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1. Poor Relief and Discipline

Poverty and its concomitant vagrancy were a perennial problem throughout the sixteenth century. The increase in the scale of poverty and vagabondage was a result of economic difficulties, for instance in agriculture, and an enormous population growth, which started in the middle of the fifteenth century. The demographic expansion was aggravated by a higher rate of internal migration, either ‘betterment migration’ or ‘subsistence migration’, resulting in a move from the land to the towns. Thus, poverty became in the first place an urban phenomenon, a problem of the overcrowded cities in early modern Europe. In every major town or city a substantial part of the inhabitants belonged to the destitute class. In Spain, for example, the proportion of the poor in the population of Toledo in 1561 has been estimated at 20 per cent. The figure for Segovia in the same year was 15 per cent.

Contemporaries were conscious of the mass of poor people in the streets. The first quantitative estimates of their numbers were made by clergymen and laymen who showed an interest in the origins of mass poverty and devoted long tracts and extensive sermons to the solution of the problem. An outstanding example for methodical approach to poor relief was Juan Luis Vives’ book *De subventione pauperum* (1526). Other important studies were also written by Spaniards: *Deliberacion en la causa de los pobres* (1545), by Fray Domingo de Soto, *De la orden que en algunos pueblos de España se ha puesto en la limosna* (1545), by Juan de Medina, and *De
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and Nürnberg (1522) were the first; Straßburg, Leipzig, and other German cities followed shortly afterwards. But it was the poor relief scheme of Ypres in Flanders which found adherents as well as critics all over Europe.

In the eyes of Domingo de Soto, a prominent theologian and father confessor of Charles V, Ypres and certain German cities could not set an example for the poor relief of Spanish towns:

...ni los de Hipre/ni ningunos alemanes pueden ser bastante exemplo para nosotros. Por que allende que como tenemos dicho son gente mas politica: tienen grandes rentas publicas/de donde aparten gran parte para los pobres/como parece en las mismas constituciones de Colonia/y de Hipre.

The various measures adopted by municipal governments in the beginning of the sixteenth century — prohibition of begging, hospitalization, compulsory poor rate, etc. — prepared the way for the administrative measures of territorial rulers later on. Reinhold A. Dorwart, for instance, stresses the important role played by the cities in this particular field of social legislation. He regards the cities of early modern Europe as the 'microcosm' of the future territorial welfare state.

The ruler's concern for the welfare of his subjects results from his patrimonial obligation of Schutz und Schirm, Rat und Hilfe, as it was called in German contemporary sources. As is indicated in the German phrase, this obligation is mutual in that it binds both ruler and subjects. In fact, the feudal system in Europe since the Middle Ages was based on this assumption. The public responsibility, claimed by many political writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was derived from the feudal duty which marked the relationship between feudal lord and vassal. Government, in their opinion, meant taking care of 'commodum, securitas, salus subditorum'. The bonum commune, according to sixteenth century political theory, had to be well to the fore in all actions undertaken by the government. In Spain Juan de Medina justified the king's concern for the poor with 'las leyes del derecho comun' and 'algunas causas y razones concernientes al bien de todo Reyno'.

All the prince and the magistrates needed was prudentia civilis (the advice for the proper political conduct), with its theoretical implications of obedience and discipline as a priori conditions for order in the State. The contemporaries generally described this task as establishing gute Ordnung und Policey. What this term

...
meant is explained by Thomas Starkey in his *Dialogue*, where Cardinal Pole demands:

> gud ordur and pollycy by gud lawys stablyschyd and set, and by hedys and rulryys put in effect; by wyche the hole body, as by reson, ys gouernyd and ruleyd to the intent that thyss multytyde of pepul and hole commynality, so helthy and so welthy, haungy conuenyent abundance of al thyngys necessary for the maytenance therof...19

The paternalistic state of the sixteenth century gradually began to regulate all aspects of private and public life in order to serve the public interest, a process for which G. Oestreich coined the word ‘Fundamentaldisziplinierung’.20

The motive underlying the disciplinarian attitude is revealed in the words of John Vowell, a magistrate of Exeter: ‘Not by nature: but good discipline doo men prooue and become good and honest.’21 Discipline took hold of every aspect of life — in government, economy, society, and church. Nobody was exempt: ‘To discipline must all the estates within this realm be subject, as well rulers as they that are ruled; yea, and the preachers themselves as the poorest within the Kirk.’22 Discipline was not something abstract. It became rather concrete, for instance, in the poor relief schemes in the sixteenth century. Even if it was intended to inculcate discipline in the minds of people from all walks of life (e.g. sumptuary laws),23 there was one social class which felt the force of discipline more severely than other groups of the society — the poor. This was mainly due to the fact that the poor in general and vagabonds in particular were considered to be a menace to both law and order and Christian virtues. That town magistrates were well aware of this threat can be seen in the case of Ypres, where the Senate justified its harsh measures with the intention ‘quam pauperum gregaria multitudo hactenus absque disciplina, ex lex, vaga, incustodita ac morum insolens quae clamoribus & pravis moribus civitatem turbant, ad meliorem vitae frugem redigeretur.’24

The class of the dispossessed people was looked upon as the source of social discontent and moral and civil disorder. They were ‘masterless men’ and therefore not within the bounds of the hierarchic order of the society,25 as William Perkins, ‘the first systematic Calvinist theologian in England’ (Christopher Hill),26 explained when he came to write his *Treatise of Callings*27 at the very end of the sixteenth century:

Poverty and its concomitant, vagrancy, were problems not only for the secular authorities, but also for the authorities of the Church.28 The beggar, living in misery and in immediate danger of harming his body and soul, could not be integrated into the parish community and was therefore lacking special supervision and instruction in Christian virtues. Wandering from one place to another, he did not attend the service on Sundays, did not confess and did not go to the Holy Communion.29 In the eyes of the Church such an anti-Christian way of life became a matter of ecclesiastical discipline.

Church discipline before the Reformation took the form of measures attempting to safeguard the purity of the Christian doctrine by the punishment of the offenders.30 The Reformers, above all the Calvinists, extended ecclesiastical discipline to all aspects of human life.31 As John Knox, the Scottish Reformer explained:

As no Citie, Towne, howse, or familie, can maytaine their estate and prosper without policie and governaunce so the Church of God, which requireth more purely to be governed then any citie or familie, can not without spirituall Policie and ecclesiastical Discipline continewe, encrease, and florishe.32

The Church’s aim was to censor the citizen’s private conduct in order to preserve Christian virtues. But the state, with a strong executive body which it alone could provide, had to lend the Church its secular arm for enforcing discipline. Both took advantage of this close co-operation. Charles-Louis Frossard wrote: ‘Parquois la discipline Ecclesiastique ne diminue aucunelement l’autorité du Magistrat, mais au contraire est ministre d’icelle, en disposant les coeurs et volontez des hommes pour s’y rendre mieux obéissans.’33

The Protestant rulers of the sixteenth century eagerly adopted this theory. The Church thereby became, in the words of R. H. Tawney, ‘the ecclesiastical department of the State, and religion was used to lend a moral sanction to secular policy’.34 Church discipline and social discipline overlapped. The final stage was reached when Milton, writing in the middle of the seventeenth cen-
tury, expressed succinctly the Puritan conception of an ubiquitous discipline:

There is not that thing in the world of more grave and urgent importance throughout the whole life of man than is discipline. The flourishing and decaying of all civil societies, all the movements and turnings of human occasions are moved to and fro upon the axel of discipline . . . . Nor is there any sociable perfection in this life, civil or sacred, that can be above discipline; but she is that which with her musical cords preserves and holds all the parts thereof together . . . . Discipline is not only the removal of disorder, but if any visible shape can be given to divine things, the very visible shape and image of virtue.35

The issue of discipline was taken up after the paternalistic state had at least partly achieved the externalization of discipline as far as the army and the poor were concerned. The appearance of the term discipline in the philosophical discussion at the end of the sixteenth century comes into line with the revival of ideas first conceived in ancient philosophy. This is particularly true in the political thought of that century. In many cases ideas seem to have become philosophical stereotypes. But in adjusting them to the special needs of that century, they took on a slight difference in meaning.36 The reason that sixteenth century authors of political literature often referred to Roman or Greek writers or the Fathers is partly due to their wish to support their own political thoughts by quoting ancient authorities.37 In many cases the evocation of ancient works happened because there was a contemporary need and a possibility for immediate application of theories developed in the ancient world.38

The most comprehensive revival of Roman thought was an achievement of Neo-Stoicism, which proclaimed the virtue of the restriction of man's freedom of will and freedom of action. Besides auctoritas, temperantia, and constiantia, the Roman idea of disciplina was compatible with the system of moral principles and rules of conduct laid down in the political literature of the sixteenth century.39 Gradually, disciplina began to include all aspects of life. It became an essential part of a new pattern of society, a pattern which did not call into question the traditional hierarchical structure of society, but attempted to preserve the old structure by new means. Thus, discipline became, as G. Oestreich wrote, 'ein Grundpfeler der Entwicklung, die die neue Ordnung in Form des absolutistischen Staates gewährleistete'.40 In theory, this implied disciplina necessarily had to clash with libertas and licentia. There can be no doubt that for most of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers of political literature disciplina took precedence over liberty and permissiveness.41 Tracing the idea of discipline in sixteenth-century political thought is legitimate not so much because this idea influenced society by playing an important role in the internalization of disciplinar and regulations, but because it reveals the social background which gave rise to such an idea. For the origins of a disciplinar attitude towards the poor we have to go back to, basically, two areas of social theory. One has to do with the aspects of the theory of labour. The other area concerns idleness.

2. Aspects of Social Discipline: Labour and Idleness

Idlenes, therfore,
maye rghte well be named
The gate of all mischiefe
that euer was framed.

. . . . .
And woulde God the maiestrates
woulde se men set a-worke,
And that within thys realme
none were suffered to lurke.
This realme hath thre commoditie
woule, tynne, and leade
Which being wrought within the realme,
eche man might get his bread.42

Robert Crowley, 'Of Idle Persons'

In the sixteenth century begging was looked upon as an outcome of idleness. 'No poverty, but rather much idulnes and yl pollycy' were, in the words of Thomas Starkey's character, Lupsei,43 responsible for the increasing number of beggars in England. The magistrates of London who had to deal with the intensification of poverty in their city came in the year 1552 to nearly the same conclusion:

. . . after due examination had, we evidently perceived that the cause of all this misery and begree was idleness; and the mean and remedy to cure the same must be by its contrary, which is labour.44

Labour became the new medicine for poverty in many cities of early modern Europe.
In ancient Rome labour was considered to be an instrument to master nature. Virgil's famous phrase of 'labor omnia vincit' was popular right through the Middle Ages. The Christian interpretation of labour was fundamentally based on two biblical passages, one from the Old Testament and one from the New. In Genesis 3:17-19, after the description of Adam's sin, God says to Adam:

\[
\text{[C]ursed is the ground because of you; no}
\]
\[
\text{in toil you shall eat of it all the}
\]
\[
\text{days of your life;}
\]
\[
\text{thorns and thistles it shall bring forth}
\]
\[
\text{to you;}
\]
\[
\text{and you shall eat the plants of the}
\]
\[
\text{field.}
\]
\[
\text{In the sweat of your face}
\]
\[
\text{you shall eat bread.} \]

Even more important for the Christian attitude towards labour became St Paul's command in the New Testament (2 Thessalonians: 10-12):

If any one will not work, let him not eat. For we hear that some of you are living in idleness, mere busybodies, not doing any work. Now such persons we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ to do their work in quietness and to earn their own living.

In scholastic philosophy the function of labour was threefold. According to Thomas Aquinas: 'Primo ad utium tollendum . . . Secundo ad corpus domandum . . . Tertio . . . ad quaerendum victum . . .'47 Juan de Medina, writing in the sixteenth century, was very much in this tradition when he wrote that men have to labour in order to gain their livelihood, to exterminate idleness, and to train their bodies.48

In the eyes of the Fathers, labour was man's duty, but only for those who were forced to work by need. Labour discipline could not be applied in general. Some people were exempt: 'Praeceptum de laborare manum non obligat aliquem singulariter',49 claimed Thomas Aquinas. Clergymen and men of noble ranks were not obliged to work. At the same time monastical orders like the Benedictines propagated laborare ex oratione and thus contributed to a Christian conception of labour which included all ranks of society.

The Reformation effected a new appraisal of labour. This was not a mere coincidence. Along with the growing awareness of the economic importance of labour went a new and even stronger emphasis on the duty of every man to work.50 Tracts and pamphlets of the Reformation period dealing with contemporary social problems were preoccupied with the idea of compulsory labour. The official view of the Church in Elizabethan England, for instance, was that it is necessary to be declared unto you, that by the ordinance of GOD, whyche he hath sette in the nature of man euerye one ought in his lawefull vocation and callings, to geue himself to labour.51

Man's duty to labour was not only prescribed by divine law. Ancient authorities were also called in evidence:

[He] man ys borne to labur and travayle, after the opynyon of the wyse and aunctyn antyquye, non other wyse then a byrd to fle, and not to lye (as Homer sayth some dow) as an vnprofytabal weight and burden of the erth.52

The anonymous tract, An Ease for Overseers,53 lists all the arguments which could be brought up in a discussion in favour of compulsory labour, namely from the divine and human law, and the law of nature. Those who did not follow God's command had to be subjected to ecclesiastical discipline. As Martin Bucer explained: 'For those that may gette their lyuinge by their labour and travaayl, and wil not, ought to be put out of the Churche.'54

Use of the term labour by sixteenth-century writers did not always imply bodily labour. Those who by their vocation were brain-workers were also regarded as profitable members of the society.55 The important thing was that every man must have a calling. Accordingly, the mendicant orders were not exempt from this rule. In contrast to Luther, who criticized the mendicant friars and their practice,56 the Spanish theologian Domingo de Soto justified the existence of mendicant orders with their profitable function, for they

\[
\text{trabajan enel culto diuino/y en la predicacion del euangelio a biuir de los fructos temporales: por raz\on del spiritual fructo que ellos hazen al pueblo.} \]

With this exception, begging gradually also became despised among Catholic writers. Juan de Medina,58 for example, thought that no theologian could be convinced that begging was a proper means to overcome destitution.

Begging was considered to be on a par with idleness; the latter was commonly regarded as a threat to one's salvation and equally
noxious for society as a whole.\textsuperscript{69} Firstly, because the idle person lives at the expense of other men’s labour like ‘a drowne be doth in a hyue, suckyth vp the hunny’\textsuperscript{60}, a metaphor which was used by Thomas Starkey in his \textit{Dialogue}. Secondly, because the idler was a menace to social order, or in the words of Jeremias Drexel, a Bavarian Jesuit, ‘Ad otium spectant cognata duo vimia: Intemperans somnus, \& neglectus ordo.’\textsuperscript{61} The authorities therefore were admonished to extirpate idleness wherever they could find it. Juan Luis Vives, in his famous book on poor relief, demanded:

\begin{quote}
Quocirca non patiendum est quem quam in ciuitati ociosum viure, in qua tamen quam in domo bene instituta vnnumqueque decet esse in officio prisci sentimentia est. homines nihil agenda discret male agere.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

The remedy recommended by contemporaries was labour.\textsuperscript{63}

Labour in terms of poor relief meant punishment as well as training and education. Robert Hitchcock, for instance, suggested that

\begin{quote}
the lustie Vacabounds and ldell persone (the rootes, buddes, and seedes of idelnesse) shall at all handes and in al places be set on worke, and labour willingly, and thereby proue good subiectes, and profitable members of this Commonweale.\textsuperscript{64}
\end{quote}

Nobody was really unable to work. Bodily infirmity, in the eyes of sixteenth-century poor relief reformers, was only an excuse. Juan Luis Vives showed that even the blind were able to gain their livelihood by playing music, spinning, making baskets, etc. Workhouses like Bridewell in London show a variety of different forms of production: making of caps, feather-bed ticks, wool cards; drawing of wire; spinning, cording, knitting, and winding silk (by those who were lame or lacking hands); making of nails and other ironwork (by those who were regarded as lazy and stubborn).\textsuperscript{65}

Labour was only one facet of social discipline in the sixteenth century. If we wish to shed light on other forms of discipline in sixteenth-century poor relief schemes, we must also examine its following aspects: supervision; control; examination; education; and punishment.

\section*{3. Supervision}

The bulk of contemporary literature on poor relief consists of pamphlets, tracts, and sermons, which are saturated with doctrines drawn from the sphere of ethics and religion, and economic phenomena are expressed in terms of personal conduct, as naturally and inevitably as the nineteenth century expressed them in terms of mechanisms.\textsuperscript{66}

In this respect there are only slight differences between lay thought and clerical thought. The point on which, for example, English writers, such as John Vowell, George Whetstone et al., differ from the writings of clergymen, is their more pragmatic disposition towards ameliorating poverty. But both groups of writers deal with the public administration of poor relief and the necessary intervention of the state. W. K. Jordan, for instance, discerns a ‘substantial difference’\textsuperscript{67} in thought between laymen on one side and clergymen on the other. Many Protestant writers of the sixteenth century, such as Andreas Hyperius who was a theologian at Marburg University,\textsuperscript{68} believed that it was at least partly the duty of the state to cope with the problem of poverty:

\begin{quote}
That it be belongeth Iontly bothe to the Ecclesiasticall, and Politike gouernour, to take care for the reliefe of the poore.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{quote}

In Catholic countries like Spain this role of the state was controversial, and the Spanish theologians Soto and Medina, who were otherwise of different opinion about poor relief, agreed that care of the poor best remained in the hands of the Church.\textsuperscript{70} State or Church, the important question was how supervision of the destitute class was actually intensified.

Juan Luis Vives, who had a decisive influence on the poor relief schemes in several European countries, gives, in his famous book \textit{De subventione pauperum}, an explanation of why it was necessary to watch and direct the poor:

\begin{quote}
in a State the poorer members cannot be neglected without danger to the powerful ones. For the former, driven by their need, in some cases turn thieves.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

Supervision became a reality in the sixteenth century in such areas where one sought to find out, for example, how large the group of poor people was, how they lived, whether there were beggars and vagrants among them, what means existed for the poor to provide for themselves, and whether charity was distributed in a proper way or not. John Vowell, a magistrate in Exeter concerned with the administration of poor relief, gives us considerable insight into contemporary ideas regarding supervision:
& so ought the magistrate who being the general Tutor is the eye of the whole City; and therefore must behold and see every particular man's cause, he is the ear and mouth of the whole body, and therefore it is to hear all and to speak for all, he is the head of the whole common wealth: and therefore must understand and direct every man in his estate and calling.\textsuperscript{25}

In terms of poor relief, the practical application of these generalities resulted in the appointment of special supervisors for the poor. This happened in Spain,\textsuperscript{26} in Venice,\textsuperscript{27} and in several other European states. In England, where the initiative had been on the side of the towns, the supervisors were called 'overseers'. In 1571 Norwich, for example, appointed commissioners 'for the viewe of the State of the poore throughoute the whole citie'.\textsuperscript{28}

To put supervision into practice the state had to rely on the parish organization. In the poor law Act of 1563, the Tudor government decreed that in each parish collectors of alms should be appointed.\textsuperscript{29} The Act of 1572 included the provision that the Justices of the Peace should appoint overseers of the poor yearly at Easter.\textsuperscript{30} The Act of 1597-8 provided that four householders should be appointed overseers.\textsuperscript{31} In the Act of 1601 the number of overseers varied according to the size of the parish.\textsuperscript{32} By 1597-8 nearly the whole responsibility for poor relief rested on the overseers, despite the provision that they should 'take Order from tym to tym by and with the Consent of two or more such Justices of Peace'.\textsuperscript{33} An anonymous writer of the period made quite clear the important role played by the overseers: 'The Ouerseer is an eie to the Magistrate in these actions, and therefore it were not amisse to take his information: for in that he makes collection of the money, he is best acquainted with the inclination of the men, and if they be credible, charitable, and conscionable, it will appeare (as the bell by the found) by their willing speeches and payments ...'.\textsuperscript{34} The West-Riding Session Rolls in Yorkshire, for example, prove just how effective this kind of supervision of the poor had become in England at the end of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{35}

4. Control

An Ouerseer, Controwier to bee calde, to see vnoccupied none to remayn: vnel they bee with sicowmesses appalde, or by debilitie of Age ouerlayne. If case theare bee too punysche them by payne
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of Stockes or scowrings whiche suche maye compell to earne their fooade els to haue no morsell.\textsuperscript{36}

\emph{William Forrest, 'Princelie Practise' (1548)}

Supervision and control are complementary to one another. If we wish to see how social discipline was enforced under sixteenth-century government,\textsuperscript{37} we have to analyse the system of control established by the overseers. By control we do not mean the methods used to preserve order, but the theoretical power or authority which was given to the overseers to direct, order, and restrain the poor.

By 1526 Juan Luis Vives had already suggested that two appointed censors should have the power to 'investigate the life and the conduct of the poor, whether of children, youths, or old men'.\textsuperscript{38} According to Andreas Hyperius, overseers could hereby rely on the assistance of state and Church, if they

redily by their publique authoritye doe charge, prohibite, constitute, and publishe to the whole multitude, what soever are thought necessarye and profitable to the setting forthe of the liberalitie towards the poore.\textsuperscript{39}

Whether or not these ideas influenced later legislation, is almost impossible to prove. However, it is likely that they at least had indirect influence. In England the magistrate of Norwich decreed in 1571 that commissioners should have

authorite from master Maior . . . to alowe and disalowe, comaunde, correcte, reforme, place and displacce, or do anie thinge or thinges, which they do in master Maiors name . . . .\textsuperscript{40}

An anonymous writer in 1601, referring to the poor law of 1597-8 in England, described an overseer as a man who 'hath the charge of employing by worke, releaving by money, and ordering by discretion, the defects of the poore'.\textsuperscript{41} Levyng the poore rate and distributing the money among those who were in need, the overseers reached a degree of control which required a considerable amount of temperantia. The overseers therefore had to be admonished to

tender the poore but doe not tyranize ouer them; for it is no more glorie to triumph ouer the poore, then to tread of a worme, it is better to deserue commendation by discrete gouernment, then exclamacion by rigorous dealing.\textsuperscript{42}
For the government to have confidence that their overseers would have self-control is one thing, to actually exercise control over them another. Thus, the overseers had to subject themselves to governmental control. Those who refused to give a close account of their activity were threatened with imprisonment.90

From what we have examined hitherto, there can be no question regarding the substantial power given to the overseers to interfere in the affairs of other people. What remains to be discussed are the methods by which they exercised their power. A concise answer can be found in the aforementioned tract, An Ease for Overseers: ‘To inquire after poore is the next way to procure poore.’91

5. Examination

Poor relief in the sixteenth century differed from previous attempts to sustain the poor in so far as indiscriminate alms-giving was diminishing, and help was only given to those who were in desperate need.92 Subsequently, private charity was canalized by the state. One way of doing this was to enact laws which encouraged the foundations of workhouses and hospitals.93 Faced also with a decline in private charity (taking into account the rate of inflation),94 the state was forced to introduce a compulsory contribution to public welfare — the poor rate.95 A fair distribution of the money raised by these means implied a careful and thorough inquiry into the needs of the poor.

In England the towns were the first to recognize that without examination the number of the poor would reach such a height that it would be impossible to sustain all of them.96 On the continent, Ypres had already attempted in 1525 to solve this problem by appointing ‘subprefetes’ whose task was

to visyte the poore houses shoppes and cotages of the poore and nedyous and to marke surely where what and howe moche helpe every one neded. Yea and ouer this by certayne tokens and coniectures to get the knowledge of their condicon their helth their homly and secrete gretes ther maners and (as nere as can be) their merites and to write these in a boke or tables ordeined for the same purpose.97

All of these suggestions show that little respect was paid to individual freedom at that time. The primary task of the state was to guarantee the minimum subsistence level in times of distress. Hyperius and other contemporary writers therefore believed that investigation was justified:

Neither is that searche fault worthy, which is made to helpe the poore, not to hurte any man, and which is ordained to procure the common safetie of all, aswel suche as to be poore in deede, as suche as are not so.98

Most Protestant writers shared the view that the amelioration of poverty required studying the social conditions of the poor.99 In the words of Andreas Hyperius, examination therefore meant ‘to understande the causes and quarells of the poore’.100

In England these ideas were put into practice in 1572. The Acie For The Punishment Of Vacabondes, And For Releif Of The Poore And Impotent provided that the Justices of the Peace ‘make diligent Searche and Enquierie of all aged and ympotent and decayed persons’.101 Furthermore, register books, containing the names of the poor, were to be kept.102 Thus, the first step was made by the state to cope with the growing number of the poor. For those who were concerned with the inspection of the poor the problem was precisely how to make distinctions between those who were in need and those who were not.103 William Perkins, for example, distinguished three degrees of need:

The first is extreme necessity, when a man is utterly destitute of the means of preservation of life. The second is great need, when a man hath very little to mainaine himselfe and his. The third is common necessity, when he hath something but yet not sufficient or competent. Now those that are in the first and second degree of need, they are the persons that must be succoured and releved.104

Another contemporary writer made distinctions between ‘willing, wilfull, negligent and fraudulent’ poor.105 In general the poor were divided into two groups: the incapacitated and the able-bodied poor.106 Most of the sixteenth-century poor laws adopted this pattern. The result of this classification was, roughly speaking, the development of two types of public welfare policy: education and punishment.107 Both were complementary aspects in the enforcement of social discipline. In Tudor England, for instance, the vagrancy acts were the complements to the poor laws.108
6. Education

W. K. Jordan has shown in his book on English philanthropy that in the sixteenth century a considerable amount of private charity went into social rehabilitation schemes, viz. relief of prisoners, loan funds, workhouses and stocks of raw material for the poor, apprenticeship schemes, hospitals, and marriage subsidies. The key phrase used to describe these actions of the state was, in the words of Christopher Hill, 're-educating the paupers themselves'. No contemporary put it more plainly than Robert Hitchcock, who suggested that the poorer sort of people, maie bee sette to some good Artes, Science, Occupations, Craftes and Labours, by whiche means they might be able to relieve them selves of their greate neede and want. And bying brought to suche vocation of life, hauing some good trade to liue upon, there is no doubt, but they will prove good and profitable subjects, and be careful to see this commonwealth florisse, and will spende their luues and blooud to defende the same, and their little wealth, their liberties, their wives and children.

Like Hitchcock, most of the sixteenth-century writers thought that poverty could and must be removed. Their remedy also was labour discipline; for idleness was in their opinion the only reason for poverty. Subsequently, poor relief took the form of employment. The Elizabethan poor law, for instance, made provisions 'for settinge to woorke ... all such persons maried or unmarried as havinge no means to mayntayne them, use no ordinary dayly Trade of life to get there lyvinge by'. Earlier, similar actions had been taken by the magistrates of London, Norwich, and other English cities.

Special attention was paid to the education of poor children. Hyperius, for example, recommended that 'those men children ... shall in their youth be sent to schole to learne good literature, and become ciuill thereby'. The advocates of education for poor children had in their minds not only to cut the number of poor in the future, but also to inculcate social discipline at an age when one was pedagogically malleable. Consequently, it was 'the cheefest parte of a good goourner and a prudent Magistrate', wrote John Vowell alias Hooker, 'to prouide that Children and yung men be by their meanes instructed and brought vp in honest artes, knowvledge & discipline'. In England Tudor government put this idea into practice by providing apprenticeship and employment in workhouses.

In the recent discussion of the Elizabethan poor laws the point of controversy is whether the measures had been mainly repressive (A. L. Beier) or preventive (John Pound). One cannot distinguish, I think, between education and punishment. The poor laws of 1597-8 in England were, in comparison with previous legislation, both disciplinary and ameliorative.

7. Punishment

Sixteenth-century authorities distinguished between poor who could be punished as vagrants, and those against whom other coercive measures had to be invoked. As in many other European states, in England social policy had begun with the punishment of vagrants. In the eyes of authoritarian governments, the vagrant was a threat to public order. The duty for the paternal ruler was therefore to suppress vagrancy and its concomitant — begging. Tudor kings and queens were not, however, the first in taking cruel measures such as imprisonment, the stocks, whipping, branding, ear-boring, deportation, forced labour in the galleys, slavery, and hanging. Spain and Venice had also attempted, more or less successfully, to suppress vagrancy in similar ways.

Many of these punishments, like branding for example, involved public disgrace. Thus, the vagrant was characterized as an idle member of society, and idleness, in the judgment of sixteenth-century writers, was 'a form of disobedience, rebellion and sin to be punished'. The offender had to show repentance, otherwise he was not to escape punishment:

But especially those valiaunt beggers, which we discrived to be contaminate with every kinde of wickednesse, shall be brought in order, and beinge gently admonished, shall renounce their ungraciousnesse, and returne into the righte way, or beinge constrayned by sharper correction ...  

Actions taken by authorities in the second half of the sixteenth century were no longer restricted to corporal punishment, but proceeded to take the form of a softer type of punishment, already supplied in the rehabilitation scheme for the poor in general. As it is explained by Thomas Lever in one of his sermons:
And he that is in nede, hauing no trust to get any thyng by idlenesse, craft or flattery, shalbe compelled to vse that labour and honest exercise, whiche shall relieue his nede sufficiently. Yea, by this meane no man shall spende his tyme in idlenesse, nor vse no any labour or diligence without due recompence.\textsuperscript{126}

While the state had the prerogative of inflicting punishment and compelling the poor and idle to work,\textsuperscript{127} it remained for the Church to inculcate the new mentality in every parishioner’s mind. 

The place for punishment of the new type was the workhouse or — more significant — the house of correction.\textsuperscript{128} Workhouses like Bridewell in London became numerous in many English towns in the second half of the sixteenth century. In Norwich, for example, the rules of the municipal workhouse stipulated that those inhabitants who refused to work were ‘to be pinnysed by the whipp at the discrecion of the wardens’\textsuperscript{129}. On a national scale, similar measures were embodied by Tudor government in the Act of 1576, providing that the able-bodied poor (including vagrants) ‘shall bee receaved into suche Howse of Correction, there to be straighly kepte, as well in Diet as in Worke, and also punished from tyme to tyme . . . ‘.\textsuperscript{130} In the legislation of 1597-8 the relief of the poor and the suppression of vagrancy were treated as separate problems. The Acte for Punishment of Rogue, Vagabonds and Sturdy Beggars made provisions for the whipping and expulsion of vagrants from the parish where they had been seized, and for their setting to work in a house of correction of the parish where they were born or where they had last dwelt.\textsuperscript{131} The Acte for the Relife of the Poore decreed that all able-bodied poor should be set to labour under the threat of penalty for refusal.\textsuperscript{132}

Thus, the paternal state of the sixteenth and seventeenth century attempted to combine social discipline with economic gains; and consequently the workhouse became the distinctive feature of European poor relief right to the nineteenth century. But not all those disciplinarian measures were successful, since new regulations had to be put into force time and time again. The reason was, as Miguel de Cervantes put it, ‘It is one thing to praise discipline, and another to submit to it.’

This study was undertaken at the suggestion of the late Professor G. Oestreich (2 May 1910 — 5 February 1978) of the University of Marburg, and is dedicated to his memory. It was prepared under the guidance of Professor H. G. Koenigsberger (King’s College, London), to whom the author is indebted for valuable criticism. I also benefited from a discussion with Professor Brian Pullan (University of Manchester).
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