

Bridewell and the People in Early Modern England — A Genealogy of Morality —

UHARA Takashi

I

Morality was an instrument for ruling the people. The purpose of this article is insisting on it by the historical approach rather than by philosophical thinking⁽¹⁾.

The above proposition could be a conclusion that is inevitably derived from my previous research⁽²⁾, that is, the research on the Bridewell Hospital in London in the late 16th century. The conclusion, however, has been only suggested in my articles so far, and never been insisted on clearly. The reason of it lay on a natural hesitation to raise such a general philosophical proposition from one historical and particular research on the institution named Bridewell in early modern London.

However, accepting the conventional criticism for the exclusive tendency of the academic studies, and also the criticism for the social history which pursues to clarify the micro world, I have become to feel more and more necessary to give my own answer. This article, therefore, was planned as an attempt to reconsider my research from the point of the above proposition.

Analyzing the “Bridewell Hospital Court Books”⁽³⁾ as the main historical sources as before, I would like to consider the relationships between the institution and the people, and to reveal the structure of power and the role

played by morality there.

II

The Bridewell Hospital was one of the five hospitals which were founded or re-founded one after another around 1550 for the reform of poor policies in London. The other four were St. Thomas's Hospital and St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which housed and relieved the sick and old poor, Christ's Hospital, which accommodated and educated orphans and poor children with no relief, and Bethlehem Hospital, which housed and treated mentally ill people. The five hospitals worked together and the Christ's supervised them.

As for the purpose of establishing the Bridewell Hospital founded in 1553, two historical sources describing it have survived. One is the suit for making Bridewell written in 1552. This historical document is a petition to Edward VI by Nicholas Ridley, the bishop of London, and the leading citizens including Richard Grafton. They hoped that the Bridewell, which was a royal palace and was rarely used at the time, would be granted to the city of London as a facility for its poor policy. Let us quote some parts of the document.

And first, may it please your honors to understand, that it was too evident to all men that beggary and thievery did abound. And we remembering how many statutes from time to time have been made for the redress of the same, and little amendment hath hitherto followed, thought to search the cause hereof, and after due examination had, we evidently perceived that the cause of all this misery and beggary was idleness : and the mean and remedy to cure

the same must be by its contrary, which is labour. And it hath been a speech used of all men, to say unto the idle, work! work! even as though they would have said, the mean to reform beggary, is to fall to work.

…… wherefore we saw that there could be no mean to amend this miserable sort, but by making some general provision of work, wherewith the willing poor may be exercised, and whereby the froward, strong, and sturdy vagabond may be compelled to live profitably to the commonwealth.

…… And among the whole rout of needy and miserable persons, we espied three sundry sorts which were diversly to be provided for, the succourless poor child, the sick and impotent, the sturdy vagabond, or idle person.

…… Now resteth for the third sort, an house of occupations, to be erected, wherein as well, the child when he is brought up and grown to years and found unapt to learning, neither any honest person desireth or would have his service, may there be exercised and occupies ; as also the sore and sick when they be cured ; who shall not be suffered to wander as vagabonds in the commonwealth, as they have been accustomed, but shall there be exercised. And unto this shall be brought the sturdy and idle : and likewise such prisoners as are quit at the sessions, that there they may be set to labour. And for that the number will be great, the place where they shall be exercised must also be great. And this being (as it were) the perfection of our whole former travail is yet undone, and moveth as now to sue for the King's majesty's house of Bridewell ; ⁽⁶⁾……

Thus, it is stated that the cause of all poverty and beggary is idleness, and the means to remedy it is labour. And the establishment of Bridewell is

proposed as the facility which does the offer or the compulsion of such labour to vagrants and idle persons and so on. It is, therefore, clearly expressed that idleness is the root of poverty and evil, and that Bridewell is the institution that corrects it. For this reason, this hospital must be recognized appropriately as a house of correction.

Another historical source, also written in 1552, is a document on the rules for Bridewell's governance.⁽⁷⁾ Let's quote also some parts of this document below.

To the governours or rather Almoners of Bridewell you are elected and assigned by the consent of the Lord Major and his Brethren to be rulers & overseers of this house of Bridewell and all the people therein and as ye are accompted for men of much Worship and wisdom and of great experience which are such and so necessary virtues as without the same this house cannot be well governed so must you according to the trust and confidence that is had in you endeavour yourselves to ye good government thereof that it may yield the worthy fruit that the same is erected for, That is to say, To be a house of continuance for the oppression of Idleness the enemy of all virtue, and the nourisher of good exercise which is the conquerour of all vice ····· The poor man is he whome age or sickness oppresseth or by losses or otherwise is beaten to the ground with necessity which doth labour willingly to gaine that may be gotten so long as power and strength will serve. The Beggar is the Contrary one who never yeildeth himself to any good exercise but continually travaileth in Idleness trayneing such youth as cometh to his or their custody to ye same wickedness of Life.

The way and means to remedy the same was thought meet first to

train up the beggars child in virtuous exercise that of him should spring no more beggars then to place the soare and aged person that he might have reliefe and succour to yield allmost to the poore and honest householder being decayed. And last of all to force and compell the Idle strumpett and vagabond to honesti and virtuous exercise soe⁽⁸⁾ that the lewd and Idle sort should remaine in Bridewell to labour ·····

Here again, the recognition that idleness is the enemy of all virtues, and labour or exercise is the conqueror of all vices is expressed. And it is clarified that the purpose of establishing Bridewell is to impose labour on lewd and idle people such as prostitutes and vagrants for training and correcting them.

And this historical source describes the authority of the governors who run Bridewell as follows.

Ye that are Governours shall understand that ye have authority by the Kings Majesties Grant that whensoever two of you or more are present ye may take into the said house all such suspected persons as shall be presented unto you as Lewd & Idle, ye may allsoe examine and punish the same according to your discretions. ····· ye 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 committ 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 and to take bonds for their good abareing of such Landlords Tenents or

(9)

suspected persons ……

Thus, the governors have broad and powerful authority to take into Bridewell “all such suspected persons as shall be presented unto you as lewd and idle” among the residents of London, and to examine them and punish them according to the governors’ own discretion. “Lewd” in this paragraph means doing bad behaviour in general, including sexual misbehaviour in principal, and “idle” means not only being lazy but also the general state of being not working with a legal job. Although “idleness” is used in a broader sense than in the present, it belongs to the realms of morality as well as “lewdness” does. And such morality is targeted by Bridewell for its controlling activities.

To the governors of Bridewell with such arbitrary authority were appointed the members of the Committee of Thirty. The committee was an organization that operated the five hospitals described above, including Bridewell, consisting of six aldermen and twenty-four citizens of London. They were all unpaid, and usually around five to ten of them attended the court of Bridewell as its governors. The court was held twice a week for the principal purpose to examine those who were brought to the institution and to decide on their punishments.

Among Bridewell’s officers, it was the beadles who played a particularly important role besides the governors. For the beadles patrolled London and took to Bridewell such persons as the ones mentioned above who “seemed to be lewd and idle.” Although two beadles were initially assigned to each of the five hospitals including Bridewell, the number was increased to four by 1569. They had their own patrolling area, and they went around to control it and to take the suspects to Bridewell.⁽¹⁰⁾

Then, what was the actual situation of the activity of the institution

called Bridewell which was established for the above purpose?

III

To clarify the activities of Bridewell it is necessary to analyze the remaining Court Books. The Court Books are historical records mainly about the examination of those who were taken to the institution and the punishments imposed to them and so on, having remained since 1559. Being based on the historical documents and citing the cases from them, let us begin to investigate the Bridewell's activities of controlling morality.

William vallannce a vile and naughtie idle vacabond who before hath bene in this house broughte nowe in by Roberte the beadell at the commandment 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 therefore was well whipped the xjth of Januarye and so comitted to the labor of the myll. < Vol.1, fol.185a ⁽¹¹⁾ >

Mr. Pierce in the article is one of the governors of Bridewell. As described here, William Vallannce had previously been held in the institution, and Mr. Pierce may have received information or reports that he was idle without working after his release. He seems to have ordered the beadle to take him as a vagrant. And after the court examination, he was punished with whipping and set to work of the mill in the institution. Handling the mill was the hardest labour in Bridewell.

In this case the beadle took the suspect and brought him to Bridewell, but as indicated in the instances below, there were various patterns of taking or bringing. We can find the cases where some officers who did not

belong to Bridewell, such as constables and night watches, took and brought suspects. And there are also cases where persons of some status in various institutions ordered their subordinates to take someone. And we can find even the cases where somebody with problems was taken and brought on the basis of the report or information by his or her master, relatives, parents, or neighbours. Let's cite some instances.

John Tether broughte into this house the xixth of Aprill (1562) by knighte cunstable to Mr Silver for that he was suspiciouslie taken in the house of Katherine witton for that no mattier was greatlie againste with admonicion given him to eschewe vice was delivered the xxijth of Aprill at courte then holden. < Vol.1, fol.211a >

Margett Warmencham and her husbandes brother Rycharde Warmencham beinge taken in the night together suspiciouslye alone together and sent in by mr Justice ffisher for the same And being here examined they confesse ther being ther together but upon not have evil will ffor that ther is not facte proved on them they are delivered. <Vol.3, 23/Apr/1578>

The former was taken by the night constable and the latter was probably taken by the justice's subordinate. The suspects of both cases were taken on suspicion of sexual offences, but as the result of the examination, the crime was not proven and they were released. It was possible to take persons to Bridewell for interrogating them just on a suspicion of lewdness in this way.

There are numerous cases of prostitutes in the Court Books, but there are also many cases of sexual offences committed not by prostitutes. We

can, therefore, realize that Bridewell tried to control the sexual morality of Londoners in general.

On the other hand, rather severer treatments were taken to “idleness”.

Josephe Cowche sent in by the wardemote enquest of Bridgewater 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 hether to doe. < Vol.3, 11/Jan/1577>

Vagrancy in this period was obvious crime and severely punished by the Poor Laws.⁽¹²⁾ Bridewell also actively controlled vagrants, took them to it and imposed forced labour of the mill. As seen in this case, however, the same measures were taken to those who were idle and lived “like a vagrant”. The “charges” described herein were imposed on the inmates of Bridewell as the housing cost and were fixed at 3 pence per day. This father might have paid the necessary charges and put the son to work in the institution, wishing for his correction.

This day William Jorden sent into this hospitall by Ralph Haines dwelling in Breadstreet London for a vagrannt for that he is able to gett his living by his trade of Buckett makinge and yet willnot take paynes ordered to be ponished and sent to St Thomas Hospitall to cure his sore legge and to be ordered backe againe to this house to be sett on worke on his said trade for that there is verie fewe that cann make such bucketts. < Vol.4, 14/Apr/1600>

Although this person was sent as a vagrant, he had been originally a craftsman making buckets. But he seems not to have worked because of his idle character. And as he had such rare skill, the measures of re-detention were taken after punishment and treatment.

Jammes Hickes sente in by Mr yonge, Mr yonge saithe he is a masterles fellowe without service, a felowe of wicked liffe. A comon drunckarde, and one that hathe abused the quenes majesty comission beinge a pursyvante, yt is ordered he shall remayne here until his father sendeth order for him. < Vol.2, 7/May/1575>

As for the “masterless” man in this article, he was so called because it had been prescribed by the law since the 14th century that anyone who was able to work and having no means of independence had to be employed by a master. The “masterless man” was almost synonymous with a vagrant.⁽¹³⁾ About his father’s order the document does not describe, but it seems to be a request for his son’s release, promising to put him to work.

In the following case, the man was released by the pleas of friends.

Ralfe Rivers sente in by Mr Gardener as a comon Roge and one that will not abide in no place is at the greate Intreatie of his frendes at this tyme uppon hope of Amendemente of his life pardened. < Vol.2, 11/Jun/1575>

However, there are few cases where idle persons were released in this way, and they were usually housed and set to labor in the institution. There are also cases where family members, relatives, friends and neighbours plead for punishment or detention. Let’s cite some examples.

Richard Saterley the sonne of Nicholas Saterley groccer, brought into this house the xvij daye of Julij 1559 at the speciall sute and request of his mother, for that the same Richard is geven to all idlenes and unthriftynes, and will receave no gentle admonycions for the amendment of his life, and therfore was here whipped the sayd daye and yere in the presence of his sayd mother. < Vol.1, fol.10b >

Dericke Heynes broughte hether by John Hollander letherdressor of Battle bridge at Sowthwerke Garrett Hollander his neighbor and Peter Stuppene ther dwelling also beinge his frendes and kynsemen for that he is a verye lewde boye and will not tarrye with any master which he denieth not And they desire that he maye be ponished And kepte here at labor and they will paye his chardges here. And they paye vijs for a moneth before hande. he is ponished and soe setto labor. < Vol.3, 27/Aug/1579 >

Whipping was a punishment commonly done in Bridewell, and the punishment of the latter case also refers to whipping. The former Richard Saterley was probably released solely by whipping because there was no description of the detention. His mother had him to be whipped in the hope of improving his life.

We can find the same cases about sexual morality as well.

Elizabeth Meryng the daughter of Christopher Meryng mercer brought into this house at the request of her sayd father to be kept in this house for the amendment of her life and lewdnes, and that he the same her father will paye for thordinary charges of this house iijd for a daye, and she came in the xiiij daye of Maye 1560. < Vol.1, fol.79b >

To female inmates, labour such as spinning was imposed. And the father asked Bridewell to keep his daughter in the institution, wishing for the improvement of her lewdness.

As being described in the above cases, people were taken to Bridewell not only because of “lewdness” or “idleness” but also on the grounds of “disobedience.” Let’s take some examples.

Agnes wilkes broughte into this house the xix th daye of october by Mr. hewettes beadell at Mr. harrys comandment for that she disobedientlie mysused her selfe towards her father in Raylinge and fightinge withe him for whiche she was here well whipped the same xix th of october 1561 and uppon promise made she will not at no tyme hereafter misuse her selfe any more delivered the iiij th of November.
< Vol.1, fol.166a >

Gilberte chedwicke broughte in for his disobedience to his ffather, yt is ordered that the saide Gilberte shall be whipped at a cartes Arse, yf he be not here after ruled by his father Roger Chedwicke and unto this he hathe sette his hande. < Vol.2, 11/May/1575>

Both cases are about disobedience to father, and it was a daughter who was taken in the former case and a son in the latter. The whipping punishment was usually imposed on the person of such a disobedient character though the former case was accompanied by the detention. The girl in the next instance was also whipped.

Margerye Rondell a naughtie wenche which will not be ruled by her father in lawe ap white and his wiffe her owne mother they desire

to have her ponished here which is done and she is delivered to her father and mother. < Vol.3, 14/Nov/1579 >

The following case was housed in Bridewell because he did not study besides disobedieny.

Randall Christopher sente in for his greate disobedience to his father and frendes and for that he will not abide at Cambridge beinge there placed at studie and fall to his booke which he will not do. Yt is ordered he shalbe detayned prisoner until he wilbe reclaymed, or that further order be taken. < Vol.2, 5/Nov/1575 >

The control of such disobedience, rebellious character, and behaviour that disturbs order was also being carried out inside Bridewell. For examples,

Barbara Cleyton, Agnes Hodgekyn, Alice pyttes, Johan Conaway were whipped the xxvj day of July for that they and every of them wolde not doe their worke but disobedyent to thorders of this hous and unruly. < Vol.1, fol.93b >

Robert Lee a prisoner of this howse called up into this court beinge examined saith and confeseth that true it is that he hath committed much disorder in bringinge candle into the prison and plaid at dice with the prisoners for points for which it is ordered that he shalbe punished and kept. < Vol.4, 14/Sep/1602 >

In the Court Books, there are cases in general where masters took

disobedient apprentices and servants. Let's see the following case.

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 >

Although the next instance seems to be by the similar reason, the master did not take him, and asked for whipping by letter instead.

Roger Brigs servant to Mr Anthony hossey came into this house the vij daye of July 1559 and brought a letter from his sayd master conteynyng in effect to have him ponysshed with rodds, and the sayd Roger did take the same with soche submission as certeynly he declared him selfe to have a most penitent and repentannt heart, and therefore after his ponyshment was agayne restored to his Mr. the sayd daye and yere. < Vol.1, fol.10a >

The movement to send rebellious apprentices and servants to Bridewell can also be confirmed in historical documents on the part of the guilds. The following example relates to John Smith, who was an apprentice of the Pewterers Company.

The v th daye of July (1559). At the same Courte John Smythe was sent to the warde by the Mrs comandement for mysordering hym

self and specially for that the said Smyth against the ordenannce will lye owt of his Mr howse in the night at his pleasuer saying he 'neyther carith for the Mr nor yet the wardens and that they shold not Rule hym' and the said Smyth is a comon entiser of mens servannts from theire Mr gevyng them evill counsell and also he hym self gorth about the towne lyke a marsterles man and will not work but at his owne pleasuer.

Yt was agreed that the said Smyth shoulde serve his Mr John Cutler betwene this and Mighelms next and that he shoulde lye in his Mr howse both holy daye and working daye and to be at his Mrs comandement alwayes during the same tyme And that he sholde have for his wages every daye he workithe ⁽¹⁴⁾ iiiij d.

The disobedient apprentice John Smith was punished again by the company with being sent to the ward, as indicated in the following article. But even so, his behavior would not be improved and the company sent him to Bridewell.

The xij th daye of January 1559 (1560). At the same Courte John Smythe Sometyme aprentice with Geffery Mathewe was comytted to warde by the Mr Wardens and assystannce for that he had promysed to serve a certayne tyme with John Cutler as maye apere the last yeare, and after his promys within ij dayes after went to maydstone and wrought there with a Tynkerd and made hym mowles, And beinge Suspected to come and Entice mens servannts and prentice to be obstynate agaynst there masters as before tyme he hath donne.

ffurther the xix daye of January 1559 (1560) the saide Smyth was Commytted to Brydewell for his obstenary for that he wolde not

submyt hym self But Rather worsse when he cam owt of the Counter then he was when he went in.

The saide John Smyth was Released owt of Brydewell the xxiiij daye of January and dyd submyt hym self and desired the company of fforgevenes kneeling upon his knees in the presens of the Mr and wardens and assystance and parte of the clothinge and Yemandry howsholders and Jorneymen never to offende agayne and if he do to be Banyshed the company for ever.⁽¹⁵⁾

According to and judging from this historical document, sending to Bridewell was effective, and John Smith's behaviour was improved. By the way, to "send to the ward" in the articles supposedly means sending to the Counter prison.

It is often seen in the Court Books that apprentices and servants escape from their masters. After such a runaway had been held in Bridewell, some masters accepted him or her again, while others refused. In the following case the servant was released because his brother promised to put him to work.

Arthur Pill late servant with Mr Prestwood sent in by his mr and his Brother John words Letherseller for runnyng away from his mr and nowe a Rogue he hath bene here this moneth and nowe his brother taketh hym and promyseth to put hym to a samme and so he is dischargd without ponyshement. < Vol.3, 19/Feb/1576(1577)>

Being based on the Court Books, we have seen Bridewell's activities of controlling morality, and the activities were taken not only by Bridewell's governors or beadles. But people of various positions, including family

members and relatives, were also able to take morally problematic persons to Bridewell. And they could request for his or her punishment and detention. By doing so, they tried to correct “lewd”, “idle”, and “disobedient” persons. The activities became much wider because everyone, as it were, was able to use this institution though the activities would have been limited if only the officers of Bridewell had accomplished the duties.

This fact means that the control of morality was not being carried out in one direction from the city authorities to the people in London, from top to bottom. As being obvious from the above cases, morality was an instrument for ruling the people, but there was also an aspect that the people themselves accepted it and advanced the movement of moralizing. About this respect, I want to continue the arguments more, by means of taking some cases.

IV

The unity of the neighbourhood community in early modern London seems to have been stronger in general than in today. If any member of the neighborhood community committed any illegal act or moral violation, the neighbours could report it to Bridewell or take him or her to it.

Anne Aylwarde the wiffe of william Aylwarde mynister Johan westcote and Johan kevell do saie that they sawe Johan Sutton on bed with a man thorowe 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 descriptions of such a witness “through a wall” are common in the Court Books, including the witness from “a hole of the wall” and “a hole of the door.” Such actions by neighbours were intended to protect the order of the neighbourhood community, and the following case was more aggressive.

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 sixth 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 witness that dyvers persons came to her house many tymes suspitiously & alone with her at xi & xij o clock at night when her husband is abrode, and they have warned her often of it but she will not leve. The said Anne & Jenkyn did confesse indeede that they did ofend together as it is alleaged. She hath correction & is setto labour. < Vol.3, 21/Jul/1576 >

Although she was described as a harlot in the article, she might have committed adultery. The neighbours had often given warnings to this woman, but she continued to associate with men other than her husband. Because she did not stop associating, it is written that they raided upon the scene of the crime and caught her and the man. The neighbours tried to protect the order and morality of the neighbourhood community by force. It is certain that these neighbours were the people because titles such as Mr. were not given to their names. That is, the people themselves also

participated in the control of morality, and advanced the movement. There are also cases where residents reported the existence of brothels to Bridewell.⁽¹⁶⁾

Such control of morality by the people was also true for "idleness".

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 took the husband on the basis of the wife's and her mother's complaints against him who did not work.

V

Although the original purpose of establishing Bridewell was to house lewd and idle prostitutes and vagrants and to correct their idleness by imposing the forced labour, the institution was in fact carrying out the control over morality of the whole London residents, not only of prostitutes and vagrants. Through such activities of Bridewell, it was possible for companies, masters, neighbourhood communities, and parents to submit company members, apprentices or servants, neighbours, and children respectively. And even if the attempt was not successful, they wished, at least, to submit them through Bridewell. And we can guess easily that it would be also possible to submit them by threatening to send to Bridewell without actual taking or reporting.

The realms of morality such as "idle", "lewd" and "disobedient" was the means of controlling the people in this way, but the control was not in one

direction from the city authorities to the people as seen in the above cases. There were movements to participate in the control of morality and push it forward among the people themselves. Morality could be an instrument for ruling the people, but there were also people who accepted it.

Similar facilities to Bridewell were to be established throughout England afterwards, as Bridewell had achieved a tentative success in controlling morality. Furthermore, being influenced by such England's movements, many European countries established similar confinement institutions one after another.⁽¹⁷⁾ Thus, Europe would experience the era of "great confinement"⁽¹⁸⁾.

Notes

- (1) Friedrich Nietzsche, *Zur Genealogie der Moral*, translated by Kiba Jinjo, 1940, Iwanami Shoten.
- (2) 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.; "Morality and People, Social Control in Early Modern London", *The Kyotogakuen University Review, Faculty of Business Administration*, vol.18, no.1, November 2008.
- (3) *Bridewell Hospital Court Books*, vols.1-10, 1559-1659, Guildhall Library, MF. 510-515.
- (4) As concerns the problems of the poor and the poor policies in Europe in the early modern period, see my books and articles, including the references in them.
- (5) 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.
- (6) *Ibid.*, pp.3-4. The parts of …… are omitted. The same applies to the

followings.

- (7) *Ordinances and Rules for the Government of the House of Bridewell*, 1552, British Library, Sloane MS. 2722.
- (8) *Ibid.*, fol.1a-b.
- (9) *Ibid.*, fols.2b-3a.
- (10) See my books and articles.
- (11) As for the quotation from the Court Books, each cited article of the first volume is indicated by the folio number in the angle brackets < >, as the first volume has foliation. And 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. And the content of the round brackets () is my supplement. The same applies to the followings.
- (12) See my books and articles.
- (13) See my books and articles.
- (14) *Pewterers Company, Court Minute Books*, Vol. 1, 1551-1561, Guildhall Library, MS. 7090, 1, fol.81b.
- (15) *Ibid.*, fol.90a.
- (16) For example, "William ffullwoode, John Mason, William Recke, Elizabeth Bedboe inhabitants of longe lane and divers other doe her 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, 20/Jun/1579 >
- (17) See my books and articles.
- (18) Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*, translated by Tamura Hajime, 1975, Shinchosya, Part 1, Chapter 2.

