（京都学園大学経営学部論集　第18巻 第1号　2008年11月　1頁－20頁）

Article

Morality and People

—Social Control in Early Modern London—

Takashi UHARA

Abstract

The problem of the poor was one of the major social problems in early modern London. The arguments of this article are focused on next three points. Firstly, the poor relief for the impotent poor was used as the means of social control of London. The procedure in selecting poor applicants for pensions was crucial for controlling over the morality of the poor. Secondly, Bridewell tried to moralize the evil poor like vagrants by means of setting them to work. And the institution was extending its moral control over all Londoners. And thirdly, the study of the documents of Bridewell revealed how the common people reacted to such movements of moralization. The fact was not simple. The moralization existed among the common people, and they even promoted the movements.

Keyword: the poor, early modern London, Bridewell, morality, social control

I

"Social Control" is one of the important themes of history, as well as of other social sciences. It could be argued in various forms by studying various societies in history. Michel Foucault cleared the modern power in terms of "discipline", focusing on several modern systems of school, prison, army, hospital, and so on.[1] His arguments are, in other words, on the social control of the modern society by means of discipline. As his studies revealed, "social control" never has a simple form that the elite

1) Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir, Naissance de la prison*, Gallimard, 1975.

just orders and the non-elite unwillingly submits. In fact, it has complex mechanisms according to the historical circumstances of the society. Studying social control in early modern London will also reveal its complex patterns and produce plentiful fruits.

London, the capital of England, experienced a rapid increase of population in the early modern times, and was in the process of growing to a huge metropolis especially from the middle of the sixteenth century. The population of London was 120,000 in 1550, which grew to 200,000 in 1600 and 375,000 in 1650. The rate of the growth was 67 per cent for the 50 years from 1550 to 1600, and 88 per cent for the 50 years from 1600 to 1650. On the other hand, the total population of England was 3.01 million in 1550, 4.11 million in 1600, and 5.23 million in 1650. The rate of the growth was 37 per cent for the first 50 years and 27 per cent for the second. London had, therefore, a much greater rate of population growth than whole England did.[2)]

The principal cause of such a remarkable growth of London was not the natural increase of inside population but the population inflow from outside. Most people who flowed into London in the period were immigrants seeking for employment. But as England was under severe depression of industries in the reign of Elizabeth Ⅰ, that is, in the second half of the sixteenth century, it would be difficult for them to find fobs. And moreover, the real wages kept falling because of heavy inflation. It is said that the real wages fell by more than half between 1500 and 1650.[3)] Those severe conditions caused various social problems in the growing metropolis, and the problem of the poor among them was, particularly, getting serious.[4)]

---

2) A. L. Beier and R. Finlay, eds., *London 1500-1700. The making of the metropolis*, Longman, 1986, p. 39.

3) P. Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*, Longman, 1988, p. 47.

4) As concerns the problem of the poor in early modern England, see E. M. Leonard,

The problem of the poor in early modern England had three principal points to be tackled. The first point was how to relieve the poor who could not work due to age, illness, and handicap. The second was how to assist the labouring poor whose income was below the subsistence level. And the third was how to set to work the able bodied poor who were not working. In order to deal with those points of the problem, cities and state of England eagerly tried various policies. The reason why the authorities were so earnest over coping with the problem of the poor lay in fear that riots by the poor might take place when the problem would become severer. In fact, for maintaining public peace and social stability of cities, it was one of the most significant tasks to resolve or mitigate the problem of the poor. In the middle of the 1590s, in particular, England underwent the crisis, when great hardship of famine caused the poverty to grow pervasively, and moreover, the pest prevailed in the country. But London did not suffer any serious disturbances during the period. Its policies for stability, therefore, functioned successfully as far as they could avoid riots.[5)]

In this article London's policies taken for the problem of the poor and vagrants in the early modern times will be argued, although to keep stability of the metropolis had various other problems besides the poor.

The Early History of English Poor Relief, (1900), Frank Cass, repr. 1965; M. James, *Social Problems and Policy during the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660,* London, 1930; W. K. Jordan, *The Charity of London 1480-1660,* (1960), Archon Books, repr. 1974; A. L. Beier, *Masterless Men,* Methuen, 1985, ; J. Pound, *Poverty and Vagrancy in Tudor England,* Longman, 1986; P. Slack, *op. cit.*

5) As concerns the problem of "crisis" and "stability" in early modern London, see P. Clark and P. Slack, eds., *Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700,* London, 1972; P. Clark and P. Slack, *English Towns in Transition 1500-1700,* Oxford, 1976,; A. L. Beier, *op. cit.;* F. F. Foster, *The Politics of Stability,* London, 1977; V. Pearl, "Change and Stability in Seventeenth-Century London", *London Journal,* 5, 1979; J. P. Boulton, *Neighbourhood and Society,* Cambridge, 1987; S. Rappaport, *Worlds within Worlds,* Cambridge, 1989; I. W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability,* Cambridge UP., 1991.

And it will be insisted that the social control by means of moralizing the poor was the core of such policies. Moreover, the response made by the poor facing such control will be considered.

II

In most cities of early modern England, according to Paul Slack, about 5 per cent of the inhabitants always received some kind of relief and about 20 per cent were the potential poor who would be relieved in hard times.[6] The situation of London seems to have been almost the same.[7] And the metropolis, facing such a situation, enforced various policies to cope with the problem. First of all, this section is to be focused on its poor relief for the impotent poor who could not work, and for the labouring poor whose income was below the subsistence level.

Around 1550 in London, an attempt was made to reorganize the existing system and institutions for poor relief.[8] Five hospitals were founded or re-founded, which received the poor respectively according to the types of the poverty. St. Thomas's Hospital and St. Bartholomew's Hospital accommodated and cured the sick and aged poor. Christ's Hospital received poor children and orphans, brought them up, and gave them the elementary education. The "idle" and "lewd" poor, like vagrants and harlots, were confined in Bridewell Hospital, who were put to some kind of work in the institution to reform their "idleness". Bethlehem Hospital (Bedlam) took in and cured lunatics. Those five hospitals cooperated each other to tackle the problem of the poor of London, and Christ's Hospital headed the hospitals. This innovation of policy for the poor, the hospitals system, had a purpose to take the place of the existing system, that is, the "parish centered" poor relief.

---

6) P. Slack, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
7) I. W. Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 153.
8) E. M. Leonard, *op. cit.*, pp. 30ff.; P. Slack, *op. cit.*, pp. 119ff.

For the foundation and re-foundation of those five hospitals, the "thirty members committee" was organized, which consisted of six aldermen and twenty-four citizens.[9] As for the twenty-four citizens, half of them were yearly reelected. The members of the committee raised funds for the purpose, collecting contributions from citizens and imposing tax on companies. And the members, as governors, operated the hospitals without pay.

St. Thomas's and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which had been originally set up in medieval times, were re-founded at this time and included into the system. Each hospital accommodated from 200 and over 300 sick or aged poor people for each year around 1560.[10] Each had a physician and three surgeons, who cured inmates using medical knowledge and technique of those days. Both hospitals were also eager to moralize inmates. In order that the inmates could obtain good behavior through work, some kinds of labour, such as grinding corn or spinning threads, were made by them in the institutions. The inmates were obligated to attend church that was located in the same precinct as the hospital, and he or she would have no meal if neglected the duty. The inmates who were found playing cards or dice were punished, and those who went to alehouses without permission were possibly expelled from the hospital. He or she whose disease was due to moral failing was whipped after the cure. St. Thomas's Hospital ordered in the 1590s that all syphilitic inmates should be punished as warning to others. Pregnant single women were especially treated harshly because of their lack of morality. St. Thomas's Hospital ordered such women never to be accommodated in 1562, because the hospital "is a house erected for the

9) The Declaration of the humble Suit made to the King's Majesty's most honourable Council, by the Citizens of London, 1552, in Thomas Bowen, *Extracts from the Records and Court Books of Bridewell Hospital*, London, 1798, Appendix, no. Ⅱ, p. 5.

10) P. Slack, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

relefe of honest persons and not of harlottes to be maynteyned there[11].

Both hospitals for the sick and aged poor, therefore, not only gave cure and support to the inmates but also tried to moralize them. However, whether the attempt to moralize inmates was successful is doubtful, because the terms of accommodation were generally short and the staffs of the hospitals, like nurses, often had moral defects. And the persistent shortage of funds of the hospitals compelled the governors to limit the number of inmates. It could be, therefore, said that the original purpose of both hospitals was not fully attained. But we should regard the fact that moralization was attempted even in the hospitals for the impotent poor.

The most important relief for the impotent poor and the labouring poor was the provision of regular pensions. Each parish provided such pensions to them on their petitions, and the funds of pensions came from poor rates, charities, and fines. However, as the funds in this case were also limited, the provision of pensions was made to the selected poor. It could never cover the needs of the whole London poor.

According to Ian Archer, the average pension per head was from 5 to 6 pence per week in London before 1598, when the revision of the sum was made. This average sum of the pensions could cover no more than 46 per cent of requirements for the single widow even in the 1580s, and covered only 35 per cent of them in the middle of the 1590s, when prices soared due to poor harvest. If she had dependents including children, the situation would become worse. It is, therefore, obvious that pensions were no more than supplements of income. Although they could possibly get pensions from companies or relief in private poorhouses, such opportunity would be very limited. We can eventually presume that most paupers of those days could manage to maintain the

11) I. W. Archer, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-155.

lowest level of life, getting small incomes including women's and children's, and receiving the supplementary pensions. When the family had no workers, they would rely on the pensions, begging aids from relatives and personal charities of neighbours.[12]

It was, therefore, crucial for the poor to get pensions. But it was quite evident that the population of the poor exceeded the number of those who could receive the pensions. The provision of pensions was, consequently, subject to restriction, which gave priority to the impotent poor, such as aged, handicapped, and infant. At the same time, the procedure for selection of the applicants who deserved the pensions was getting more and more important. And the selection had an aspect of moral control over the poor, leading to the social control.

The classification of the "deserving" and "undeserving" poor was the most basic one in the categories of the poor, which were argued in a large number of pamphlets on the poor published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In fact such a classification also existed in the late Middle Ages, the "deserving" poor meant the "impotent" poor who could not work due to being aged, sick, and handicapped at that time. In the early modern times the core of meanings of the "deserving" poor was also the same, but the classification included moral meanings more and more clearly, because the "idle" poor like vagrants were increasing rapidly. Among vestrymen, who were elite citizens in parish and selected the applicants, the boundaries of acceptable behaviour and life of the poor were made clear. In short, official moral standards for the poor who deserved pensions were made. If the pauper's behaviour was not orderly, the vestry could cut the pension temporarily, expecting the improvement. Thus the poor who crucially needed the pensions were subject to the morals and standards which the leading and rich citizens

12) *Ibid.*, pp. 194-197.

of parish desired.[13]

The linkage between poor relief and moralization in early modern London appeared not only in the selection of the poor applicants for pensions, but also in various other aspects. An ordinance of 1579 prescribed that vestrymen should visit houses of the poor every day and check whether they were working or not, and that vestry should present the disorderly poor and their children to the wardmotes. Moreover, officers were appointed to search inmates in parish, for the purpose that vestry should stop paying pensions to the poor who lodged relatives as inmates. This policy aimed at lightening the burden of parish by means of limiting the relief only to the poor who long resided there. But the officers also eagerly inspected the morals of the poor, especially of single poor women. The introduction of "overseers of the poor" in the poor law of 1598, who were to examine behaviours of the poor in parish, means that the London's policy moralizing the poor developed into the state's policy.[14]

Thus the poor relief for the impotent poor and the labouring poor contained not only giving relief to them but also putting them into the moral universe which the elite of parish or city desired. In other words, the poor relief was used as the means of the social control.

Ⅲ

As for the "idle" poor like vagrants who were able-bodied but not working, stern measures were taken against them in early modern England, as well as in other European countries.[15] Overlooking the history of

13) *Ibid.*, pp. 96-98.

14) *Ibid.*, p. 98.

15) As concerns the problem of the poor in early modern Europe, see J-P. Gutton, *La société et les pauvres en Europe, XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles*, PUF., 1974; C. Lis and H. Soly, *Poverty and Capitalism in Pre-Industrial Europe*, Harvester Press, 1982; B. Geremek, *La potence ou la pitié*, Gallimard, 1987.; Robert Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern*

English Poor Laws reveals the fact quite clearly. Poor Laws had dual aspects of dealing with the poor. On the one side was relief for the impotent poor, and on the other was punishment or suppression of the "evil" poor, such as vagrants. And the reason why the very severe punishments, including death penalty, were to be inflicted on vagrants lay in the circumstances that the number of vagrants had rapidly increased since the early sixteenth century and the existing policy to them, such as personal charities, had lost its effectiveness. For maintaining public peace and preventing epidemics, the authorities of cities and state eagerly wanted to root out the problem of vagrants by means of reinforcing the control over them. But it can be easily concluded that such harsh measures against vagrants were not successful, because the poor laws which prescribed the measures were repeatedly revised due to lacking effectiveness. In fact, the policy could not bring the decrease of them. The number of vagrants, eventually, continued to increase until the middle of the seventeenth century. Then a new policy against them was attempted in London in the mid sixteenth century. It was to confine them in an institution and reform their idleness through setting them to work there. The institution, which was founded then, was aforesaid Bridewell Hospital.

Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London, and Richard Grafton, a grocer, and other leading citizens of London petitioned Edward Ⅵ to grant Bridewell Palace to the city for the scheme. Bridewell Palace was originally built by Henry Ⅷ, and it was not being used at the time of the petition, then was granted to London in 1553.[16] Bridewell Hospital was founded "to be a house of continuance for the oppression of Idleness, the

Europe, Cambridge UP., 1994.

16) As concerns the history of founding Bridewell, see E. G. O'Donoghue, *Bridewell Hospital*, Vol.1, John Lane, 1923, chap. XV; A. J. Copeland, *Bridewell Royal Hospital*, London, 1888, chap. III.

enemy of all virtue, and the nourisher of good exercise which is the conquerour of all vice". And therefore, "the lewd and idle sort should remaine in Bridewell to labour so long as they were whole"[17]. Bridewell was, in other words, established as a house of correction or workhouse for vagrants and other idle persons, and it tried to reform their idleness by means of putting them to work, not by severe punishments.

Concerning the rights of the governors of Bridewell, a document written in 1552 prescribes as follows, "y^{e} have authority by the Kings Majesties Grant that whensoever two of you or more are present y^{e} may take into the said house (Bridewell) all such suspected persons as shall be presented unto you as Lewd & Idle, y^{e} may allsoe examine and punish the same according to your discretions. …… y^{e} have allsoe authority to visit Taverns Alehouses dyceing houses Bowleing Allyes Tennys playes and all suspected places & houses of evill Resort within the City of London and suburbs of the same and within the sheir of Middlesex and not only to enter into the said houses and places but allsoe to apprehend comitt towards and punish at your Discretions as well the Landlords or Tenants of such houses as have any such Lewd persons resorting unto them whether they be men or women …… Further y^{e} have Authority from time to time to make such wholesome statutes Laws and Ordinances as shall be thought meet & convenient unto you for the good government and better order of the said house[18]. "According to this prescription, the governors of Bridewell had almost unlimited powers to arrest, confine, examine, and punish "lewd and idle" persons.

To understand the actual activities of this institution needs to investigate Bridewell Hospital Court Books[19], which contain numerous

17) *Ordinances and Rules for the Government of the House of Bridewell*, 1552, British Library, Sloane MS. 2722, fol.1a-b.
18) *Ibid.*, fols.2b-3a.
19) *Bridewell Hospital Court Books*, vols. 1-10, 1559-1659, Guildhall Library, MF.510-

documents about suspects who were taken into the institution. And the analysis of the Court Books covering the Elizabethan period has made it clear that various minor offenses and moral offenses were the targets of its control, as well as vagrancy and prostitution.[20] As such targets were "idleness" and "lewdness" , Bridewell seems to have always tried to control morality of Londoners, while most of the suspects taken by it were the poor. It must be useful for understanding the point concretely to quote some instances from the Court Books.

Next some cases quoted at the beginning are on vagrancy and idleness.

> John Grene broughte into this house the thirde of november (1561) by dobyns and mase the beadells at the commandment of the masters of christes hospitall for that he beinge a stoute vacabond naughtie and Idell fellowe was taken beginge and therfore was here whipped the same daye and comitted to the labor of this house / discharged the viijth of november 1561. 〈Vol. 1, fol. 169a〉[21]

Many vagrants, like this man, were taken to Bridewell, whipped, and forced to labour with the mill, which took the hardest work in the in-

---

515.

20) As for the study on the Bridewell Hospital Court Books and the activities of Bridewell, see my books and articles written in Japanese, and my English articles, Takashi UHARA, "London Bridewell in the Early Elizabethan Period", *Journal of Baltic and Scandinavian Studies*, vol. 4, 1994.; "Bridewell and People, Social Control in Early Modern London", *The Kyotogakuen University Review, Faculty of Business Administration*, vol. 11, no.1, July, 2001.; "Vagrancy and Punishment, Social Policy in Early Modern London", *Journal of Baltic and Scandinavian Studies*, vol. 11・12, 2002.

21) As the first volume of Bridewell Hospital Court Books has foliation, the folio number of each cited article is indicated in the angle brackets 〈 〉. The content of the round brackets ( ) is my supplement.

stitution. Beadles in the article were the officials who watched the fixed district of London and took suspects at their discretion or on governors' orders. The hospitals above mentioned had eight beadles in total in this period[22], who were paid and full time workers. The custodial term of Green was six days, which could be an average one because most inmates were confined for a week or about ten days. Although Green was obviously a "real" vagrant and taken begging, even those who had jobs but were not working, such as the man in the next case, suffered the same harsh correction.

> William vallannce　a vile and naughtie idle vacabond who before hathe bene in this house broughte nowe in by Roberte the beadell at the comanndment of Mr pierce for that he ys vile and a naughtie idle fellowe and yet a good workman and will not in no wise work and therfore was well whipped the xjth of Januarye and so comitted to the labor of the myll. 〈Vol.1, fol. 185a〉

Even though being mentioned as a vagabond, this man, "a good workman", must have been a resident with occupation, not a vagrant. But as he would not work and was living "idly", he was treated in the same way as vagrants.

> Josephe Cowche　sent in by the wardemote enquest of Bridgewarde for that he is a lewde fellowe and will not worke but lyve idelly and vagrantlye and very disobedient to his father and mother very lewdely he is here ponyshed and setto worke here the enquest promise that his father shall paye his chardges and send him worke

22) The number of beadles was doubled by 1569. British Library, Lansdowne MS. 11, no.19.

hether to doe. 〈Vol.3, 11/ Jan/ 1577[23]〉

This case, again, must be not on a vagrant but on a resident. The "charge" in the article was three pence a day, which Bridewell collected from payable inmates. The parents desired Bridewell to confine their idle and disobedient son and to reform him, even though it took them the charge.

As for the cases of being "disobedient", masters often requested the reformation of their ungovernable apprentices and servants from Bridewell. Most of such masters brought them by themselves to the institution and desired it to receive them.

> William Higham servannt to Powell Somers Seaman dwellinge at parishe gardeine broughte into this house the xxiiij th of Januarye (1562) by his said Mr for that he stubbornelie dothe and hathe done and refused to serve his said Mr and not onelie by stoutnes but by evell tonge and behaviour in his mr absence hathe not regarded his misteres and also for that he ranne from his service well whipped the same daie and comitted to the myll. 〈Vol.1, fol. 193a〉

The instances that masters, like this seaman, brought their stubborn and disobedient apprentices or servants to Bridewell are omnipresent in the Court Books of the Elizabethan period. In fact Bridewell wanted to prevent such apprentices and servants from becoming vagrants due to leaving their masters and losing jobs. And therefore, the institution tried to control the morality of apprentices and servants of London and

23) As the volume 2, 3, and 4 of the Court Books have no foliation, each cited article is indicated with the date when the case was examined in the court.

to moralize those who lacked it by means of whipping and forced labour.

Bridewell also tried to control sexual morality of people, including of apprentices and servants. Next are only two instances out of numerous such cases in the Court Books.

> Thomas Stable　servannte with harrye busshefeld merchantaylor dwellinge nere Drapers hill broughte into this house the x th of June (1562) at the comanndment of Mr Baskerfeld Sheriffe for that he comitted whordome with Agnes Smithe servante in the same house whom he hathe gotten with childe wherfore he was well whipped the same daye and the xxiij th of June by Mr baskerfeldes letter delivered out of this house to go unto oxford shier. 〈Vol.1, fol. 220a〉

> Agnes Bagley　sente in by mr Alderman Boxe for that she resorted to one Abraham Neale servante unto John Chapman cowper of the parishe of St margaret on ffishe streat hill beinge an Apprentice to whome she saithe she is sure, she is ordered by mr kelke that yf she do resorte anye more into the companie of the same Abraham untill he be out of his yeres, And that he maie lawfullie marrye hir, she shalbe broughte to this house and here punysshed for the same. 〈Vol.2, 4/Jun/1575〉

Throughout the Elizabethan period, many male and female sexual offenders and misdemeanours, including prostitutes, were sent to Bridewell, whipped, and forced to work. Otherwise, like the latter case, Bridewell warned them. The authorities of London actually wanted to lighten the burden of poor relief through preventing births of illegitimate children of the poor. However, Bridewell's control over sexual

morality was carried out not only for such an actual purpose but also for much wider social control of London, because men and women having wealth and high status were also sent to it. Sexual morality was, in fact, used as one of the axes of Bridewell's control over the morals of Londoners. Next is the case where a man with high status was anonymously recorded in the Court Books.

> M. M. M. brought into this house the xxij daye of Januarij 1559 (1560) for that he was accused most filthely to abuse the body of Elyn Remnannt and Jone Mylls at sondry tymes and in sondry places, and beyng called and examyned he hathe confessed the same. But for asmoche as this was the first tyme of his deteccion, and also that he is a man of callyng in a company of most worship and hathe a good wife and great famely, It was consydered by the Governors of this house upon his most humble submission that after exhortacon and admonycon geven for the amendment of his life, he should for this tyme yeld and paye at his awne costes and charges for the makyng of xxv foote of the wharfe of Bridewell and so to be discharged for this present tyme./ he pd a fyne of x £ / xxv fete 〈Vol.1, fol. 54b〉

Seeing some aspects of activities of Bridewell with the limited instances, we can conclude that the institution aimed at controlling the morality of all Londoners and moralizing those who lacked it, although Bridewell centered its efforts upon the morality of the poor. The "idle" and "lewd" persons, whom Bridewell targeted, did not mean only vagrants and prostitutes. Its object of control was much wider. But as Bridewell was also in financial difficulties, like the other institutions for the poor, it could not fully attain the aim. Those who were put to work in the institution made merely a minority of the persons who were sent

there. The majority were released only with whipping or even without any punishments. Further, the terms of working, if any, were short in general. It is, therefore, uncertain how successfully the moral reformation was practiced in Bridewell. However, this institution must have had enough force, for example, to make disobedient apprentices and servants become obedient. Otherwise the masters would not have brought them to it. A lot of cases in the Court Books where masters did so illustrate the effectiveness of the institution to the full. And it was likely that threatening them with the suggestion of sending to Bridewell would be generally used for getting their obedience. The same threatening would be also made to any residents who lacked morals, as well as apprentices and servants. In fact anybody could be brought there by his or her neighbours, if lacking morals.[24] Thus the moral control over all Londoners was put forward by this institution, and the social control of London through moralization was being promoted as well.

Ⅳ

How did the people react to such movements of moralization? Most residents of early modern London were members of some community groups, such as neighbourhood, parish, ward, and company. And in this section "neighbourhood", a relatively small geographical world, is to be examined for making clear the reaction of the people. The examination is, again, based on Bridewell Hospital Court Books.

The unity of neighbourhood of early modern London seems to have been generally stronger than that of neighbourhood of the present. Some sanction could be taken against neighbours who violated morality or norms in the neighbourhood. Moreover, it would be normal activities for the residents to watch suspicious neighbours. We can find out the facts

24) See my books and articles.

in next some cases.

> Anne Aylwarde the wiffe of william Aylwarde mynister Johan westcote and Johan kevell do saie that they sawe Johan Sutton on bedd with a man being a laborer, And that he had thuse of hir bodie, And they sawe it thorrowe a wall, And the saide Johan Sutton denieth that ever he had the use of hir bodie, But because the witnesses aforesaide did testifie it to hir face the saide Johan Sutton had by order correction. 〈Vol.2, 26/Mar/1575〉

The Court Books sometimes recorded neighbours witnessing sexual offenses through a hole of wall, like the instance, or a hole of door. Such peeping activities were not illegal in the society where the idea of privacy was underdeveloped. In fact such activities were rather active and deliberate ones to keep order of the neighbourhood.[25] Neighbouring residents, moreover, took more positive measures than just witnessing.

> Anne Lewes wife of Roberte Lewes baker of broken wharf brought in by the constable for an harlot. Johan Davis wyef of Thomas Davis dwelling next house to the said Anne said for witnes that on Thursdaie last in the morninge the xixth of Julie she being in her house through a wall sawe her and one Jenkyn Hewes alias William Jenkyn a tapster together upon a bedde being thereon naughti with their bodies, tooke them with the matter, also xij more of her neighbors witnes that dyvers persons came to her house many tymes suspitiously & alone with her at xi & xij o clock at night when her husbond is abrode, and they have warned her often of it but she will not leve. The said Anne & Jenkyn did confesse in-

25) I. W. Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

deede that they did ofend together as it is alleaged. She hath correction & is setto labour. 〈Vol.3, 21/Jul/1576〉

According to this instance, the neighbours often warned the woman who kept company with other men than her husband not to do any more.[26] They blamed her for her moral offense and expected her reformation. But because she disregarded the warning, they resorted to force, catching her and the man red-handed. Judging from the situation, the neighbours must have been always watching her.

In addition to taking notice of the activities of the neighbours, we must regard the fact that Thomas Davis, the next dweller, has no terms of respect like "Mr." in the document. He was, therefore, not a man of the elite. Those who blamed the moral offenders, caught them, and handed them over to the constable were actually of the common people. This fact, being also found out in other instances, means that the moralization movement of those days was not necessarily in the direction from the elite to the common people. And furthermore it means even that the common people might promote the moralization movement among themselves. Next is a case where neighbours complained about a brothel to Bridewell.

William ffullwoode, John Mason, William Recke, Elizabeth Bedboe inhabitants of longe lane and divers other doe here complayne that Tottles wiffe kepeth most abhomynable bawderye in her house ther for lx or lxxx men in one daie to abuse them with iiij or v harlotts which are ther daylye for that purpose. And divers yonge wemen and men have gotten ther deseases and burned ther bodies. 〈Vol.3,

26) Although the woman is described as a harlot in the article, the received money is not recorded. Those women who had illegal intercourse were often sent to Bridewell as harlots.

20/Jun/1579〉

As the inhabitants in this case also had no terms of respect, they were not of the elite but of the common people. Although they would be probably not suffering any damages from the brothel, they reported it to Bridewell with the desire to remove it from the neighbourhood and keep its order.

The common people took such actions not only on sexual offenders but also on "idle" and "disobedient" neighbours, as follows.

> Robert Baker dwellinge at St Giles in the feildes sent hether by thinhabitants for that he will not worke for his lyvinge he sayeth that he is a wevor yet he hath not wrought this 2 yeres, he is complayned on by his wiffe and her mother, he is setto labor. 〈Vol.3, 16/Jan/1578〉

The inhabitants brought the man to Briedwell and wanted his reformation through the forced labour, after hearing the complaint made by his wife and mother-in-law.

V

The poor relief of early modern London was used as the means to moralize the poor, or the means of social control, by the parish elite, as I. W. Archer and K. Wrightson have pointed out.[27] As for the evil poor, including vagrants, Bridewell Hospital tried to moralize them through the forced labour. And the institution was extending its moral control over all Londoners, although its main target was the morality of the

27) I. W. Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 97; K. Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680*, Hutchinson, 1982, p. 181.

lower classes.

But as the documents of Bridewell Hospital Court Books illustrate, the movements of moralization did not always shape the simple stream that flowed from the elite to the poor or to the common people. Such movements could exist and be even promoted among the common people. Particularly in the community of neighbourhood, residents of the common people would warn moral offenders, and even bring them to Bridewell, requesting their reformation. They wanted to keep order and norms of the community of neighbourhood. The social control through moralization in early modern London was, therefore, supported by the basic parts of the society, that is, the communities of neighbourhood.