0	0	4.4	0	3.2	1.4	1.2	3.5
Decayed	0	0.8	0.3	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	2.3
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	5.1	6.6	1.5	4.0	2.9	4.4	0	2.1	4.2	1.2	2.3
Worn out	14.1	9.9	2.7	3.2	8.9	0	0	2.1	5.6	3.6	4.7
Dismissed	2.5	4.1	2.7	2.4	2.9	1.4	3.3	4.3	2.8	4.4	5.8
	99.6	100.3	99.4	99.4	99.5	99.6	100.9	98.0	99.7	98.0	6.1
Total in year	78	121	322	122	67	68	59	91	71	250	85

Cause of Discharge	1738	1739	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748
Ill	41.5	39.4	40.8	36.8	52.6	52.4	50.6	34.4	41.3	45.2	41.1
Wounded & ill	5.6	3.9	4.2	3.1	2.6	1.2	1.2	0.6	2.2	0	2.3
Injured & ill	12.3	11.8	14.0	17.8	16.0	12.1	4.5	1.3	4.5	4.7	4.4
Injured	19.1	17.1	15.4	23.1	15.1	18.2	11.0	12.8	16.0	22.3	14.8
Wounded only	1.1	6.5	0	1.0	2.6	2.4	1.9	41.2	19.5	5.2	5.9
Wounded & injured	4.4	2.6	0	4.2	1.7	1.2	0	1.3	0	0.4	0.6
Wounded & decayed	0	0	1.4	0	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
Decayed	0	0	1.4	3.1	0	0	0.6	0	2.2	0	2.3
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	4.4	1.3	1.4	3.1	1.7	1.2	5.1	0.6	5.7	5.2	1.6
Worn out	7.8	5.2	9.8	5.2	2.6	8.5	22.0	6.7	5.7	14.7	10.5
Dismissed	3.3	11.8	11.2	2.1	3.5	2.4	2.5	0.6	0	0.9	15.6
	99.5	99.6	99.6	99.5	99.2	99.6	99.4	99.5	97.1**	98.6***	99.3
Total in year	89	76	71	95	112	82	154	148	87	210	472

** The cause of discharge of one man not legible as page was trimmed and text missing.

*** one man 'did not appear' when called for examination – dead or too ill.

Cause of Discharge	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753	1754	1755
Ill	49.6	68.6	67.4	66.6	73.7	72.6	75.6
Wounded & ill	2.5	3.6	1.2	1.8	2.5	0	0
Injured & ill	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.7	3.3	1.5	0
Injured	13.9	7.2	16.8	16.6	14.4	13.2	8.9
Wounded only	3.3	4.8	4.8	0.9	1.6	3.1	5.1
Wounded & injured	0.2	1.2	0	0	0	0.7	1.2
Wounded & decayed	0	1.2	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	1.0	2.4	2.4	2.7	1.6	1.5	0
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worn out	13.9	4.8	2.4	7.4	1.6	5.4	3.8
Dismissed	18.6	3.6	2.4	0.9	0.8	1.5	5.1
	98.3	99.8	99.8	99.6	98.9	99.5	99.7
Total in year	387	83	83	108	118	128	78

Appendix 5-3 Reasons for Discharge - Marching Foot

The table shows showing the percentages of **Marching Foot** in each year discharged under the following general headings with the percentage of those rejected for pension. Below Dismissed is a 'check line' that will equal approximately 100%.

Cause of Discharge	1716	1717	1718	1719	1720	1721	1722	1723	1724	1725	1726
Ill	7.0	6.9	3.3	7.6	7.5	5.6	5.4	7.5	7.2	5.8	10.6
Wounded & ill	1.4	3.0	2.8	2.9	7.5	6.3	5.4	4.7	0.8	1.9	6.5
Injured & ill	2.8	0.76	1.0	2.3	3.2	5.6	2.2	2.7	7.2	5.8	9.0
Injured	22.4	21.5	20.3	22.4	22.5	21.4	19.0	14.3	25.8	14.5	27.8
Wounded only	26.1	33.0	35.5	27.8	32.2	36.4	42.7	41.0	33.8	31.0	27.8
Wounded & injured	7.4	10.7	10.1	13.6	13.9	14.0	10.9	15.0	10.4	9.7	6.5
Wounded & decayed	0	2.3	3.3	0.5	0	2.8	1.8	2.0	0.8	1.9	0.8
Decayed	0	0.76	0.5	0.5	1.0	1.8	0.4	1.3	0.8	0.9	2.4
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	7.9	3.0	0.5	2.3	2.1	0	1.3	4.1	4.0	5.8	1.6
Worn out	12.6	8.4	9.0	6.5	8.6	1.8	9.0	4.1	4.0	10.6	4.9
Dismissed	12.6	8.4	12.9	11.8	1.0	2.8	1.3	2.0	4.0	11.6	1.6
	100.2	98.7	99.2	97.9	99.5	98.5	99.4	98.7	98.8	99.5	99.5
Total in year	216	130	177	169	93	107	220	146	124	103	122

Cause of Discharge	1727	1728	1729	1730	1731	1732	1733	1734	1735	1736	1737
Ill	9.5	5.2	3.4	7.1	13.7	14.1	12.8	23.1	10.0	18.3	18.8
Wounded & ill	6.6	4.1	3.5	6.5	5.8	6.2	4.7	5.7	0	7.6	6.2
Injured & ill	5.2	6.4	11.2	11.8	11.1	12.4	14.2	13.7	3.4	11.3	13.9
Injured	17.8	37.0	38.9	32.4	38.5	27.1	31.9	30.4	22.6	26.1	27.3
Wounded only	32.0	16.7	19.9	19.1	12.4	14.1	13.3	11.5	24.7	17.8	13.9
Wounded & injured	16.5	13.0	12.9	10.9	9.1	8.4	6.1	5.7	6.5	8.9	8.9
Wounded & decayed	0.9	1.7	0.8	2.9	1.3	1.1	0.4	2.1	1.3	1.5	0.8
Decayed	0.6	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.9	1.1	1.4	2.1	4.3	3.0	4.0
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	2.6	5.0	1.5	0.8	0	3.9	2.8	0.7	8.2	1.2	0.8
Worn out	6.2	7.7	5.5	5.2	3.9	10.7	11.4	3.6	17.8	2.2	3.5
Dismissed	1.3	1.5	0.7	1.2	1.9	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.8	1.5	1.3
	99.2	99.4	99.5	99.3	99.6	99.6	99.4	99.3	99.3	99.4	99.4
Total in year	303	453	703	474	153	177	210	138	230	627	223

Cause of Discharge	1738	1739	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748
Ill	15.7	20.1	32.6	28.9	31.9	27.7	31.8	23.8	22.5	31.6	33.4
Wounded & ill	6.6	4.8	5.4	2.3	3.3	3.5	1.2	1.2	0.7	0.9	1.3
Injured & ill	9.0	13.7	12.5	12.1	10.0	6.4	6.2	2.0	2.2	3.4	3.0
Injured	35.7	39.5	21.7	21.9	28.9	19.8	16.9	18.0	30.9	32.2	21.9
Wounded only	11.5	4.8	4.8	18.2	8.4	9.0	7.8	41.2	23.4	19.6	15.2
Wounded & injured	6.6	3.2	3.8	1.4	2.1	2.3	0.7	1.2	3.6	0.1	0.8
Wounded & decayed	0	1.6	0.5	0.4	1.2	0	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.1
Decayed	1.8	1.6	2.1	2.8	1.6	0.5	2.1	0.5	1.2	0.8	0.7
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	0	6.4	11.9	7.9	7.5	20.7	10.1	3.3	2.9	3.4	3.4
Worn out	10.9	4.0	1.0	3.2	3.3	8.7	21.5	6.8	10.9	6.6	10.5
Dismissed	1.2	0	2.7	0.4	0.8	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.8	9.2
	99.0	99.7	99.0	99.5	99.0	99.4	99.5	99.3	99.4	99.4	99.5
Total in year	165	124	184	214	238	342	709	775	983	732	1319

Cause of Discharge	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753	1754	1755
Ill	36.6	52.0	40.5	48.6	58.7	52.1	45.3
Wounded & ill	0.7	4.5	0.9	2.1	1.0	0.7	2.5
Injured & ill	1.56	2.5	1.9	1.0	2.0	3.8	1.0
Injured	8.5	16.6	24.7	28.4	17.0	23.3	21.1
Wounded only	4.7	2.5	5.9	7.1	6.7	5.8	8.2
Wounded & injured	0.6	0.5	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.1	2.0
Wounded & decayed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	1.08	1.0	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.1	2.5
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	6.0	2.0	1.9	1.0	1.5	0.7	1.0
Worn out	23.3	15.1	16.8	8.1	11.8	11.6	15.9
Dismissed	16.3	3.0	4.9	0	0	0	0
	99.3	99.7	99.3	99.5	100	100	99.5
Total in year	1662	198	101	183	194	257	194

Appendix 5-4 Reasons for Discharge - Marines

The table shows showing the percentages of **Marine Regiments of Foot** in each year discharged under the following general headings with the percentage of those rejected for pension. Below Dismissed is a 'check line' that will equal approximately 100%.

Cause of Discharge	1740	1741	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748
Ill	75.0	19.2	26.7	21.7	29.5	31.8	31.0	35.8	21.0
Wounded & ill	0	0	2.3	5.1	1.1	2.2	1.3	0.7	1.0
Injured & ill	0	7.6	10.4	7.6	12.5	3.4	5.4	5.9	5.2
Injured	25.0	23.0	41.8	48.7	40.9	44.3	47.2	51.4	33.9
Wounded only	0	46.1	10.4	6.4	5.6	13.6	7.4	2.9	5.8
Wounded & injured	0	0	0	2.5	2.2	0	1.3	0.7	0.6
Wounded & decayed	0	0	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	0	1.5
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	0	0	0	0	2.2	0	0.6	0.7	1.0
Worn out	0	0	1.1	5.1	2.2	2.2	2.7	0.7	3.0
Dismissed	0	3.8	5.8	2.5	3.4	2.2	0	0.7	26.3
	100	99.7	99.6	99.6	99.4	99.7	97.9	99.7	99.3
Total in year	4	26	86	78	88	88	148	134	460

Cause of Discharge	1749	1750	1751	1752	1753
Ill	20.0	14.2	20.0	35.7	50.0
Wounded & ill	2.8	4.7	0	7.1	50.0
Injured & ill	6.7	9.5	0	0	0
Injured	31.7	38.0	60.0	28.5	0
Wounded only	6.7	11.9	0	14.2	0
Wounded & injured	1.9	4.7	0	0	0
Wounded & decayed	0	0	0	0	0
Decayed	0	0	0	0	0
Superannuated, no longer able to serve	0.9	0	0	7.1	0
Worn out	12.5	4.7	0	0	0
Dismissed	17.3	9.5	20.0	7.1	0
	100	97.2	100	99.7	100
Total in year	104	42	5	14	2

Appendix 6-1 Dates of payment of the Out-pension

The year dates have been adjusted so that the year is deemed to start on 1st January not on 25th March.

Pensions were intended to be paid six months in arrears. The pension covering the period June to December 1723 was supposed, therefore, to be paid in June 1724. The column 'Time after end of pension period' records the number of weeks between the last date of the payment period and the date when the pension was actually paid. The Column 'Time after due date' records the delay after the expiration of six months at which time the pension should have been paid.

Start date is the first day on which Out-pensioners could collect their pensions.

Time from Start Date is the total period from the beginning of the period for which payment was being made, up to actual date upon which the payment was made, ie. from 25th June 1712 until 28th September 1713 equals 15 months and one week.

Year	Start Date	From	To	Period of Pension Arrears	Time after end of pension period	Time from start date	London Gazette
1713	28 Sept	25.6.1712	24.6.1713	12 mths	14 wks	15 mths 1 wk	5147
1714	None						
1715	30 Oct	24.6.1713	24.6.1715	24 mths	19 wks	28 mths 2 wks	5367
1716							
1717							
1718	2 Jan	25.6.1715	24.12.1717?	30 mths ?	9 days	30 mths 1 wk	5599
1718							
1719	10 Mar	?25.12.1717	24.12.1718?	12 mths	11 wks	14 mths 2 wks	5727
1720	7 Mar	25.12.1718?	24.6.1719	6 mths	39 wks	14 mths 2 wk	5826
1721	13 Mar	25.6.1719	24.6.1720	12 mths	37 wks	20 mths 2 wk	5935
1722	19 Feb	25.6.1720	24.6.1721	12 mths	34 wks	19 mths 2 wks	6630
1723	12 Mar	25.6.1721	24.6.1722	12 mths	37 wks	20mths 2 wks	6142
1723	25 Nov	25.6.1722	24.6.1723	12 mths	22 wks	17 mths	6216
1724	4 Aug	25.6.1723	24.12.1723	6 mths	32 wks	13 mths 1 wk	6285
1725	19 Apr	25.12.1723	24.12.1724	12 mths	16 wks	15 mths 3 wks	6358
1725	14 Dec	25.12.1724	24.6.1725	6 mths	25 wks	12 mths	6428
1726	25 Oct	25.6.1725	24.12.1725	6 mths	44 wks	16 mths	6520
1727	5 June	25.12.1725	24.12.1726	12 mths	24 wks	17 mths 1 wk	6584
1728	17 June	25.12.1726	24.12.1727	12 mths	24 wks	17 mths 1 wk	6678
1729	19 May	25.12.1727	24.12.1728	12 mths	21 wks	17 mths	6775
1730	24 Feb	25.12.1728	24.6.1729	6 mths	34 wks	14 mths	6856
1730	21 July	25.6.1729	24.12.1729	6 mths	30 wks	13 mths	6896
1731	14 May	25.12.1729	24.6.1730	6 mths	48 wks	16 mths	6982

1731	23 Aug	25.6.1730	24.12.1730	6 mths	35 wks	13 mths 5 wks	7010
1732	26 Apr	25.12.1730	24.12.1731	12 mths	18 wks	16 mths 1 wk	7082
1733	5 June	25.12.1731	24.12.1732	12 mths	24 wks	17 mths 2 wks	7196
1734	23 May	25.12.1732	24.12.1733	12 mths	22 wks	17 mths	7295
1735	22 May	25.12.1733	24.12.1734	12 mths	22 wks	17 mths	7401
1736	26 May	25.12.1734	24.12.1735	12 mths	22 wks	17 mths	7506
1737	17 May	25.12.1735	24.12.1736	12 mths	21 wks	17 mths	7608
1738	4 May	25.12.1736	24.12.1737	12 mths	19 wks	16 mths 2 wks	7694
1739	11 June	25.12.1737	24.12.1738	12 mths	24 wks	17 mths 2 wks	7810
1740	12 Aug	25.12.1738	24.12.1739	12 mths	33 wks	19 mths 3 wk	7932
1741	7 July	25.12.1737	24.12.1740	12 mths	28 wks	18 mths 2 wks	8027
1742	14 July	25.12.1740	24.12.1741	12 mths	29 wks	18 mths 3 wks	8133
1743	1 July	25.12.1741	24.12.1742	12 mths	27 wks	18 mths 1 wk	8232
1744	12 June	25.12.1742	24.12.1743	12 mths	25 wks	17 mths 3 wks	8332
1745	28 June	25.12.1743	24.12.1744	12 mths	27 wks	18 mths	8442
1746	22 July	25.12.1744	24.12.1745	12 mths	30 wks	19 mths	8550
1747	24 Mar	25.12.1745	24.6.1746	6 mths	39 wks	14 mths 3 wks	8621
1747	1 Sept	25.6.1746	24.12.1746	6 mths	36 wks	14 mths 1 wk	8671
1748	5 July	25.12.1746	24.12.1747	12 mths	28 wks	18 mths 2 wks	8757
1749	20 July	25.12.1747	24.12.1748	12 mths	30 wks	19 mths	8866
1750	26 June	25.12.1748	24.12.1749	12 mths	26 wks	18 mths	8962
1751	27 June	25.12.1749	24.12.1750	12 mths	26 wks	18 mths	9067
1752	4 June	25.12.1750	24.12.1751	12 mths	23 wks	17 mths 2 wks	9167
1753	26 June	25.12.1751	24.12.1752	12 mths	26 wks	18 mths	9277
1754	2 July	25.12.1752	24.12.1753	12 mths	27 wks	18 mths 1 wk	9383
1755	26 June	25.12.1753	24.12.1754	12 mths	26 wks	18 mths	9486

Appendix 8-1

Reform of Out-pension payment system

TNA, Chatham Papers, PRO 30/8/77, f.137 et seq

A letter from an unidentified correspondent in Ireland suggesting how the method of payment of the pension might be improved for the benefit of the Out-pensioners. No date but probably 1752 and filed with other correspondence from that year.

/ indicates end of lines in the original. Spelling and punctuation as in the original.

Sir,

As you are acquainted with officers of distinction in His Majesty's service I do not/ think it improper to Inform you of some very gross abuses committed on the Out Pensioners/ of Chelsea Hospital settled in this Kingdom, and do believe that fraudulent practices of the same nature/ are committed on the Out Pensioners in Great Britain.

When the discharged soldiers pass the Board for want of money to carry them to their/ respective homes, they are obliged to apply to men called Usurers, who advance half a years pension/ for which they stop Annually from Each pensioner £1:4:6 at least, others a good deal more, this/ large stoppage out of £7:12:6 is made on Acct (as they say) of the hazards they run in advancing/ money before it becomes due, & the trouble of receiving & committing it to the Usurers here, so that by ye/ time it reaches the old soldiers hands they are Plundered of a Considerable part. Why there/ should be Usurers there & here to fleece these poor men, and how to remedy this Evil is the question.

I believe the most effectual and surest way would be for the board to appoint a pay master/ in London for all the Out Pensioners, allowing him to stop one Crown from Each Man for Agents fees/ then each man would receive yearly £7:7:6, whereas some of them receive here but £6, others/ £6:2, £6:4, £6:6 or £6:8 at most. Perhaps the pay master would think the above/ stoppage too little for the hazard he would run in advancing so much money, but if the board/ thought proper to advance half a Year, the above Stoppage would be a sufficient reward for his Labour.

Now, Sir, I must mention a fraud of a deeper dye, there are a great many forged Affidavits [shortened to Affits in the text] sent over yearly/ in mens names that have been dead 12 months, 2 years and sometimes longer, which would be a hard matter/ to detect on the other side of the Water, tho Easily done here; the method I would propose & in my humble/ opinion would effectually put a stop to their M [illegible] Cheat for the board to appoint a pay master/ here of Character, and one that knows the Principal Gentlemen & Justices of the Peace where the/ pensioners reside & the said pay master to send the proper Affits over

Every half Year & to be obliged to/ pay the men the full sums he receives for them. Notwithstanding he would be well paid for his trouble/ by the Exchange of money, the Pay master in London to remit the money to the pay master here, & when/ any of the pensioners died. The pay master here to inform the one in London of the man's name, the Regiment he was discharged from & the day of the month he died, as this Method would not tax upon/ the Government but on the contrary a saving by preventing false Affits being sent over, would be so/ great a relief to a large number of men, I make not the least doubt if the case was stated as it really/ is & laid before his Royal Highness the Duke he would think it worthy of his consideration.

There is another fraud I had like to omit, most of the pensioners here are very poor, & as/ many bad economists, which obliges them to go perhaps six weeks before pay day to their Usurers/ to borrow half a guinea or three Crowns which the Usurers lend with a seeming reluctance &/ Oblige each poor fellow to spend one Shilling, Eighteen pence or two Shillings of the borrowed/ money in the house before he leaves it, when Pay day Comes the borrowed money is stopped. & a Crown for use, [[Ed. ie. as interest]] so that in fact the poor abused men do not receive £6 Clear out of their/ pensions. What sort of men the Usurers in London are, or how they live I will not take it upon me/ to say, but the Usurers here keep Alehouses & Brandyshops so yt [that] no truth or honesty can be Expected from them. Another thing I must let you into, the Usurers in London have entered into a combination/ to give no more money than what is Mention'd as Above, so that by not having a proper pay master the/ men are obliged to agree with the Usurers upon their own terms. The Usurers here/ have many more ways than what I have told you to distress the worn out men. -----

Suppose 2000 Out pensioners settled in the Severall towns & Counties in Great Britain &/ Ireland A Crown a man stoppage for Agents fees would come to £500 a year, and the least that

End of first page folio 137 recto

Each pensioner would receive annually more than he does, would be Nineteen Shillings & Six pence/ which is a seventh part more than they receive at present. The Paragraph that says if ye board/ thought proper to Advance half a years pension might be objected against for the Advanced sum/ of 2000 men would Amount to £7625 every half year or thereabouts. I own it is a large sum/ [illegible probably *but*] their not doing it is the cause of the pensioners Applying to Usurers there & here for the(y) Can/ subsist no more than Marching Regiments if they are not paid beforehand. If the board do/ not think it convenient to Advance the above sum, still they have it in their power to be of/ great Benefit to the pensioners here, by obliging the Usures there to make less stoppages & remit/ the money to one person here that may be Confided in of the Boards Appointing -----

Another objection might be made against this Scheme, that is the making of two or three/ new Employments, it is true, but no body is

hurt by it but the Usurers, the Government give no salaries/ & will not be imposed on by forged Affits, and the old Soldiers will have Justice done them/ You see I have laid open black Villainous facts that Cry aloud for redress.

Since my writing the Above, I am informed by some of the pensioners living in the/ Remote parts of the Kingdom, that they never receive more than £5:10 – so that £2:2:6 is deducted from them Annually.

I will suppose the Board will not, & the appointed pay master cannot advance the above/ Sum £7625. There will be men ready Enough to do it when they know their money will/ be Well Secured, & have Reason to Imagine the Interest will be punctually paid, the Interest for half a year of £7625 at 4 pr C [percent] is £152:10, this Interest to be raised by a Stoppage of 1s 6d/ a man Every half year, & this Stoppage to be made by the Pay Master, 1s/6d a man at 2000 men is/ £150 which will be but £2:10 short of the half Years Interest at the rate of 4 pr C then the/ men Will receive Annually £7:4:6 which is more money by 16/6 than the highest paid/ pensioners receive at present & £1:4:6 more than many of them receive.

The mens full pay annually		£7:12:6
Stoppage for Agents fees	5s	
For Interest money	<u>3s</u>	
	8	8
		£7:4:6

If 4 pr C is thought too little Interest add 1 pr C more & make a larger stoppage/ from the men, the Interest of £7625 at 5 pr C for half a year is £190:12:6 the Stop/ of 2 Shillings a man from 2000 for half a year is [£] 200 which would be £9:7:6 more/ that the Interest money, and the men would receive annually £7:3:6 –

The mens full pay annually		£7:12:6
Stoppage for Agents fees	5s	
For Interest money	<u>4s</u>	
	9	9
		£7:3:6

From the Knowledge the author has of Ireland, he has learned the above/ particulars mostly from the Justices of the Peace & the Pensioners.

You are to observe the Usurers pretend they run great risqué in Advancing of/ money in case any of the pensioners should die before pay day, which I deny; for they never/ make it known until they have received the ensuing half year (I speak of the Usurers on this/ side the Water) so that it constantly falls upon the government as it must necessarily do/ if the above scheme should take place for the pensioners receive six months Advance/ & some of them lives perhaps but three, I

believe you would think it severe to stop [illegible]/ the lender or pay master the three months the pensioner did not live. [[ie. to expect the paymaster to recover the over-payment in respect of the time during which the pensioner was dead, or to dishonour the debt owed to the lenders aforementioned in respect of the time following the pensioner's death]]

End of page 2 f. 137 verso

When a pensioner applies to an Usurer for a years Advance, he never receives more than / £5 which s £2:12:6 short of his pension.

I am well assured that 6, 12, 14 nay 24 years after some of the pensioners have died/ the pension hath been received by forged Certificates -/

NB. the above paragraph which would oblige the usurers in London to Employ but one / Pay Master here would be the best method I can think of to prevent forgeries -----/

The highest paid pensioner in Great Britain receives but £6:6 out of £7:12:6.

END

Appendix 8-2

British Library Add Ms 33053 f. 87

Idea of a scheme to be enacted for the relief of the Out-pensioners of Chelsea from the oppression of money lenders by a new plan of payments of the Out Pension

1. All assignments of the pension made by any Out-pensioner admitted on the pension from and after 25th of December 1754 to be null and void to all intents and purposes
2. All Out-pensioners admitted on the pension from and after 25th of December 1754 to be paid the pension in advance every half year on Certificates or personal appearance of the half year preceeding
3. An Agent to be appointed by His Majesty to receive the pension half yearly, and to give a proper and final discharge for the same to the Treasurer's Office of Chelsea, on certificates of the half year preceeding as aforesaid, and to remit or pay the same to the Out-pensioners
4. The Auditors of the Imprests to be specially authorised and required to pass and allow in the Treasurer of Chelsea's Accounts the Receipt of the Agent as aforesaid
5. No deduction, stoppage, charge or fee whatever to be made by the said Agent or by any person at the Treasurer's Office or at the Office of the Secretary of Chelsea, from and out of the annual Out Pension of Chelsea
6. Penalties on Agent or other persons offending against this Act
7. All Out-pensioners admitted from and after 25th of December 1754 to receive on their admission in advance the pension for such number of days as shall be to run to the expiration of the current half year
8. All Out-pensioners admitted before 25th of December 1754 to be entitled to receive the pensions by their good and lawfull Attorneys, and the said Out pension is hereby directed to be paid in the same manner it is now, viz. a twelve month pension after the same is become due and not in advance until 25th of December 1755
9. The Paymaster to be authorised and required to deduct and withhold in his hands one shilling in the pound on all moneys applicable to the Out pension, in order that the said sum so withheld may be applied by His Majesty's Warrant to the uses and charges of the new plan of payment

The Poundage on £60,000 will produce £3,000 pr an[um] it is proposed that this fund should be applied by His Majesty's Warrant in the following manner to make the increased charge of the Out pension by a payment in advance about £1,400; by Warrant to the Agent and for his Deputies in Ireland and Scotland and elsewhere £800; to the Deputy Treasurer in Lieu of accustomed fees £400; to the Secretary in Lieu of ditto £200

The Out-pensioner now receives from about £6 down to the wretched pittance of £5: whereas by the above Plan he will receive neat £7 : 4 : 6 and that paid in advance, half yearly without any the least additional expence brought on the public

Annotated on the reverse

Mr. Pitt Paymaster General
X [10th] Oct [illegible but probably] 1753

Appendix 8-3

List of Excise Collections, 1764-5

Barnstable	Essex	Manchester	Taunton
Bath*	Exon	Marlborough	Tiverton
Bedford	Gloucester	Northamptonshire	Wales -
Bristol	Grantham	Northumberland	East
Buckingham	Hampshire	Norwich	Middle
Cambridge	Hereford	Oxfordshire	North
Canterbury	Hertford	Reading	West
Chester	Isle of Wight	Richmond	Westmorland
Cornwall	Leeds	Rochester	Woolhampton*
Coventry*	Lichfield	Salisbury	Worcester
Cumberland	Lincoln	Salop	York
Derby	Liverpool*	Surrey	
Dorset	London	Suffolk	
Durham	Lynn	Sussex	

Source: TNA, CUST48/17, f. 204-205. A similar list - TNA, CUST48/15, f. 432 - dated February 1758 mentions Lancaster and Warwick as collections, but does not include those on the above list marked *.

Appendix 9-1

Trades - Arranged alphabetically with the numbers of men who professed them showing the large variety of occupations undertaken by those who later became soldiers.

Anchor Smith	4
Apothecary	24
Attorney	6
Attorney's Clerk	11
Attorney's apprentice/bound to/served an	3
Attorney, son of an ...	5
Baker	142
Baker's apprentice	5
Barber	176
Barber, son of a	1
Barber-surgeon	4
Bargeman	3
Basket maker	10
Bellows maker	2
Bitt maker (horse bitt)	1
Blacksmith	332
Blacksmith, son of a	4
Blacksmith & Farrier	8
Bleacher, Cloth, linen or hair	16
Block maker (pulley maker)	1
Boatman	2
Boat builder	1
Bonnet maker (Scottish, man's bonnet)	2
Bookbinder	8
Book keeper	3
Book seller	1
Brass founder	13
Brazier	31

Brazier's apprentice	2
Brazier's son	1
Breeches maker	18
Buckskin Breeches maker	6
Brewer	14
Brewer's employee	8
Brick maker	29
Bricklayer	114
Bricklayer's apprentice	4
Bridle cutter	1
Brush maker	5
Buckle maker	46
Builder	2
Butcher	262
Butcher's apprentice	4
Butcher's son	2
Button maker	10
Cabinet maker	18
Cabinet maker's apprentice	1
Calendar man (part of the preparation of cloth, smoothing and flattening, perhaps glazing)	5
Calico printer	1
Callico stamper	1
Cane chair maker	2
Cane Chair maker's apprentice	1
Carman	3
Card maker	10
Carpenter	264
House Carpenter	5
Ship's Carpenter	4
Carrier	9
Carver	5
Carver's apprentice	1
Chaft filer (?) - shaft maker for tools?	1

Chain maker	1
Chair maker	11
Chairman (Sedan chair carrier)	7
Chandler, tallow	46
Chapman	10
Cheese monger	1
Chocolate maker	2
Chorister	1
Clerk	14
Clerk to an attorney	16
Clerk to a Collector of Excise	2
Clerk to a merchant	3
Clock maker	11
Clog maker	7
Cloth Dresser / worker	93
Cloth Dresser's apprentice	2
Clothier	132
Clothier's apprentice	3
Coach builder / smith	5
Coach painter	1
Coachman	16
Cobbler	1
Collar maker (for draught horses)	15
Collector of the Revenue	1
Collier	31
Comb maker	13
Confectioner	6
Cook	9
Cook's apprentice	1
Cooper	97
Cooper's apprentice	2
Copper smith	2
Cordwainer	101
Cork cutter	6
Corker (man who corked / made-watertight ships)	1

Currier	26
Currier's apprentice	2
Cutler	75
Cutler's apprentice	3
Sword cutler	7
Draper	2
Draper of Linen	25
Draper of woollens	2
Distiller	13
Distiller's apprentice	3
Drover	20
Drover's son	1
Dry Salter (food processing)	2
Edge Tool maker	3
Edge Tool maker's apprentice	1
Embroiderer	1
Engraver	2
Excise man	13
Farmer	557
Farmer's servant (labourer)	10
Farmer's son	82
Farrier (smith & farrier)	56
Farrier's apprentice	2
Flax Dresser / Flaxster	43
Fell monger	24
Felt maker	2
File cutter	6
Fisherman	18
Fisherman's son	1
Forester	1
Forge man	3
Founder	13
Brass founder	12
Framework knitter	14
Fruiterer	5

Fuller (wool trade)	13
Furrier	1
Furrier's apprentice	2
Gardener	246
Gardener's apprentice	3
Gardener's labourer	3
Gentleman's companion	1
Glass grinder	15
Glass grinder's apprentice	2
Glass maker	4
Glass maker's apprentice	1
Glazier	25
Glover	89
Glover's apprentice	2
Glove dyer	1
Goldsmith	3
Goldsmith's apprentice	2
Grocer	12
Grocer's apprentice	2
Groom	9
Gun barrel maker	1
Gun lock maker	2
Gunsmith	29
Haberdasher	7
Haberdasher of hardware	1
Hair bleacher	1
Hair merchant	1
Handle setter	1
Harness maker	7
Hatter	66
Hatter's apprentice	3
Heel maker	9
Herdsman	17
Holster maker	1
Hoop maker (women's skirt hoops)	2

Hop merchant	1
Horse hirer (man who lets out his horses)	2
Hosier	7
Hot presser	5
House painter	1
Husbandman	1,316
Inn/Tavern keeper/Publican	25
Publican's son	3
Instrument maker, Mathematical	1
Instrument maker's apprentice, Mathematical	1
Iron founder	6
Ironmonger	5
Jack Smith (man who made jacks to go in fireplaces on which to roast meat and all the clockwork machinery to go with it.)	2
Jeweller	6
Jobman	1
Jockey	3
Joiner	81
Joiner's apprentice	5
Keel man	1
Labourer	3,010
Lace man (metallic lace/braid)	7
Lace man's apprentice	1
Last maker	3
Latch maker (door fittings)	1
Leather dresser	14
Leather seller	1
Lighterman	3
Lime burner	3
Limbner/Limner (painter)	1
Limner's apprentice	1
Line spinner	1
Linen stamper/printer	3
Lock smith/filer	19

Locksmith's apprentice	1
Looking Glass polisher	2
Loom repairer	1
Maltster	92
Mason	76
Mason's apprentice/labourer	6
Mat maker	3
Match maker	1
Mercer	6
Mercer's apprentice	3
Merchant	14
Merchant's apprentice	2
Merchant's son	11
Miller	90
Miller's son	3
Millwright	4
Miner	35
Mirror polisher	1
Mohair twister/spinner	9
Mop maker	1
Musical instrument maker	3
Musician	6
Bag Piper	1
Fiddler	3
Nailor	82
Needle maker	8
Net maker	2
Officer	45
Officer's son	17
Ostler	25
Pack horse driver/carrier	2
Pack thread spinner	1
Packer	5
Packer's apprentice	1
Painter	17

Fan painter	1
Pan maker	1
Paper maker	17
Paper maker's apprentice	1
Parchment maker	1
Park keeper	2
Pastry cook	4
Patten maker	6
Paviour	5
Paviour's apprentice	1
Pedlar	80
Pewterer	8
Pewterer's apprentice	2
Pin maker	18
Pin maker's apprentice	2
Pipe maker (tobacco)	45
Piper See Bag Piper	
Plasterer	30
Ploughman	12
Plumber/Lead worker	14
Poulterer	8
Porter	17
Potter	10
Press maker (apple press for cider)	1
Printer	11
Razor maker	1
Reed maker	3
Refiner	1
Ring maker	2
Rope maker	29
Rug maker	2
Saddler	49
Sail maker	5
Sailor	38
Salt maker	1

Sawyer	73
Scissor maker	1
Scholar	15
School master	10
Scowerer	1
Scribe	1
Scribbler (wool preparation)	32
Scythe maker / smith	2
Servant (gentleman's servant)	404
Shagreen case maker	1
Sheer smith	2
Sheerman (cloth finisher)	39
Shepherd	6
Shipwright	5
Shipwright's apprentice	1
Shoe maker	880
Shoe maker's apprentice	44
Shop keeper	15
Sieve maker	4
Silk dyer	4
Silk mercer	1
Silk throwster	2
Silversmith	11
Silver chain maker	1
Silver wire drawer's apprentice	1
Skinner	22
Slater	19
Smith See Blacksmith	
Snuff maker	1
Snuff box maker	2
Soap boiler	15
Stage Coach man	1
Starch maker	1
Stationer	2
Stationer's apprentice	1

Statuary (sculptor?)	1
Stay maker	31
Steward	3
Stirrup maker	1
Stocking Frame maker	3
Stone cutter	24
Stone cutter's apprentice	1
Sugar baker	2
Surgeon	21
Sword slipper (either the man who fitted the blade to the hilt or the scabbard maker)	1
Tailor	681
Tailor's apprentice	11
Tailor's son	5
Tallow chandler	36
Tanner	79
Tanner's apprentice	3
Tapster	7
Thatcher	8
Thread maker	8
Throwster	4
Tile cutter/maker	4
Tiler	2
Tinman	2
Tobacco box maker	1
Tobacconist/ Tobacco spinner	17
Tool maker	4
Toy maker (walking cane tops, scabbard mounts etc)	5
Trunk maker	1
Turner (wood or ivory)	30
Twine spinner/ Cord winder	3
Upholsterer	17
Upholsterer's apprentice	1
Victualler	4
Vintner	18

Vintner's apprentice		1
Wagoner		9
Waiting man		1
Warrener		4
Watchman (Night Watchman)		1
Watch maker		4
Watch spring maker		1
Waterman		33
Weaver		1,452
Broad Cloth weaver	20	
Cambrick weaver	2	
Fustian worker	3	
Holland weaver	3	
Indian weaver	1	
Lace weaver	2	
Linen weaver	105	
Livery lace weaver	1	
Orris weaver (braid)	1	
Ribbon weaver	16	
Sack weaver	1	
Saddle girth weaver	1	
Serge weaver	10	
Shag weaver	1	
Silk weaver	19	
Tape weaver	5	
Tapestry weaver	1	
Velvet weaver	2	
Webster/webbing weaver	3	
Worsted weaver	3	
Wheelwright		41
Whip maker		5
White smith		21
Whitster/lauderer		2
Wig/Peruke maker		68
Wine cooper		5

Wine cooper's apprentice	1
Wire Drawer	14
Wool comber	262
Wool sorter	1
Worsted comber	2
Writer	4
Writing master	1
Total	14,320
Born/bred in the Army/Regt	171
His father an officer	31
Clergyman's son	3
Lived upon his means	1
Lived with his friends	59
Lived with his father/parents	28
Born to no Trade/Business	35
Gentleman	30
Total	358

Appendix 9-2

Trades - as a ranked list. In this arrangement of the table, the numbers of men declaring that they had followed a trade as masters or journeymen have been combined into a single figure. Apprentices, assistants or the sons of practitioners have been listed separately. It provides an indication of the proportions of those professing particular occupations throughout the Army. The first six trades were followed by 8,156 men out of the sample of 14,320.

Labourer	3,010
Weaver	1,652
Husbandman	1,316
Shoe maker	924
Tailor	697
Farmer	557
Servant (gentleman's servant)	404
Blacksmith	336
Carpenter (House & Ship)	273
Wool comber	262
Butcher	262
Gardener	252
Barber	177
Baker	147
Clothier	132
Bricklayer	114
Cordwainer	101
Cooper	99
Cloth Dresser / worker	93
Maltster	92
Miller	90

Glover	89
Cutler	85
Nailor	82
Joiner	81
Pedlar	80
Tanner	79
Mason	76
Sawyer	73
Wig/Peruke maker	68
Hatter	66
Farrier (blacksmith & farrier)	64
Saddler	49
Buckle maker	46
Chandler, tallow	46
Officer	45
Pipe maker (tobacco)	45
Founder (Brass or iron)	44
Flax Dresser/Flaxster	43
Wheelwright	41
Sheerman (cloth finisher)	39
Sailor	38
Tallow chandler	36
Clerk	35
Miner	35
Waterman	33
Scribbler (wool preparation)	32
Brazier	31
Collier	31
Stay maker	31
Plasterer	30

Turner (wood or ivory)	30
Brick maker	29
Draper (Linen or Wool)	29
Gunsmith	29
Rope maker	29
Currier	26
Attorney	25
Glazier	25
Inn/Tavern keeper/Publican	25
Ostler	25
Apothecary	24
Breeches maker	24
Fell monger	24
Stone cutter	24
Skinner	22
Surgeon	21
White smith	21
Drover	20
Lock smith/ filer	19
Slater	19
Cabinet maker	18
Fisherman	18
Pin maker	18
Vintner	18
Herdsman	17
Painter	17
Paper maker	17
Porter	17
Tobaconnist/ Tobacco spinner	17
Upholsterer	17
Bleacher, Cloth, linen or hair	16
Coachman	16

Collar maker (for draught horses)	15
Glass grinder	15
Scholar	15
Shop keeper	15
Soap boiler	15
Brewer	14
Framework knitter	14
Leather dresser	14
Merchant	14
Plumber/Lead worker	14
Wire Drawer	14
Comb maker	13
Distiller	13
Excise man	13
Fuller (wool trade)	13
Grocer	12
Ploughman	12
Chair maker	11
Clock maker	11
Printer	11
Silversmith	11
Basket maker	10
Button maker	10
Card maker	10
Chapman	10
Musician	10
Potter	10
School master	10
Carrier	9
Cook	9
Groom	9
Heel maker	9
Mohair twister/spinner	9

Wagoner	9
Bookbinder	8
Needle maker	8
Pewterer	8
Poulterer	8
Thatcher	8
Thread maker	8
Chairman (Sedan chair carrier)	7
Clog maker	7
Haberdasher	7
Harness maker	7
Hosier	7
Lace man (metallic lace/braid)	7
Tapster	7
Confectioner	6
Cork cutter	6
File cutter	6
Jeweller	6
Mercer	6
Patten maker	6
Shepherd	6
Brush maker	5
Calendar man (part of the preparation of cloth, smoothing and flattening, perhaps glazing)	5
Carver	5
Coach builder / smith	5
Fruiterer	5
Hot presser	5
Ironmonger	5
Packer	5
Paviour	5

Sail maker	5
Shipwright	5
Toy maker (walking cane tops, scabbard mounts etc)	5
Whip maker	5
Wine cooper	5
Anchor Smith	4
Barber-Surgeon	4
Glass maker	4
Millwright	4
Pastry cook	4
Sieve maker	4
Silk dyer	4
Throwster	4
Tile cutter/maker	4
Tool maker	4
Victualler	4
Warrener	4
Watch maker	4
Writer	4
Bargeman	3
Book keeper	3
Carman	3
Edge Tool maker	3
Forge man	3
Goldsmith	3
Instrument maker, musical	3
Jockey	3
Last maker	3
Lighterman	3
Lime burner	3
Linen stamper/printer	3
Looking Glass maker/polisher	3

Mat maker	3
Reed maker	3
Steward	3
Stocking Frame maker	3
Twine spinner/ Cord winder	3
Bellows maker	2
Boat man	2
Bonnet maker (Scottish)	2
Builder	2
Cane chair maker	2
Chocolate maker	2
Copper smith	2
Dry Salter (food processing)	2
Engraver	2
Felt maker	2
Gun lock maker	2
Hoop maker (women's skirt hoops)	2
Horse hirer (man who lets out his horses)	2
Jack Smith (man who made jacks to go in fireplaces on which to roast meat and all the clockwork machinery to go with it.)	2
Net maker	2
Pack horse driver/ carrier	2
Park keeper	2
Ring maker	2
Rug maker	2
Scythe maker/ smith	2
Sheer smith	2
Silk throwster	2
Snuff box maker	2
Stationer	2
Sugar baker	2
Tiler	2
Tinman	2
Whitster/lauderer	2

Worsted comber	2
Bitt maker (horse bitt)	1
Block/Pulley maker	1
Boat Builder	1
Bookseller	1
Bridle cutter	1
Calico printer	1
Calico stamper	1
Chaft filer (?) - shaft maker for tools?	1
Chain maker	1
Cheesemonger	1
Chorister	1
Coach painter	1
Cobbler	1
Collector of the Revenue	1
Corker (man who corked/ made-watertight ships)	1
Embroiderer	1
Fan painter	1
Forester	1
Furrier	1
Gentleman's companion	1
Glove dyer	1
Gun barrel maker	1
Haberdasher of hardware	1
Hair bleacher	1
Hair merchant	1
Handle setter	1
Holster maker	1
Hop merchant	1
House painter	1
Instrument maker, Mathematical	1
Jobman	1
Keel man	1
Lace man's apprentice	1

Latch maker (door fittings)	1
Leather seller	1
Limbner / Limner (painter)	1
Limner's apprentice	1
Line spinner	1
Loom repairer	1
Match maker	1
Mop maker	1
Pack thread spinner	1
Pan maker	1
Parchment maker	1
Press maker (apple press for cider)	1
Razor maker	1
Refiner	1
Salt maker	1
Scissor maker	1
Scowerer	1
Scribe	1
Shagreen case maker	1
Silk mercer	1
Silver chain maker	1
Snuff maker	1
Stage Coach man	1
Starch maker	1
Statuary (sculptor?)	1
Stirrup maker	1
Sword slipper	1
(?scabbard maker? Fitter of a blade to a hilt ?)	
Tobacco box maker	1
Trunk maker	1
Waiting man	1
Watchman (Night Watchman)	1
Vintner's apprentice	1
Watch spring maker	1
Wool sorter	1

Writing master	1
----------------	---

Total 14,106

APPRENTICES OR SONS OF MASTERS /JOURNEYMEN

Brazier's apprentice	2
Brazier's son	1
Brewer's employee	8
Bricklayer's apprentice	4
Butcher's apprentice	4
Butcher's son	2
Cabinet maker's apprentice	1
Cane Chair maker's apprentice	1
Carver's apprentice	1
Cloth Dresser's apprentice	2
Clothier's apprentice	3
Cook's apprentice	1
Currier's apprentice	2
Distiller's apprentice	3
Drover's son	1
Edge Tool maker's apprentice	1
Farmer's son or servant (labourer)	92
Farrier's apprentice	2
Fisherman's son	1
Furrier's apprentice	2
Glass grinder's apprentice	2
Glass maker's apprentice	1
Glover's apprentice	2
Goldsmith's apprentice	2
Grocer's apprentice	2
Hatter's apprentice	3
Instrument maker's apprentice, Mathematical	1
Joiner's apprentice	5

Locksmith's apprentice	1
Mason's apprentice/labourer	6
Mercer's apprentice	3
Merchant's apprentice	2
Merchant's son	11
Miller's son	3
Officer's son	17
Packer's apprentice	1
Publican's son	3
Paper maker's apprentice	1
Paviour's apprentice	1
Pewterer's apprentice	2
Pin maker's apprentice	2
Shipwright's apprentice	1
Silver wire drawer's apprentice	1
Stationer's apprentice	1
Stone cutter's apprentice	1
Tanner's apprentice	3
Upholsterer's apprentice	1
Wine cooper's apprentice	1
Sub-Total	214
Grand Total	14,320

Glossary

Arme Blanche - an expression redolent of chivalry and meaning swords as used by cavalry, which claimed higher status than infantry. Firearms were never referred to as the *Arme Noire*, but there was an implication that gunpowder weapons were dirty and only suitable for the lower orders of military society.

Blunderbuss - a short, large calibre shoulder firearm with a bell muzzle that was loaded with multiple small projectiles and discharged at short range.

Canister shot - an artillery round for anti-personnel use made up of a tin case containing musket or carbine balls that burst on leaving the gun's muzzle. The artillery equivalent of a shotgun cartridge.

Cuirass - armour worn to protect the torso. In the British Army only the front plate was worn. In the French front and back plates were used. Such armour was only worn by the regiments of Horse, not the Dragoons.

Dirk - a Scottish dagger, easily concealed.

Establishment - the authorised number in the Army as a whole. Establishments were settled annually. Before 1707 Scotland had its own Establishment as did Ireland until 1802. The same word was used for the document that detailed the numbers involved and their pay.

establishment - the authorised number of soldiers in an individual Regiment or Troop.

Firelock - the soldier's primary firearm; a musket in the infantry or a slightly shorter and lighter musket known as a carbine in the cavalry.

Fowling piece - a sporting firearm used to shoot birds, but capable of use for military or criminal purposes.

Full calibre - this term has been used in connection with artillery ammunition meaning the diameter of a cannon ball. A British 6 Pounder ball had a diameter of 3.498 inches, a 9 Pounder 4 inches. The calibre of the barrel was slightly larger - the windage allowance - to permit easy loading and projection. See also Canister Shot.

Garrison - '... sent to garrison ...' SEE Invalids. The process of being removed from the Out-pension and posted into an Invalid Company was referred to as being sent to garrison.

Guns - pieces of artillery - cannon, howitzers or mortars - not portable firearms.

Household Cavalry - though an expression not used in the eighteenth century, it will occasionally be used here. It comprised the four Troops of Horse Guards (two after 1746) and the two Troops of Horse Grenadier Guards.

Invalids - Out-pensioners who were required to perform service in the Invalid companies that garrisoned the principal coastal fortifications of England.

invalids - those who through illness, injury or wounds were recommended to the Royal Hospital.

Mine - a subterranean passage ending in a chamber packed with gunpowder to be blown up under an enemy's position. Used in siege warfare in order to destroy the besieging forces' artillery batteries or trench systems.

Other Ranks - the Private soldiers and Corporals of a regiment or troop.

Piece - muskets and carbines were often referred to as the soldier's piece.
See Firelock.

Polearms - In the British Army the halberds carried by sergeants comprised an axe-like blade with a rear curved blade and a central spike. Half pikes carried by officers bore a simple leaf-shaped spear point. Both were approximately 8 feet tall. The officers of mainland European nations mostly carried spontoons or partisans having a more elaborate and larger spear point.

Tattoo - the drum call to return to quarters and extinguish lights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

British Library

Hardwick Papers
Idea for a scheme to be enacted for the relief of the Out-pensioners of Chelsea from the oppression of money lenders by a new plan of payments of the Out-pension
Ref: Add Mss 33053 f. 87

Blenheim Papers
Secretary's Letter Book
Ref: Add Mss 61299

Halifax Papers
Egerton Ms
Ref: Eg929 f. 156
Holland House Papers, Add MS 51378

Cambridge University Library

Cholmondeley Houghton Papers Ch (H) 1/804, 821, 1753, 1755, 1765 & 1767 letters from Kingsmill Eyre to Walpole as PMG 1730s

Ch(H) Papers 83,1 State of the Charge of Chelsea Hospital with Muster Roll and Invalid Company state 1709-10

Ch(H) Papers 83,1c List of Pensions at Hospital drawn by attorney and concerned in a fraud, May 1715

Ch(H) Papers 83,17 Scheme for preventing frauds in drawing pensions at Chelsea Hospital, no date

Ch(H) Correspondence 83/2617 K. Eyre to Walpole 13.9.1736

CH(H) Correspondence 83/2680 Letter K. Eyre to Walpole, 7.4.1737

Cheshire and Chester Archives and Local Studies Centre

Parish Registers of St. Mary's within-the-Walls, Chester, Ref: MF98/1, P20/1/2, 1704-1740 and P20/1/3 1740-1782

Essex Record Office (found on NRA site with query 'Maimed')

Account of Henry Ayloff, Esq., late Treasurer for the East Division of Essex for charitable uses and maimed soldiers, Lady Day 1686 – Lady Day 1688 - Ref: D/DP 077

Account of Edward Bullock, Esq., late Treasurer for the East Division of Essex for charitable uses and maimed soldiers, Midsummer 1691 – Michaelmas 1694 - Ref: D/DH/ VI D 77

Account of Sir William Luckyn, late Treasurer for the East Division of Essex for charitable uses and maimed soldiers, Michaelmas 1694 – Christmas 1699 - Ref: D/DH/ VI D 78

Account of John Sparrow, Esq., late Treasurer for the East Division of Essex for charitable uses and maimed soldiers, Lady Day 1705 – Lady Day 1709 - Ref: D/DGd 03

Resolution of the Common Council of Harwich regarding discharged and invalid soldiers arriving from Holland, 22.8.1743 - Ref: T/P/162/9

Draft of the final report by the Lord Mayor of London on the distribution of the money raised by subscription during the Jacobite Rebellion, 1745 - Ref: D/DM Z2

Burial Registers of St. James's Church, West Tilbury
Ref: D/P 91/1/2 F(5)

Family History Centre of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, London

Parish Registers of St. Cuthbert's Church, Carlisle
Film No. 0090578

Parish Registers of St. Mary's Church, Chester
Film No. 2045839

Parish Registers of Drypool Church, Hull
Film No. 1702901

Parish Registers of St. Thomas's Church, Portsmouth
Film No. 0919725

Sheerness Dockyard Church Records
Film No. 1818341

Parish Registers of Christ Church, Tynemouth, 1703-1734
Film No. 1068652

Parish Registers of St. James's Church, West Tilbury
Film No. 0853324 & 1472764

Grenadier Guards Regimental Archive

Courts Martial Book, January 1748/9.

Lambeth Palace Archives

A Description of the Hostel of the Invalides by Thomas Povey, c. 1682 -
Ref: Ms745

Lloyds TSB Group Archives

Cox & Co.
Misc. Papers 1718-1943

National Army Museum

Calcraft's Ledger for 66th Foot
Ref: 8505/79

Thomas Fisher, Regt Agent Papers
Ref: 8507/19 & 20

Norfolk Record Office

Maimed Soldiers & Mariners Fund
Treasurer's Accounts 1737-1739
Ref: BUL 4/12

Royal Hospital, Chelsea cited as RHC

Administration ADM 11, 14, 53, 54, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 82, 84, 86, 94, 96,
97, 110, 114, 118

General History HIST 51, 518, 548

B/G papers concerning the Hospital Burying Ground

In-Pensioners I/P 9 'An Account of the several Alterations that have happened on the List of House Soldiers or Out Pensioners of the Roysl Hospl, as Death, Discharges Exchanges or Replacings since 21 July 1743 from which day Col Hall had the Command of the said Hospital'.

The National Archives cited as TNA

Audit Office

AO 1/52 (1680) to 1/93 (1784) Army Accounts
AO 1/1489 to 1495 Out-pensioners

AO 3/667 Reports Chelsea Hospital

AO 15/13 to 69 Warrants, Commissions Chelsea Hospital
AO 15/89 to 103 Letters of Attorney

Customs and Excise

CUST 47/209 Excise Board Minutes, 28 Sept 1754 – 10 Jan 1755
CUST 47/210 Excise Board Minutes, 14 Jan 1755 – 25 April 1755
CUST 47/211 Excise Board Minutes, 22 April 1755 – 22 July 1755

CUST 48 Out Letters - Excise to Treasury

CUST 119/344 Excise Board Miscellanea

Papers of William Pitt, 1st Earl of Chatham

PRO 30/8 Correspondence

Probate Records

PROB 11/869 Last Will and Testament of Mr. Andrew Highstreet

State Papers

SP 9 Minutes of the Privy Council

SP 41 State Papers, Military, 1731-1732

War Office

WO 4 Secretary-at-War Out Letters

WO 5 Marching Orders

WO 7/122 Muster-Master General, Out-letter book 1716-1748

WO 12/11589 Garrison Chelsea Hospital

WO 23/124 to 131 In-Pensioner Muster Rolls

WO 24 Establishments

WO 26 Warrants

WO 27 Monthly Returns and Inspection Returns

WO 30/90 Petitions

WO 109/51 Grants by Parliament to O-Ps 1722 to 1728

WO 116/1 (1715) to 9 (1792) Pensions for disability

WO 118/45 'Kilmainham' Hospital (1704-1749) Wrongly catalogued - Report on the Chelsea Out-pensioners living in Ireland by Mr Johnston, 1744.

WO 120 RHC Admission Books by Regiment 1715 to 1812.

WO 246 RHC Letter Books 1715-1962

WO 247 RHC Miscellanea

WO 248 Royal Warrants relating to RHC, 1703 - 1861

WO 248/27 King's Warrant to H. Pelham to pay 2s a day to a person responsible for paying for quarters for Invalid Out-pensioners

WO250/1 Chelsea Board papers

WO 250/458 (1703) to 463 (1787) Hospital Journal

WO 250/470 to 477 RHC Board Minutes (1716-1785)

WO 284/1 Garrison Orders, Gibraltar 1720 - 1739

Treasury Papers

T29/32 Treasury Board Minute Book 1754

T29/57 Treasury Board Minute Book 1785-86

PUBLISHED STATE DOCUMENTS

General Index to the Journal of the House of Commons, 1714-1774

Journal of the House of Commons, Vols. 18 1715-1717, 19 1718-1722

PRINTED PRIMARY SOURCES

Anon, *A List of the Reduced Officers of His Majesty's Land-Forces and Marines Intitled to receive Half-Pay in Great Britain* (1749)

- Anon, *A Soldier's Journal containing a Particular Description of the several Descents on the Coast of France last war ...* (London: 1770)
- Anon, *Abstract of the By-Laws, Rules and Orders, made by the Governors of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II, Near Dublin ...* (Dublin: 1752)
- Annals of King George containing not only the Affairs of Great Britain but the General history of Europe during that Time, 6 Vols,* (London: 1716-1722)
- Anon., *The Case of the Agents for the Out-Pensioners of Chelsea College* (1755)
- Anon., *The Case of the Officers who were Commissioned ... to Command the Eight Companies to be form'd out of the Able-Bodied Out-Pensioners of Chelsea Hospital ...* (London: 1711)
- Anon, *The Statutes at Large, Vol. 7, 1745-1756* (London: 1770)
- Anon, *Charter of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II near Dublin for the relief and maintenance of antient & maimed officers and soldiers of the Army of Ireland* (Dublin, 1760)
- Anon, *Memoirs of the Life and Gallant Exploits of the Old Highlander Sergeant Donald MacLeod who, having returned wounded with the Corpse of General Wolfe from Quebec was admitted an Out Pensioner of Chelsea Hospital in 1759 and is now in the CIII^d year of his age* (London: 1791)
- Anon., *Report of the Commissioners on the Mode of keeping the Official accounts in the Principal departments connected with the Receipt and expenditure ... for the Public Service* (London: 1829)
- Bayley, M., *Petition of Martha Bayley relating to the several Grand Abuses in Her Majesty's Royal Hospital near Chelsea,* (London: 1710)
- Burn, R., *The Justice of the Peace and Parish Officer* 9th Ed., 3 Vols, (London: 1764)
- Campbell, N., *An Account of Nicholas Campbell being a genuine narrative of some of the most remarkable actions of his life. In which is a faithful representation of the arts and contrivances of the late usurers at Chelsea,* (London: 1761)
- Cobbett, W., *Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England* Hansard, Vol. VIII 1722-1732, 1811 and Vol. XV 1753-1756 (London: 1813)
- Colley, R., *An Account of the Foundation of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II near Dublin for the relief and maintenance of antient & maimed officers and soldiers of the Army of Ireland* (Dublin: 1725)
- Cuthbertson, B. *System for the Complete Interior Economy of a Battalion of Infantry* New Edition, (Bristol: 1776)

Defoe, D., *The Life and Adventures of Mrs. Christian Davies, commonly called Mother Ross* (with Introduction by the Hon. Sir John Fortescue), (London: Peter Davies Ltd., 1928)

Information for Duncan Campbell, Collector of Excise in Glasgow ... against John Lawson, late sergeant in the 22nd Foot, one of the Out Pensioners of Chelsea Hospital (Edinburgh: 1788)

Mac-Manus, E., *Petition to The King, the Privy Council and both Houses of Parliament regarding the Discovery of the Frauds relating to Chelsea Hospital*, 1721

Muller, J., *A Treatise of Artillery* 3rd Ed., 1780, (Ottawa: Museum Restoration Service reprint, 1965)

Shaw, J., *The Practical Justice of Peace and Parish and Ward Officer* 5th Ed., 2 Vols., (London: 1751)

Simes, T., *The Military Guide for Young Officers etc* 3rd Ed., (London: 1781)

Stevens, A., *The Petition of Andrew Stevens and Thomas Shaw relating to Abuses in General Fielding's Regiment of Invalids*, c. 1726

The Dublin Gazette

The Gentleman's and Citizen's Almanack compiled by Samuel Watson for the Year of Our Lord (Dublin: 1756)

The London Gazette

The Post Boy

War Office, *A List of His Majesty's Forces on the British Establishment ...* Reprint by the Society for Army Historical Research, Special Publication No. 4, (London: 1931)

Wilson, T., *An Account of the Foundation of the Royal Hospital of King Charles II near Dublin for the relief and maintenance of antient & maimed officers and soldiers of the Army of Ireland* (Dublin: 1713)

Wolfe, J., *Instructions to Young Officers ...* 2nd Ed., J. Millan, (London: 1780)

Woodman, J., *The Rat-Catcher at Chelsea Colledge*, (London: 1740)

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anderson, B.L., 'Money and the Structure of Credit in the Eighteenth Century' *Business History*, Vol. 12, (1970), pp. 85-101

Anderson, D., 'The Earliest Appearance of the Black Watch' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XVIII, (1939), pp. 16-20.

Ashton, T.S., *An Economic History of England – The 18th Century* (London: Methuen, 1972)

Ashworth, W.J., *Customs and Excise – Trade, Production and Consumption in England, 1640-1845* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003)

Atkinson, C.T., 'Jenkin's Ear, the Austrian Succession War and the 'Forty-Five – Gleanings from sources in the Public Record Office' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXII, (1943/4), pp. 280-298.

Bailey, B., *Almshouses* (London: Robert Hale, 1988)

Bailey, D.W., *Small Arms of the British Forces in America 1664-1815* (Woonsocket, RI: Mowbray Publishers, 2009)

Baker, N., *Government and Contractors - The British Treasury and War Supplies 1775-1783* (London: The Athlone Press, 1971)

Bannerman, G.E., *Merchants and the Military in Eighteenth-Century Britain: British Army Contracts and Domestic Supply, 1739-1763* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008)

Baule, S. & Hagist, D., 'The Regimental Punishment Book of the Boston Detachments of the Royal Irish Regiment and the 65th Regiment, 1774-1775' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 88, (2010), pp. 5-19.

Beattie, J.M., *Crime and the Courts in England 1660-1800* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)

Blanco, R.L., 'The Attempted Control of Venereal Disease in the Army of Mid-Victorian England' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XLV (1967), pp. 234-241.

Bowen, H.V. & Gonzalez, A., (eds), *Mobilizing Resources for War: Britain and Spain at Work during the Early Modern Period* (Pamplona: EUNSA, 2006)

Brewer, J. & Hellmuth, E., (eds), *Rethinking Leviathan: the Eighteenth Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Brewer, J., *The Sinews of Power, War, Money and the English State 1688-1783* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988)

Browning, R., *The War of the Austrian Succession* (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1994)

Bruce, A.P.C., 'Secretaries at War' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. LIII, (1975), p. 177.

Carman, W.Y., 'William Herd of the Fifth Foot' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXXII (1954), pp. 119-122.

Chandler, D., *Marlborough as a Military Commander* (London: Batsford Ltd., 1973)

Charters, E., *Disease, War and the Imperial State, The Welfare of the British Armed Forces during the Seven Years War* (London: Chicago University Press, 2014)

Childs, J., *The Army of Charles II* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976)

Childs, J., *The Army, James II and the Glorious Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980)

Childs, J., *The English Army of William III, 1688-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987)

Childs, J., *The Nine Years War and the British Army 1688-1697, the operations in the Low Countries* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991)

Clay, C., *Public Finance and Private Wealth, The Career of Sir Stephen Fox, 1627-1716* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)

Clode, C.M., *The Military Forces of the Crown, their Administration and Government* 2 Vols. (London: John Murray, 1869)

Cole, W.A., 'Trends in Eighteenth Century Smuggling' *English Historical Review*, (1957-58), pp. 395-409

Colley, L., *Britons, Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (London: Vintage Books, 1996)

Conway, S., *The British Isles and the American War of Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Conway, S., *War, State and Society in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Conway, S. & Sanchez, R.T., (eds), *The Spending of States - Military expenditure during the Long Eighteenth Century: patterns, organisation and consequences, 1650-1815* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2011)

Cormack, A. & Jones, A., *The Journal of Corporal William Todd, 1745-1762* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2001)

Cormack, A., 'The Artillery Company of the City of Norwich, 1745' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 80, 2002, pp. 181-185.

Cormack, A., 'The Sword of Private Thomas Brown of Bland's Dragoons, Dettingen, 1743' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 87 (2009), pp. 99-107.

Cottesloe, Col. the Lord, 'The Earliest 'Establishment' – 1661 – of the British Standing Army' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. IX, (1930), pp. 214-242.

Crittall, E., (ed.), *The Justicing Notebook of William Hunt 1744-1749* (Devizes: Wiltshire Records Society, 1982)

Crumplin, M., *Men of Steel: Surgery in the Napoleonic Wars* (Shrewsbury: Quiller Press, 2007)

Curtin, P.D., *Death by Migration. Europe's Encounter with the Tropical World in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Dalton, C., *English Army Lists and Commission Registers 6 Vols*, (London: 1898-1904)

Dalton, C., *George I's Army 2 Vols*, (Uckfield: Naval & Military Press Reprint, 2005)

Dann, U., *Hanover and Great Britain 1740-1760* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1991)

Davies, G., 'The Reduction of the Army after the Peace of Ryswick, 1697' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXVIII (1950), pp. 15-28.

Davies, G., 'Recruiting in the Reign of Queen Anne' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXVIII, (1950), pp. 146-159.

Dean, C.G.T., *The Royal Hospital Chelsea* (London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd, 1950)

Douet, J., *British Barracks 1600-1914: their Architecture and Role in Society* (London: English Heritage, 1998)

Drenth, W., *A Regimental List of the half-pay officers for the year 1714 on the English and Irish Establishments* (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2012)

Drenth, W., *A Regimental List of the Reduced officers for the year 1699 on the English, Scots and Irish Establishments* (Eindhoven: Drenth Publishing, 2013)

- East, R., *Choice Chips of Revenue Lore, 1660 to 1876* (Portsmouth: Hampshire Telegraph, 1877)
- A. Eccles, *Vagrancy in Law and Practice under the Old Poor Law* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)
- Ellis, K., *The Post Office in the Eighteenth Century - A Study in Administrative History* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958)
- Floud, R., *An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians* (London: Methuen, 1973)
- Floud, R., Wachter, K. & Gregory, A., *Height, Health and History - Nutritional status in the United Kingdom, 1750-1980* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- George, M.D., *London Life in the XVIII Century* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 2nd Edition, 1930)
- Goldstein, E., *Eighteenth Century Weapons of the Royal Welsh Fuziliers from Flixton Hall* (Gettysburg, Pa.: Thomas Publications, 2002)
- Graham, A., *Corruption, Government and Party in Britain, 1702-1713* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)
- Graham, A. & Walsh, P., (eds), *The British Fiscal-Military States, 1660-c.1783* (London: Routledge, 2016)
- Guy, A.J., (ed), *Colonel Samuel Bagshawe and the Army of George II 1731-1762* (London: The Bodley Head for the Army Records Society, 1990)
- Guy, A.J., *Oeconomy and Discipline, Officership and Administration in the British Army 1714-1763* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985)
- Hagist, D.N., 'Unpublished Writings of Roger Lamb, soldier in the American War of Independence' Part 2, *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 90 (2012), p. 79.
- Hagist, D.N., 'Maintaining Scotland's Military Roads: Orders for Sergeant McGregor's Party, 1772' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 93 (2015), pp. 210-213.
- Hammond, J.L. & Hammond, B., *The Village Labourer 1760-1832 - A Study of the Government of England before the Reform Bill* (repr. - Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1987)
- Handover, P.M., *A History of the London Gazette, 1665-1965* (London: HMSO, 1965)
- Harding, R., *Amphibious Warfare in the Eighteenth Century – the British Expedition to the West Indies, 1740-1742* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1991)

Hay, D., 'War, Dearth and Theft in the Eighteenth Century: The Records of the English Courts' *Past & Present*, No.162, (1982), pp. 117-160.

Hayter, Tony, *An Eighteenth Century Secretary at War, the Papers of William, Viscount Barrington* (London: The Bodley Head for the Army Records Society, 1988)

Hayter, Tony, *The Army and the Crowd in Mid-Georgian England* (London: The MacMillan Press Ltd, 1978)

Hindle, S., *On the Parish? The Micro-Politics of Poor Relief in Rural England c.1550-1750* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Hindle, S., *Technologies of Identification under the Old Poor Law*, British Association for Local History Phillimore Lecture, 3 June 2006.
www.bahl.co.uk/thl/issue.php?volume=36&issue=4

Hitchcock, T., *Down and Out in Eighteenth Century London* (London: Hambledon & London, 2004)

Hitchcock, T. & Black, J. (eds), *Chelsea Settlement and Bastardy Examinations, 1733-1766* (London: London Records Society, 1999)

Hitchcock, T., King, P. & Sharpe, P., (eds), *Chronicling Poverty: The Voices and Strategies of the English Poor, 1640-1840* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd., 1997)

Hitchcock, T. & Shoemaker, R., *London Lives - Poverty, Crime and the Making of a Modern City, 1690-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

Holmes, G., *Augustan England - Professions, State and Society, 1680-1730*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982)

Honohan, P., 'Using other People's Money: Farewell to the Irish Pound' *History Ireland*, Vol. 10 Issue 1, Spring 2002

Hoppitt, J., 'Attitudes to Credit in Britain, 1680-1790' *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 33, (1990), pp. 305-322.

Houlding, J.A., *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981)

Hudson, G.L., 'Arguing Disability: Ex-Servicemen's Own Stories in Early Modern England, 1590-1790' in Bivins, R. & Pickstone, J.V. (eds), *Medicine, Madness and Social History – Essays in Honour of Roy Porter* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Hudson, G.L. 'Disabled Veterans and the State in early modern England', pp. 117-144 in Gerber, D.A. (ed.), *Disabled Veterans in History* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000)

- Hudson, G.L., (ed.), *British Military and Naval Medicine, 1600-1830* Welcome Series in the History of Medicine, (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2007)
- Hunt, M., 'Women and the Fiscal-Imperial State in the late Seventeenth Century and early Eighteenth Century', pp. 29-47 in Wilson, K., *A New Imperial History - Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Hurl-Eamon, J., 'Insights into Plebian Marriage: Soldiers, Sailors and their wives in the Old Bailey Proceedings' *London Journal*, Vol. 30 Issue 1 (2005), pp. 22-38.
- Hutt, G., *Papers Illustrative of the Origin and Early History of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1872)
- Innes, J., *Inferior Politics: Social Problems and Social politics in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Ivers, L.E., *British Drums on the Southern Frontier. The Military Colonization of Georgia, 1733-1749* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1974)
- Jacobsen, G.A., *William Blathwayt, A Late Seventeenth Century English Administrator* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932)
- Jupp, P., *The Governing of Britain 1688-1848, The Executive, Parliament and the People* (London: Routledge, 2006)
- Kammen, M., *Colonial New York, A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)
- Kent, P., *Fortifications of East Anglia* (Lavenham: Terence Dalton, 1988)
- King, S., *Poverty and Welfare in England, a regional perspective, 1700-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)
- King, S. & Tomkins, A. (eds), *The poor in England, 1700-1850. An Economy of Makeshifts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003)
- Kopperman, P., (ed.) 'Regimental Practice' by John Buchanan, M.D., *An Eighteenth Century Medical Diary and Manual* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012)
- Laslett, P., *The World we have lost - Further Explored* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2000)
- Leftwich, B. R., *A History of the Excise* (London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1908)

- Leslie, J.H., 'The Siege of Gibraltar by the Spaniards, 1727' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. III, (1924), pp. 111-145.
- Leslie, N.B., *The Succession of Colonels of the British Army, 1660 to Present Day* (London: Gale and Polden Limited for Society for Army Historical Research, 1974)
- Linch, K. & McCormack, M., (eds), *Britain's Soldiers - Re-thinking War and Society 1715-1815* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014)
- Lloyd, S., 'Cottage Conversations, Poverty and Manly Independence in Eighteenth Century England' *Past & Present*, No. 184, (2004), pp. 69-108.
- Lovegrove, R., *Silent Fields - the long decline of a nation's wildlife* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Lynn, J.A., *Giant of the Grand Siècle; The French Army 1610-1715* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Malcolmson, R.W., *Life and Labour in England, 1700-1780* (London: Hutchinson Publishing Group, 1981)
- Mann, M., *The Veterans* (Norwich: Michael Russell (Publishing) Ltd., 1997)
- Marston Acres, W., 'The Bank of England Picquet' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XII (1933), pp. 74-83.
- McCorry, H., "'Besides, he was very drunk at the time ..." Desertion and Discipline, North Britain, 1751 - 1753' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Pt. 1 Vol. LXIX (1991) pp. 221-232, Pt. 2 Vol. LXX (1992) pp. 114-117, Pt. 3 Vol. LXX (1992) pp. 189-197, Pt. 4 Vol. LXXI (1993) pp. 42-50, Pt. 5 Vol. LXXII (1994) pp.142-159.
- McCrae, M., *Saving the Army. The Life of Sir John Pringle* (Edinburgh: Birlinn Ltd, 2014)
- Mui, H. & L., *Shops and Shopkeeping in Eighteenth Century England* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989)
- Muldrew, C., *The Economy of Obligation - The Culture of Credit and Social relations in early Modern England* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1998)
- Muskett, P., 'Military Operations against Smuggling in Kent and Sussex, 1698-1750' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. LII (1974), pp. 89-110.
- Naulet, F., *L'Artillerie Francaise (1665-1765), La Naissance d'une Arme* (Paris: Economica, 2002)
- Newnes Motorists Touring Maps and Gazeteer* (London: ND circa 1937)

- Ottaway, S., 'Providing for the Elderly in Eighteenth Century England' *Continuity and Change*, CUP, Vol 13, Issue 3, pp. 391-418, 1998
- Ottaway, S., *The Decline of Life: Old Age in Eighteenth Century England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Owens, J., *Plain Papers relating to the Excise Branch of the Internal Revenue Department from 1621 to 1878, or A History of the Excise* (Linlithgow: 1879)
- Perry, N.R. (ed), *The Poor Law Settlement Documents of the Church of St. Mary, Oldswinford 1651-1791* (Birmingham: Birmingham and Midland Society for Genealogy and Heraldry, 1977)
- Porter, R., *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Penguin Books, Revised Edition, 1990)
- Powicke, F.M. & Fryde, E.B. (eds), *Handbook of British Chronology*, 3rd Ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Rae, R., *Major Robert Farmar of Mobile* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1990)
- Reynolds, M., *A History of the Irish Post Office*, (Dublin: MacDonnell Whyte Ltd., 1983)
- Roberts, J.L., *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon, 2002)
- Rogers, N., *Mayhem – Post-war Crime and Violence in Britain 1748-1753* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012)
- Roseveare, H., *The Financial Revolution, 1660-1760* (London: Longman, 1991)
- Rudé, G., *Hanoverian London 1714-1808* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1971)
- Rule, J., *The Vital Century, England's Developing Economy 1714-1815* (London: Longman, 1992)
- Rule, J., *Albion's People, English Society 1714-1815* (London: Longman, 1992)
- Scouller, R.E., *The Armies of Queen Anne* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966)
- Sherrard, O.A., *Lord Chatham, a War Minister in the Making* (London: The Bodley Head, 1952)
- Skrine, F.H., *Fontenoy and Great Britain's Share in the War of the Austrian Succession, 1741-1748* (London: Wm. Blackwell & Sons, 1907)

- Sloss, J., *Richard Kane, Governor of Minorca* (Troubridge: Bonaventura Press, 1995)
- Smail, J., 'Credit, Risk and Honor in Eighteenth-Century Commerce' *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 44, (2005), pp. 439-456
- Stacy, K.R., Venereal Disease in the 84th Regiment of Foot during the American Revolution *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 77 (1990) pp. 237-239.
- Storrs, C., (ed.), *The Fiscal-Military State in Eighteenth Century Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2009)
- Styles, J., *The Dress of the People - everyday fashion in eighteenth century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007)
- Sumner, P., 'The Clothing of the British Army in 1746' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. XXIII, (1945), pp. 72-74.
- Taylor, W., *The Military Roads in Scotland* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1976)
- Thomas, P., 'Military Mayhem in Elizabethan Chester: The Privy Council's Response to Vagrant Soldiers' *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. 76 (1998), pp. 226-247.
- Tomasson, K. & Buist, F., *Battles of the '45* (London: Batsford, 1962)
- Turner, D.M., *Disability in Eighteenth Century England; Imagining Physical Impairment* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012)
- Valenze, D., *The Social Life of Money in the English Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- von Arni, E.G., *Justice for the Maimed Soldier, Nursing, Medical Care and Welfare for Sick and wounded soldiers and their families during the English Civil war and Inter-Regnum, 1642-1660* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001)
- von Arni, E.G., *Hospital Care and the British Standing Army, 1660-1714* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006)
- Webb-Carter, B.W., Colonel Wellesley's Standing Orders to the Thirty-Third Regiment, 1798 *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, Vol. L (1972), pp. 65-77.
- Wennerlind, C., *Casualties of Credit, The English Financial Revolution, 1620-1720* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Wilcox, M., 'The "Mystery and Business" of Navy Agents, c. 1700-1820' *International Journal of Maritime History*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, December 2011, pp. 1-28

Williams, G., *The Prize of all the Oceans: the Triumph and Tragedy of Anson's Voyage round the World* (London: Harper Collins, 1999)

Wright, P., 'War and Peace with the Maroons, 1730-1739' *Caribbean Quarterly*, University of the West Indies, Vol.16, (1970), pp. 5-27

Wrightson, K., *Earthly Necessities - Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain, 1470-1750* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2000)

UNPUBLISHED THESES

Bois, J-P., *Les Vieux Soldats à l'Hotel Royal des Invalides au XVIIIeme Siècle*, Doctorat, Université de Paris.

Ferguson, K.P., *The Army in Ireland from the Restoration to the Act of Union*, PhD, Dublin University, 1980.

Nielsen, C.L., *Chelsea Out-Pensioners: Image and Reality in Eighteenth-Century and early Nineteenth-Century Social Care*, Newcastle, 2014.

Steppler, G. A., *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793*, PhD, Oxford, 1984.

WEBSITES

The Proceedings of the Old Bailey, London 1674 to 1834
<http://www.OldBaileyonline.org>

Government Departments - webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk -

www.hmrc.gov.uk/history/hmce.htm

[www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/results.asp\[hash\]mid](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/results.asp[hash]mid)

Huguenot Histories - www.lisburn.com/books/huguenots

Measuring Worth - www.MeasuringWorth.com