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The history of crime and punishment has become an issue of major scholarly concern and Pieter Spierenburg is one of the researchers in the field who has strongly contributed to this outcome. Since 1978 he has actively researched the history of criminal justice and published several books of which The Prison Experience. Disciplinary Institutions and Their Inmates in Early Modern Europe, in my opinion, is the most balanced one. Pieter Spierenburg started his journey through the history of crime and punishment at the heyday of the Marxist-revisionist scholars like Michel Foucault, Dario Melossi and Massimo Pavarini, and introduced Norbert Elias’ process-oriented approach to the study of the evolution of penalties. He uses this perspective also in The Prison Experience which was first published in 1991.

At that time the reviewers all went into Spierenburg’s convincing rectifications of some fixed suggestions, in particular those made by Michel Foucault in Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison. Foucault’s idea that the prison system was brought about by modernization and invented around 1800 is falsified. Based on solid data Spierenburg shows us that Amsterdam in the Netherlands and Hamburg in Germany pioneered as far as the ‘birth’ of the criminal prison is concerned. In those cities criminal institutions were in full operation one century earlier than Foucault claimed.

While Foucault suggests an orderly shift from physical punishment to imprisonment at the end of the seventeenth century, Spierenburg persuasively argues that the scaffold and the prison coexisted and that experimentation with various penal forms, such as banishment, corporal punishment and forced labour, could be observed in early modern Europe. The change from corporal punishment to imprisonment occurred gradually, starting in the sixteenth and continuing well into the twentieth century. This is, Spierenburg indicates, part of a larger social process in which justice from above grew stronger in connection with the increased power and confidence of the state authorities.

Originally the prison policies concentrated on vagrants and beggars and evolved into focusing on criminals. As stated above, in the Dutch Republic as well as in the city-state of Hamburg, criminal offenders were among the prison inmates from an early date. In the German states the association between crime and prison grew closer in the course of the eighteenth century together with the differentiation of almshouses and workhouses for the poor, private institutions for misbehaving family members and criminal prisons for the delinquents.

Spierenburg discusses this differentiation process in relation to the firm establishment of elites in the commercial and industrial towns in Northern Europe and the emergence of new secular mentalities in which attitudes towards poverty and marginality shifted. A division was made between the undeserving and the true poor. Beggars were no longer seen as following Jesus’ footsteps and did not deserve charity any longer. They came to be considered primarily in terms of the worldly trouble they might cause to the society at large and were seen as a travesty of the biblical
notion that men should work in the sweat of their brow. The sphere of charity was reserved for the truly deserving poor who were admitted to the almshouses.

Originally the beggars, vagabonds and criminals served their time in the same prison workhouses, though in separate wards, with deviants who had been put into custody at the request and the expense of their family. This private confinement solved both the authorities’ concern with public order as disturbed by wayward citizens and the families’ private problems as their honour was no longer put in jeopardy by the deviant behaviour of a family member. The arrangement of private confinement developed into the establishment of private institutions when the detention in prison workhouses became too disgraceful for its growing connection with crime. This institutional differentiation facilitated the authorities’ orientation on the repression of criminals in judicial institutions.

Pieter Spierenburg presents us with a richly documented comparative history of the overall impact of imprisonment in early modern Europe. He concentrates on the Netherlands and the German states and draws ample parallels with other countries like England and France. He introduces new themes e.g. about the organizational structure of the (in)famous Dutch Rasphouse as an ‘enlarged household’ with a house father and mother, where labour served as a punishment within a paternalistic context, instead of as a factory of discipline with economic profits.

As an aside he revises Simon Schama who, in The Embarrassment of Riches, incorrectly discusses the drain-or-drown myth (‘pompen of verzuipen’) as of Dutch instead of German origin. The drain-and-drown story held that the most recalcitrant inmates of the Rasphouse were disciplined in a special cell which would flood slowly, giving the inmate the choice between frenetic attempts to drain the water or drown in it. No such cell, such embarrassment, ever existed in the Amsterdam Rasphouse nor anywhere else in the Netherlands.

In the Rasphouse male inmates were forced to rasp Brazilian redwood for the dye industry and in the Spinhouse, an equivalent institution for women, female prisoners had to spend their time spinning and sewing for the clothes production. Neither prison workhouse turned a profit. The hypothesis that the spread of prisons was primarily due to the need for profit and for disciplinary training of the unemployed does not hold according to Spierenburg’s research data. The primary motive behind the labour regime was punishment.

Spierenburg discusses the development of the penal process within a broader theoretical frame but his strength lies in his eye for details with which he delivers revelatory insights. Based on thorough archival research he produces thrilling accounts of the daily routines in prison and the prison subculture. He presents an incisive picture of the inmates’ opportunities to gain a reduction of the length of their confinement and shows us how this scheme of reductions functioned as a tool to promote prison discipline.

It encouraged the inmates to perform their assigned tasks and discouraged escape attempts like those made by criminals punished by the Zierikzee court which had
the habit of imposing life sentences. Such penalties pre-empted the possibility of control by the inmate’s hope of obtaining a reduction of the time in detention. In early modern age, just like today, the intertwining of punishment and reward proved to be effective. Amsterdam was the first city to experiment with this system and its records about the reduction of penalties go back to 1597 when a sentence of twelve years contained the provision of reduction by four years if the punished criminal would behave properly.

The Prison Experience covers the early modern era from the sixteenth century to around 1800 (for Holland 1811), the end of the judicial Ancien Régime. Influenced by Norbert Elias’ civilisation theory the long-term development of the prison system is presented in the perspective of the history of mentalities. Changing sensibilities and punishments are described in the shifting cultural contexts of the civilisation process. This perspective also had guided Spierenburg’s earlier research projects e.g. about the evolution of corporal punishment, as published in his book Spectacles of Suffering (1984). As stated before, Spierenburg is the first scholar who has applied Elias’ perspective fruitfully to the analysis and description of long-term changes in the penal system. The same theoretical trail has been followed by Herman Franke and John Pratt.

Herman Franke has published a seminal study about the emancipation of prisoners. He starts his story in 1800, the period where Spierenburg ends, and concentrates on the changes in the Dutch prison system to the modern day. He centres on the increasing sensitivities to the physical and psychical suffering of prisoners which stimulated the introduction and expansion of prisoners’ rights as well as the gradual improvement of the way they were being treated. His Twee eeuwen gevangen (Two centuries of imprisonment), in a Dutch edition of 1990, was published in 1995 in an abridged and updated English translation under the title The emancipation of Prisoners. A Socio-Historical Analysis of the Dutch Prison Experience.

John Pratt is influenced by both the civilisation and the rationalisation theories in his study of the nineteenth and twentieth century history of judicial penalties in the Anglophone societies, that is the Commonwealth and the USA. In Punishment and Civilisation. Penal Tolerance and Intolerance in Modern Society (2002) he focuses on the internal changes of the penal system and goes into prison conditions like the prisons’ architecture and the prisoners’ food, hygiene and clothing. He meticulously describes and interprets the various developmental shifts in the English criminal sanction system as stages in the civilisation and decivilisation processes as well as the rationalisation and bureaucratisation processes which came about in the Western societies during the past two centuries. He also has ample thoughts for the shift towards harsher punishments in the last part of the former century.

The attitudinal and behavioural shift from the 1980s onwards was preceded by strongly supported ideas about the ‘death’ of the prison (decarceration) when confining people was looked upon as an uncivilized and insensitive reaction to crime and other kinds of deviance. Today’s populist punitiveness, which addresses the
belief in an increasing crime problem and the leniency of criminal sanctions, makes a mockery of the notions of decarceration: the number of prisoners is higher than ever. Historical studies of the long-term processes are essential to a broadening of our insight into the social and mental shifts in the past and the present. The intended and unintended changes in the sensitivities and attitudes to the problems of crime and punishment become more understandable by most valuable historical books like *The Prison Experience. Disciplinary Institutions and Their Inmates in Early Modern Europe* by Pieter Spierenburg.

Elisabeth Lissenberg
Professor of criminology at the University of Amsterdam.
August, 2006
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PREFACE

This book has been in the making for quite some time. My interest in the history of imprisonment dates back to the beginning of 1975, when I had just embarked upon the research for what was to become a thesis on executions. Perusing the literature on punishment and discipline in early modern Europe, I encountered a number of references to, though few extensive discussions of, the emergence and spread of various types of carceral institutions. This phenomenon fascinated me because of its implications for the study of such subjects as deviance, the family, madness, and state formation processes. At that time only one example of the ‘social control’ historiography of prisons, Rothman’s The Discovery of the Asylum, had been published, so I basically had to develop my own ideas on the subject. Using empirical evidence from Amsterdam court records, I included a chapter on imprisonment in my 1978 dissertation.

When I became a member of the Department of the History of Society at Erasmus University, I chose this subject for a major project. Following an extensive reading of the literature and preliminary investigation in Dutch archives, I prepared a paper that was presented at the First International Conference on the History of Crime and Criminal Justice held at the University of Maryland in 1980. This paper was published by my department (Spierenburg 1984b). The first analysis of the data was presented in that publication. Part of the analysis, with corrected data, is included in several chapters of the present book. During the 1980s the project was continued at a slower pace, because I was also pursuing other interests. With regard to imprisonment, I concentrated on the theme of confinement at the request of relatives and its implications for family discipline. This resulted, among other publications, in an article in Social Science History (Spierenburg 1986). Some of the evidence presented there is included in chapters 9 and 10. The bulk of the research for this book, however, was performed during the period 1986–1989, and the data are analyzed here for the first time.

For assistance received in the course of so many years, I owe numerous debts of gratitude. The first is to my department, for providing working facilities and for financing several research trips to Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck. Also, a number of students provided assistance in gathering and processing data. For this book, the contributions of Mila Davids and Jan Bruggeman were important. In archives I visited, my queries always received a sympathetic reply, and for this a few persons should be mentioned in particular. Florence Koom came up with valuable sources from
Haarlem archives still in the process of being inventoried, while Rob Huybrecht offered similar help at the Algemeen Rijksarchief at The Hague. Originally a stranger to German record offices, I was grateful for guidance by Frau Breitenfeldt and Dr. Lührs in Bremen and Dr. Eckard in Hamburg. In Lübeck, Frau dr. Grassmann took the trouble to search for me in a pile of recently recovered archive boxes that had not yet been catalogued due to the fact that a city proud of its historical past was reluctant to pay for its conservation.

Scholarly suggestions and criticism were freely given from various sides. Rudolf Dekker and I have exchanged references for years, and the present book is one of the products that has profited from this exchange. Sjoerd Faber provided me with quantitative data that he had not included in his own book. Valuable help also came from Bengt Ankarloo, Lee Beier, Johannes Feest, Mary Elizabeth Perry, Lotte van de Pol, Herbert Reinke, and Jan Sundin. Peter Burke and Joanna Innes commented on an early draft of the manuscript, while Peter Klein did the same for chapter 6. David Greenberg and James Murray, who read the manuscript for Rutgers University Press, made helpful comments. The book’s preliminary version was discussed during a session at my home one September night. Present were two of the persons already mentioned—Dekker and Faber—and Herman Diederiks, Floor Egmond, Herman Franke, and Jean Jüngen. We reflected on the subject informally but seriously over a glass of good wine and some French cheese, proving that scholarship can also be fun.
A NOTE ON SPELLING

The early modern period lacked a standard spelling of words; notably, names were spelled differently by the same person at various times. I have chosen, therefore, to adhere to the following principles: Dutch names are always written in modern fashion, while German ones are rendered the way they appear in the majority of instances in the records. Although it is the rule in modern German to capitalize every noun, in my sources this was never done consistently. This provides legitimation for keeping German nouns in lower case, which allows easier reading. Geographic names have not been anglicized, save for a few very familiar ones.
CONCLUSION

Imprisonment, Mentalities, and Social Change

The final chapter returns to the framework outlined in the first: a process-oriented approach to the history of imprisonment and repression generally. We have gone from the theoretical to the empirical, and now come back to theory again. Chapter Two discussed the emergence in the late sixteenth century of imprisonment and other spatial solutions to problems of marginality, deviance, and crime, and explained this development with reference to pacification and state formation processes. The empirical data in parts Two and Three corroborated this thesis, but they also raised new problems. Other factors besides state formation have to be taken into consideration to discover the social context of the evolution of systems of discipline and punishment.

One problem—the question of whether the exploitation of the labor force in the service of capitalist production was the main impetus behind the emergence and spread of imprisonment—can now be reviewed in the light of the evidence on the economics of imprisonment and the relationship of imprisonment to the other forms of bondage. Early modern prison workhouses were pseudohouseholds rather than capitalist manufactories, and penal considerations prevailed over economic ones, the prison administrators accepting a modest loss. By contrast, economic motives seem to have played a role in the introduction of other penalties. Transportation also cost the English government money, but it was cheaper than building new prisons, and in America convicts earned profits for private employers. Eikirch argues that the British preferred transportation to the Continental example of putting delinquents to forced labor in prison workhouses because they associated the latter practice with state tyranny. But he admits that constitutional liberties were only paid lip service, since they were so easily sacrificed abroad.¹ We must conclude that the crucial difference between transportation and imprisonment lay in the commercial priorities guiding the first and the importance of the household model for the second. A comparable argument can be made with regard to galley servitude. In Spain and in France until 1715 the need for able-bodied oarsmen
determined the fate of convicts. Strong men were kept longer than their
term: precisely the practice which Rusche wrongly associates with prison
workhouses. To be sure, the problem of manning a war fleet is not just an
economic one and it can hardly be said that the specialized training incul-
cated into oarsmen contributed to the discipline of the labor force in the
interest of capitalist production. Generally, however, it seems that rulers
who desired financially expedient solutions above all, favored forms of
bondage other than imprisonment. This is even more understandable
when we consider that these forms were penal sanctions from the outset,
while prison workhouses were originally meant as solutions to problems
of marginality and immorality rather than crime. For such institutions the
household model seemed most appropriate.

Imprisonment certainly became a criminal punishment, though, and as
such, its evolution should be viewed as part of the evolution of bondage
generally. A major trend in the history of penal systems in Europe was the
shift from public spectacles to privately inflicted punishment, which began
in the seventeenth century and gained momentum in the period 1770–
1870. The proliferation of prison workhouses represented a crucial phase
in that shift. The very existence of carceral institutions meant that atten-
tion was deflected from the scaffold to some extent, but the new penalty
still had a considerably public character. The same can be said for other
forms of bondage. The French public could not see the oarsmen when
they were at sea, but in the port of Marseille they freely interacted with
this group. The galley convicts were also displayed publicly in other areas
of France, primarily through the use of ‘the chain’ as they journeyed to-
ward Marseille. Processions of between 200 and 400 convicts tied to-
gether by the neck in pairs departed twice a year from three different
starting points. The Paris chain took about a month to reach Marseille,
during which the convicts marched about 500 kilometers and completed
their journey by boat. At every stop along the way the procession was
shown in the marketplace. Although local inhabitants often kept a low
profile, fearing that their carts would be confiscated, the chain was an
effective teaching device. The custom was practiced by all Mediterranean
states keeping galleys. In France it was abolished with the fleet, but Span-
ish convicts continued to be led to the arsenals in this way after 1748.3

To a lesser extent, this type of ritual also characterized transportation in
Britain. London convicts went in procession from Newgate to Blackfriars,
where they embarked. Convicts from Southwark joined them a little fur-
ther down the Thames. From Bristol jail, criminals sentenced to transpor-
tation rode on horseback to Bideford, chained two by two. Crowds were
reported to watch the spectacle. A few rich convicts escaped the infamy of
such rituals by paying for the privilege of traveling in a coach.4 Apart from
this theatrical accompaniment to transportation, English houses of correc-
tion were just as open to visitors as Continental prison workhouses. That
is attested, among others, by Ned Ward's account of a visit to the London Bridewell. The processions of criminals condemned to transportation are documented for the eighteenth century only, which probably means they were discontinued in the nineteenth. Galley chains usually disappeared with the punishment of which they were part; in the Spanish case, presumably, they did not survive the abolition of forced labor on the arsenals in 1818. Prisons featured the most conspicuous shift with respect to publicity. Everywhere they were closed to the curious public around 1800; henceforth, only selected persons with a professional interest were admitted. This was a major step in the privatization of punishment.

Another question, which is difficult to answer from the available evidence, refers to the interrelationship of the evolution of imprisonment, alternative forms of bondage, and the penal system generally to changing sensibilities vis-à-vis the physical treatment of offenders. Did the judges, the executive authorities, or the general public of the early modern period reflect on the suffering inherent in various types of punishment? Few voices articulating feelings on this point have come down to us from the days when prison workhouses were first established. Casual hints about imprisonment being an alternative to the scaffold have been noted in Amsterdam and Hamburg around 1600. It is understandable that few such arguments were recorded at the time, since imprisonment was not really considered a penal sanction. Its subsequent evolution in that direction, although complicated by problems such as that of infamy, does not seem to have generated major debates on the physical treatment of offenders. Most people found disciplinary beatings a normal and acceptable procedure, and the pumping myth was widely believed. Neither does the literature on alternative forms of bondage, such as galley servitude, reveal anything like a lively discussion of this subject. We have to wait until the end of the eighteenth century to find expressions of moral concern about certain forms of forced labor. The deadly work of glass-polishing in the Nürnberg prison, for example, met with criticism from opposition groups in the late 1790s. This was a special case. There is no record of a principled opposition to forced labor as such—on the Continent at least—during the early modern period. Certainly, imprisonment was never seen as a threat to the bodily integrity of delinquents. Reformers around 1800 were concerned with matters such as fresh air, diet, and the separation of the sexes, rather than the physical treatment of the inmates.

The link between the rise of imprisonment and changing sensibilities with regard to physical treatment of convicts is largely implicit. In the end, the existence of prison workhouses and their use for penal purposes paved the way for the decline of more direct forms of physical punishment. Before that happened, however, the scaffold and confinement coexisted for over two hundred years. At first, each was imposed on different categories of offenders, but from the middle of the eighteenth century, the two
largely served as alternatives. For England, Beattie explains the increasing frequency of imprisonment partly with reference to a declining confidence in physical punishment. By the early nineteenth century, British reformers simply considered the prison as synonymous with an absence of the infliction of pain—though perhaps without regard for what happened inside the institutions. The fact that prison life was largely hidden from public view helped to sustain such notions. In other countries the situation was comparable. The triumph of imprisonment after 1800, the building of penitentiaries, the experiments with solitary confinement, the panoptic principle: these phenomena are very well-known and they are not my subject. They formed part of the transformation of repression generally between 1770 and 1870, which was related in turn to a new phase in state formation processes.

Paradoxes The developments dealt with here, to emphasize it once more, were not unilinear. The history of forms of punishment other than the scaffold was one of recurrent experiments, retreats, and new beginnings. In the European core-area, two paradoxes were inherent in the evolution of imprisonment. First, although the existence of prison workhouses contributed to an eventual diminishment of emphasis on the physical element in the penal system, at the beginning these institutions represented an intensification of repression. The intensity of repression increased, not in the sense that every offender received harsher treatment, but rather that new groups of people became its target. They were marginals, the attitudes toward whom had changed for the negative, and undisciplined persons whom their families shunned. Policies attuned to the change of mentalities concerning marginals confirm the growth of a stronger justice from above, and consequently bolster state authority. The paradox can be explained: it was the subsequent evolution of prison workhouses, rather than their first appearance on the scene, which was related to changes in the penal system. We have to wait until the later seventeenth century, and in most regions until the eighteenth century, to find authorities confidently relying on less severe forms of repression for the more traditional offenders. As this confidence spread, the imprisonment penalty was extended to thieves and comparable delinquents.

The second paradox is implied by the combination of old and new models. Although, originally, committal to a prison workhouse was not an official criminal sanction, a stay there was certainly punitive. Securing the punitive character of these institutions received priority over exploitation of their economic potential. For the authorities and the administrators, penal considerations prevailed over economic ones. Thus, from the start, imprisonment contributed to the renewal of modes of repression, and in that sense the system might be termed innovatory. However, the application of this new form of punishment took place in a rather traditional
context. Its model was the household rather than the manufactory. This paradox can be explained if we realize that the family became more important as a model within society generally in the course of the early modern period. The closely knit but hierarchically structured unit of father, mother, children, and servants was viewed by governments as a microcosm reflecting their own ideal relationship with their subjects. Criminals and marginals—the latter increasingly considered as delinquents, too—were seen as obstructing this paternalistic order. They were not perceived so much in economic terms, as a reservoir of potential manpower, as in moral terms, as persons who had broken away from the disciplining bonds of the family. For these outsiders forced labor was seen as an exercise in discipline, rather than an opportunity to become accustomed to an industrial routine.

This view also makes it understandable why the authorities were prepared to offer the opportunity of imprisonment as a tool to families who had problems with troublesome members, including the insane. These individuals had broken away from traditional bonds, too. The evidence on private confinement shows that the connections between the one type of deviance and the other were hazy and ill-defined in the early modern period. Even the borderlines between insanity and immorality were not always clearly defined—the same people were alternately denoted in terms of the one or the other. The rise of a medical approach to madness served to differentiate it from unacceptable behavior generally, and in the nineteenth century insane asylums became distinct institutions. Some of the traditional forms of immorality, however, had been drawn into the medical domain during this process. Redefined as illnesses, they were less harmful to the reputation of those exhibiting them, and more important, of their families. Early modern private confinement prefigured this development.

A final observation is on the ironies of history. One period's ideals were the anxieties of another. Nineteenth-century advocates of imprisonment in lonely cells were queasy about physical suffering and wished punishment to be directed at the mind of an offender. Early modern judges had fewer scruples about meting out physical punishments, but they found solitary confinement an unbearable torment. For private prisoners, on the other hand, to be alone and think about one's sins was thought to be a suitable pastime. Nowadays, both corporal punishment and solitary confinement, or 'sensory deprivation,' are widely considered forms of torture and unacceptable. Even routine imprisonment has come under attack. Experiments are being undertaken in several countries at present to 'divert' the treatment of offenders from the penal system to an external agency. Alternatively, offenders who are still tried by a court are sentenced to work for nonprofit organizations. To a certain extent, these practices repeat the experience of four centuries ago. Had the concept been current,
contemporaries might well have viewed the committal to a prison workhouse as a form of 'diversion.' In the beginning, the courts largely considered these institutions as external agencies. Rather than belonging to the sphere of justice, the houses were associated with charity and served the general public good. Their purpose was to divert juvenile and other non-serious offenders away from the penal system. Inmates were to do useful work and be spared the taint of infamy. The purposes of imprisonment four hundred years ago parallel modern arguments in favor of diversion. That prison workhouses eventually became firmly associated with the penal system may serve as a warning.
NOTES

There are two bibliographies: of printed sources (A) and of secondary literature (B). In the notes, (A) or (B) preceding an author's name indicate in which bibliography to look for the work.

Chapter One. Introduction

1. See, for example, (B) Ignatieff 1983: 183.
2. In the Netherlands the works of Hallema constitute the main example. See also (B) Eggink 1958.
5. (B) Ignatieff 1978. It should be stressed that he modified his views in later publications. Ignatieff 1983 is an excellent review article in which he is critical of the revisionist approach, including his own, but adheres to the nineteenth-century perspective. In his contribution to Petit 1984 he is much more aware of the longer-term process involved.
6. Other recent studies on imprisonment and prisons in the nineteenth century that should be mentioned include (B) Petersen (1978), Rüller (1981), and the contributions by Franke, Faber, Diederiks, and Leonardos to Faber et al. (1989) for the Netherlands; the articles by Digneffe and Dupont-Bouchat (1982) for Belgium; O'Brien (1982) for France; Mecklenburg (1983) for Germany; Henriques (1972) and the contributions by Tomlinson and DeLacy to Bailey (1981) for England; Kaczynska (1988) for Poland; and Rothman's follow-up study (1980) for America.
7. See (B) Spijerenburg 1987.
8. (B) Rusche 1933 is an outline of this theory. He then expanded it into a more elaborate work, which was edited by Kirchheimer and first published in an English translation (Rusche and Kirchheimer 1939). Because Rusche was the actual author, whenever I refer to it in the text, I will use only his name.
10. (B) Treiber and Steinert (1980: 83) note the inconsistency, too. The problem may be partly solved if we assume that Foucault thought that the _bolsa_ and warehouses he dealt with in _Histoire de la Folie_ did not serve penal purposes at all, so that he could neglect them in _Surveiller et Punir._
11. See also (B) Weiss 1987, a review article whose author shows an awareness of the longer-term process.
12. (B) Spijerenburg 1984a.
13. See especially (B) Innes 1987 and Beier 1985: 164-169. Both historians are still engaged in research on the subject.
14. See (B) Faber 1983; Spijerenburg 1984a; Pol 1987; and a forthcoming books by Jürgen and Boomgaard.
15. I have concentrated less on Lübeck than I had originally intended, because most of its archival records have been kept in the DDR and became available only as I was completing my manuscript. All but a few documents referring to the Danzig prison were destroyed during World War II.
16. They all may have done so, but the records are no longer extant in many cases.
18. During my research I found that Hallema is frequently wrong on points of detail. Investigators can use his work to direct them to specific records, although he often fails to
specify his sources. In all cases where Hallem and I studied the same events, I have based my study on the original records. In a few cases I refer to documents published by Hallem when I could determine their authenticity.

19. See, among others, (B) Innes 1987: 42; Rosenfeld 1906: 3.


24. GAF, Burg. Resol.: 20 March 1734 (fo. 35) and 23 November 1754 (fo. 92 vs).

25. GAA, 5059: nr. 32, pp. 226, 329; index also refers to p. 459, which is missing.

26. The word ‘voluntary’ is used in a practical, formal sense. A prison is an institution with an involuntary membership because its inmates are physically prevented from getting out. In a more general sense all members of society are restrained by forces around them. A poor man may have no other choice but to enter a workhouse. Even a king, as Norbert Elias brilliantly demonstrates, can be ‘imprisoned’ in his own court.

27. (B) Pike (1982) uses the concept of penal servitude for approximately the same group of penalties. This term, however, refers primarily to forced labor other than to restrictions on a person’s freedom.

28. See, among others, (B) Foucault 1960; Lis and Soly 1979; Geremek 1987. Schwartz 1988 uses the concept in a slightly different sense, specifically referring to a wave of arrests of beggars in France in 1724–1733.

Chapter Two. Idleness and Labor

1. (B) Treiber and Steinert 1980.

2. (B) Jong 1986: 95.

3. Quoted in (B) Kunzel 1986: 41.

4. (B) Hoyt 1966: 125, 571.

5. (B) Jong 1986: 104.


7. (A) Mabillon 1887. Compare (B) Sellin 1926, and Mendez and Pavarini 1987. Ariès (1981: 66) mentions a form of confinement that, because of its religious context, can be considered related. Certain offenders were locked up in rooms in the churchyard, sometimes in close proximity to immured female hermits.

8. (B) Jetter 1966: 8, 39.
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The supervisors’ right of imprisonment was also mentioned by Langendijk in the middle of

67. GAH, Handschriften: nr. 153, dossier R: ms. Langendijk, fo. 18–24. The gate and
the statue are now in the Frans Hals Museum at Haarlem. I relied both on Langendijk’s
description and my own observation.
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1. (A) Baudartius (1624, vol. I, book 5, p. 40) is the only one to provide the sculpture’s
symbolic meaning, which appears to have become forgotten. Wagenaar (8: 239) was
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Both authors translate the motto; for other translations, Hooft, (PC), 1976: nr. 362 (p.
810); Gebouwen 1736: 342. On the motto’s history, see (B) Boas 1917. The gate and the
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8. (A) Howard 1792: 22.
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dicht zuweilen": (A) Reinkenck 1659: 842.
10. (A) Wageman, 81: 240, 260, 264. De Lairesse's painting is now in the Amsterdam
Historical Museum.
12. (B) Müller 1985: 34.
13. I am indebted to Paul Schultz for this interpretation.
16. (copy in) GAL, Stad: nr. 6525. (A) Bowrey (1927: 38–39) says that he had to pay
two men for a share in Amsterdam in 1698.
17. GAL, Stad: nr. 6527 and 6528. An additional difference between the two towns was
that Leiden accorded a part of the income from the boxes to the schout and his deputies and
the prison's indoor father, while the one (who) received a share in Amsterdam. This may have caused
Leiden officials to encourage visitation.
18. GAA, 5059: nr. 44, p. 367.
19. (B) Elias, Johan, 1663: nr. 171. Bonstemaat had married in 1646, which suggests
that the other children may have been older. He was not a schepen in 1663.
21. For special interest in notorious male delinquents, see GAH, Kast 7-2-2-6 and
7-2-2-8; GAD, Stad: nr. 2001-2, fo. 140-v (8 April 1718).
22. The Haarlem rules in: GAH, Werkhuys: nr.12, instruction for the cipier (undated,
probably late 17th century). See also Burg. Resol.: 26 November 1615 (fo.50). For Bremen:
23. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 62.
24. See, for example, an incident in 1801: GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-2, fo. 208-v.
26. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 132v-133.
27. (B) Streng 1890: 89–90.
30. (A) Stenius 1616. The Hamburg zugbthaus was praised in a brief rhymed description:
see (B) Ebeling 1935: 40–42.
31. For the full titles of its various editions, see Bibliography A. Note that the word
wonderlijk, translated here as "amazing," also means "marvelous."
32. The preface actually says "Raspin," which may be a misprint; further on he is consist-
ently called Raspinnus.
33. GAA, 5061: nr. 282, fo. 284-v. Nr. 283 should list his punishment (a whipping on
the scaffold, according to the Historia), but the index is lacking a Frans.
34. GAA, 5061: nr. 285, fo. 77–78v.
37. (A) Lipsius 1605.
38. See the original Latin edition (Johannes Iscius Pontanus, Nove et Urbis Amsteloda-
menaeum Historia, Amsterdam 1611): 99–100. Three observers in the 1660s still referred to
the edition of false cretins in the raphouse: (A) Fokkens (1662: 279–280); Dapper
(1663: 428); and the Hamburg traveler Christian Knorr von Rosenroth (quoted in (B)
Ebeling 1935: 110). By that time, arrested beggars were imprisoned in the workhouse.
39. They are the editions kept in the library of the GAA and at Marburg. The latter forms
part of a convolute; it is undated, but its spelling and the length of pages prove that it is a
different edition.
40. Edition kept at Strasbourg. The Ghent copy may be the same edition, but it lacks the
epilogue and an explanation of a plate.
41. (A) Koning 1616 (unpaginated).
42. (A) Baudartius, 1624; vol. I, book 5, pp. 40–42.
43. (A) Fokkens 1662: 279–280. The crashes were also referred to by Bowrey (1927: 42), who visited the raphouse as late as 1698.
45. (A) Moortchteet 1889: 107 (original ed.: Rouwen 1615).
46. (A) Mémoires 1837: 250–251. According to (B) Chill (1962: 417), the "Cour des Miracles" became a kind of fortress, which was demolished in 1666.
47. (B) Kraemer 1944: 261 et seq. See also Dupille 1971. She uses "Cour des Miracles" as a generic term for a retreat of beggars and rogues. However, it is clear from her account that only the one referred to here was actually called by that name. Her earliest reference to the term "Cour des Miracles" dates from 1603 (31–41).
48. (A) Hainhofer 1834: 11.
49. Reproduced in (B) Hirth 1897: nr. 1636. In Amsterdamum Maandblad (1939: 182) A.W. refers to two versions of this sheet with slightly different wordings of the text. He ascribes the plate to Simon Frisius. See also F. Müller, Beredeneerde Beschrijving van Nederlandsche Historieplaten. Vol. 4. Amsterdam 1882: nr. 1417 C and D.
50. Reproduced in (A) Scheilbe 1850: nr. 51.
51. Reproduced in (A) Scheilbe 1850: nr. 88. Augsburg was biconfessional then, but in 1629–31 the emperor was able to favor the Catholics. (B) Warmbrunn 1953: 162–164.
52. (A) Krausoldus 1698.
53. GAA, 5059: nr. 41 (city chronicle, middle of 17th century).
54. (B) Pol 1988: 122–123, 128; GAH, Kast 2:24.7 (I am indebted for the archival reference to Rudolf Dekker).
55. (A) Fokkens 1662: 283–285.
56. Notably, he refers to the Dutch edition of the History of amazing miracles, which, in fact, does not include the pumping story. See (B) Schama 1988: 35. On imprisonment generally there are more errors.
57. (A) Brown 1682: 18. The dates in the text refer to the years when the authors visited Amsterdam or claimed they did.
58. (A) Missen 1691, 1: 21.
60. (A) Blainville 1743, 1: 36.
61. The entire passage devoted to the raphouse is quoted from a manuscript in (B) Ebeling 1935: 117–118.
63. (A) Howard 1792: 58.
64. (B) Hipel 1898: 492.
65. (B) Hallena 1936: 33–38. Hallena also suggests that the free-thinker Adriaan Koerbagh died in the water cellar. This is probably based on a misreading of Meinsma 1896: 316–324. Koerbagh's interrogations and sentence are in GAA, 5061: nr. 318 (fo. 115v and 118v) and 586 (fo. 91, which has a blank where the judgment ought to be inserted).
66. (B) Sellin 1944: 72.
67. (A) Dapper 1653: 426.
68. (A) Wagenaar 1760–1768: 8: 242. Some people must have called it a "water-ceiling" though, since this name appears in (B) Nieuwenhuijs (1820: 303). Nieuwenhuijs does not refer to the pumping myth and explains that a layer of cement protects this cellar from becoming moist. The workshop also had a dark pit; in 1612 its regents determined that the beggar Hendrik Aarse had to sit there each Saturday: GAA, 5061: nr. 366, fo. 30.
69. (A) Gebouwen 1736: 345–346.
70. "On a aboli l'usage depuis quelques années": (A) Missen 1698, 1: 30.
71. See the works cited above and (B) Sellin 1944: 70–71. Schama (1988: 34) also refers to a manuscript account kept at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, by Robert Bargrave, dated 1634, but in his notes the date has been changed into 1652–1655.
72. See (B) Moes 1891: 102. Moes quotes the entire passage devoted to the raphouse. Neither did (A) Evelyn (1803: 21), who saw the raphouse in August 1641, refer to the myth.
73. See (B) Vambéry 1915. Vambéry gives a German translation of the entire passage concerning the raphouse.
74. This story, about a Strasbourg beggar who preferred the fruits of begging to an inheritance, does not appear in the two versions of the Liber Vagatorum (A: Liber 1862; Fielen 1914) that I consulted.
75. (A) [Historie-] Miracula 1617: 24–29.
76. The ordinance is published in (B) Pietsch 1931: 77. Von Hippel (1898: 644) explains that the Dantzig archive contained a manuscript combining its prison ordinance, a description of the Amsterdam rathouse (the one discussed in chapter three, which did not refer to the water punishment), and passages from Pontanus and from the (German) Miracula San Raspi. The records consulted by Von Hippel and Pietsch are no longer extant.

Chapter Six. The Prison as a Household

1. The difference in meaning between ‘household,’ used in the chapter title, and ‘family,’ appearing in the first section subtitle, should be noted. While the idealized prison community was viewed as a kind of (morally regenerating) family, the institutions were run more or less as complex households.

2. In 20th-century Dutch historiography it ha become customary to denote the ruling patricians as regenten. In the time of the Republic this was never done, and a burgomaster or council member would certainly have felt offended by it. It would be better if historians quit this anachronistic usage.

3. There was also a board of alten in Hamburg. In 1698 it was said that its members (referring to the spirithouse) had always belonged to the town’s oberalten (SAH, 242-1-1: nr. A29-1, p. 168). The division of tasks between alten and provosten remains unclear, but only the latter, led by the jahrverwalter, actually managed the institution’s affairs.

4. In Amsterdam in 1659 one of the regents had to visit the rathouse every day to judge cases. The Leiden magistrates found that twice a week was enough: GAL, Stad: nr. 6525.

5. GAH, werkhuys: nr. 12, second document.
6. (A) Hout 1927: 77 (date corrected from the original document in GAL, Stad: nr. 6522).
7. GAH, werkhuys: nr. 12, first document.
8. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 99-2, fo. 79.
11. “in den standt der Oberkeit”: SAH, 242-1-1: nr. A14-1, front page, and fo. 110 v. in addition to the provosts, the alten were bound by the agreement.
13. GAL, Stad: nr. 6525.
14. GAH, Werkhuys: nr. 12; see also Kast 7-2-2-7, containing a dossier which confirms that most instructions in 1686 have been approved.
15. Tuchmeister, also called, pardaun: (A) Wagenaar, 8: 250.
17. In Hamburg these functions regularly appear in the records of the schultheus as well as the sintheus. It seems though, that the words werkmeister and tuchmeister were sometimes used interchangeably. The term fabriqmeister is used in Bremen in 1749: SAB, 2-D, 18: d: dossier 10. The other functions are mentioned at an earlier date: ibid.: doses 4 and 5. I will refer to the werkmeister/tauchmeister as ‘master of discipline.’
18. SAH, Satzachen: Cl. VII, Lit. Mb, nr. 2, vol. 5g. The two personnel members were interrogated after a prison riot.
19. SAB, 2-D, 18: d. dossiers 661 (30 Sept. 1726) and 5 (1754–1757).
20. GAA, 345: nr. 3 (undated document in 18th-century handwriting).
21. GAA, 5061: nr. 354, fo. 35.
22. SAB, 2-D, 18: d. dossier 4 (1748: art. 18).
23. (A) Wagenaar (8: 266) still used this term. See also GAL, Stad: nr. 6525 (1659).
24. From now on, therefore, I will refer to him as the “indoor father.”
25. SAH, 242-1-1, nr. A28 (art. 3 of the *economus*’s instructions); SAB, 2-D 18. d: dossier 4 (1748).
29. (B) Spiersburg 1988a: 38–49 (on households) and 302–304 (on brothels).
30. (B) Otis 1985: 83.
31. GAA, 5028: nr. 2, fo. 182–183v. The word journeymen ("gezelten") is also used by S. Egberts and in (A) Ordnung 1598.
33. SAH, 242-1-1: nr. A14-1, fos. 3 and 4v.
34. SAH, 242-1-1: nr. A14-1, fos. 128 v–132, 134, 156, 137v–139. Compare 18th-century Bedford, where the jailkeeper was usually assisted by his wife: (B) Stockdill 1977: passim.
35. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 72v–73 (1736). For other advertisements, see fo. 101–107v and nr. 59-2, fo. 152–153v.
37. GAA, 345: nr. 3 (undated dossier). See also (A) Gebouwen 1736: 344.
38. (Copy in) GAL, Stad: nr. 6525.
39. GAA, 5061: nr. 354, fos. 31v–39v and 75.
40. SAB, 2-D 18. d: dossier 6a.
41. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 76–77. This situation was institutionalized in 1743: GAD, Stad: nr. 1242 (fourth contract, art. 11). The regents of the Amsterdam workhouse had a private servant, too: (A) Wagenaar, 8:249.
42. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1: fo. 101–107v.
43. GAD, Stad: nr. 1242.
45. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 117–119.
46. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-2, fo. 152.
47. See (B) Adler 1924: 60–61.
48. (B) Rusche and Kirchheimer 1939: 24–33.
49. The Dutch Republic, pioneering in imprisonment, has traditionally been considered not to have been a champion of mercantilism. Rusche anticipates this objection with the argument that the high wages in Holland ensured that every effort was made to draw upon the available labor reserves: (B) Rusche and Kirchheimer 1939: 42. In a recent article, however, Klein (1989) defends the thesis that Dutch authorities adopted mercantilist policies.
50. (B) Rusche and Kirchheimer 1939: 46–52.
51. GAH, Kast 7-2-3-1.
52. GAH, Grote Lade 5-2-4.
53. GAH, Kast 7-2-3-16 (lesser values omitted).
54. GAH, Werkhuis: nr. 3 (last document, 7 Oct. 1664).
55. GAH, Kast 7-2-3-21.
56. GAH, Kast 7-2-2-5.
57. GAH, Werkhuis: nr. 13 (10 December 1710).
58. GAH, Grote Lade 7-8-9-b.
59. GAH, Grote Lade 7-8-9-j. See also the monthly accounts over approximately the same period: GAH, Werkhuis: nr. 18.
60. GAH, Grote Lade 7: Bundel 10, Letter a (lesser values omitted).
62. GAH, Burg. Resol.: 24 March 1786 (fo. 27 v–31v, art. 18 and 22).
63. All documents in SAB, 2-D 18. d: dossier 1a.
64. (B) Kampman 1984: 67–68.
65. GAL, Stad: nr. 6527.
66. GAD, Stad: nr. 2010 (dossier 17).
67. GAA, 5089: nr. 24, p. 308 and nr. 27, pp. 136 and 206; (A) Wagenaar, 8:265.
68. GAD, Stad: nr. 2001-11, fo. 112v–113. For further financial details about the Delf
prison, see St. Joris: nrs. 125 et seq., 144, 180, 340, 347–55. In 1758 the institution was
said to own a capital of over 16,000: St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 97. Basing himself on a few
misinterpreted data, (B) Bouricius (1927: 30) thought that the *taalhuis*’s textile business
was thriving in the 18th century; his opinion is reproduced in Wijnenbeck-Olthuis 1987:
74–75.

69. Regents’ complaint in: GAA, 5059: nr. 72; specification of the subsidies in: ARA,
3.20.52: nr. 465.

70. SAB, 2-D, 18. d: dossier 6a.

71. (B) Grambow 1910: 41–46.

72. SAB, 2-d. 18. d: dossier 1a (1799).

73. (B) Pietsch 1931: 41–43, 59–65; Verhoeven 1978: 49; Schmidt 1915: 87–88,
321–322; Steer 1988: 171–176; Reekers 1981: 36–37, 43; Wolf 1963: 13; Schubert 1983:
295–296, 299–301.

74. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 69 (11 Sept. 1713 and 14 Dec. 1761); Stad: nr. 2001-II, fos.
47v–54, 129, 142v.

75. GAH, Werkhuys: nr. 13 (3 June 1760).

76. (A) Dapper 1663: 419–420. In St. Gallen sales were reported to have been prob-
lematic too: (B) Mayer 1987: 199.

77. (B) Fokker 1862: 65–99.

78. GAA, 5024: 1612–47 (1 Sept. 1612). Published text, with a few minor errors, in

79. GAD, Stad: nr. 872.

80. (Copy in) GAL, Stad: nr. 6524.


82. Many were held in 1661–3: SAB, 2-N, 3. a.

83. SAB, 2-D, 18. d: dossier 1a (5 June 1618; 1660 Oct. 1645) and dossier 7 (1647,
1650).

84. (B) Streng 1890: 66.

85. (B) Schmidt 1915: 34–38; Doering 1926: 27.

86. GAA, 5020: nr. H, fo. 99v–100v.


88. GAA, 5020: nrs. m., fo. 227 (1655) and P, fo. 121 (1675). Brandy had already been

89. GAA, 347: nrs. 42 et seq. contain the permits for the years 1742–1771. See also (A)

90. GAD, Stad: nr. 1224.

91. GAL, Stad: nr. 8979. The entire series, covering the years 1703–1810, ends with
nr. 8991.

92. (B) Pietsch 1931: 30; Ebeling 1935: 57.

93. See, for example, Amstelodamum Maandblad (1938): 63; SAB, 2-D, 18. d: dossier
1a (25 Nov. 1716).

94. With some variations, these arguments are put forward by (B) Eichler 1970: 144–
145; Sachse and Tenmstedt 1980: 122; Reekers 1981: 63–64. See also Lis and Soly 1979:
117 (who argue in a similar vein but admit that the economic benefit was rather a question
of expectations than of practical success).

95. SAH, 242-1-I: nr. A14-1, fos. 55, 61, 93.

96. See the contract with Johan Schnakenborg in Bremen, 30 Oct. 1646: SAB, 2-D. 18.
d: dossier 1a.

97. GAD, Stad: nr. 1242 and 2010–1013; St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fos. 1–7, 8–12, 17, 20,
34–36, 57–59, 94–98. At the end of the 18th century, the indoor father may have had a
private business as well. In 1788 Willem Maas obtained permission to start a worsted man-
ufactory of his own in prison and it was said that his brother had done the same previously:
St. Joris: nr. 59-2, fo. 98 v.

98. GAD, Stad, nr. 1242.

99. GAA, 5059: nr. 72; ARA, 3.20.52: nr. 465.

100. (B) Sothmann 1970: 72–79.


103. Quoted in (B) Reekers 1981: 41.
105. (A) Dapper 1663: 428; Wagenaar 1760–1768, 8: 236.
106. GAH, Werkhuis: nos. 13 (3 June 1760) and 18; Grote Lade 7:8-9-1.
108. (A) Dapper 1665: 419–420; Bonemantel 1897, 1: 281.
109. GAL, Stad: nr. 6529.
110. An inventory of 1712–1713 lists two rauflaken and one raup, “which are no good”: GAD, St. Joris: no. 57-1, fo. 57v (see also fo. 60, where the rauflaken is used for a barricade). Also in 1713 an inmate hit another on the head with a redwood log (GAD, Stad: nr. 2120a, fo. 15).
111. SAB, 2-D. 18: d: dossiers 1a and 10 (30 Oct. 1664) and dossier 1a (23 Jan. 1669).
112. SAB, 2-D. 18: d: dossiers 4 (1724 and 1748), 6c (23 Feb. 1702), 6b1 (August 1782).
113. SAH, 242-1-J: nos. A25, A10, and A13; see also A14-1, fos. 74v, 110, 136v.
114. (B) Streng 1905: 38–64, 91.
115. Data from a preliminary investigation in Dutch archives; for Arnhem, see (B) Verhoeven 1978: 41.
116. (B) Hippe 1898: 646; Pietsch 1931: 38; Doering 1926: 24; Soothmann 1970: 66–84; Eichler 1970: 146.
119. (B) Soothmann 1970: 106–108, 126, 159–164. The author does not inform us when exactly glass polishing was introduced and presents her data in a slightly chaotic fashion.
120. Additionally, (A) Wagniz (1791–1794: 2: 7) refers to “milling cotton” in the Augsburg prison in the 1790s.
123. (A) Bartsch 1650: 286–290. The book went through numerous editions; I consulted the oldest possessed by the Amsterdam university library.
125. (B) Nic 1937: 37.
126. (B) Schaef er 1937: 326, 331, 337.
128. For a serious case, see GAL, Oud, Rechtelijk Archief: nr. 4, Correctieboek N, fos. 100–102. See also (A) Posthumus 1914, 4: nr. 274 and (B) Nie 1937: 126, 274.
129. (B) Nic 1937: 21–22.
130. GAH, werkhuis: nr. 3.
131. (B) Doorman 1940: 82.
133. GAA, 5020: nr. H, fo. 146.
134. Document nr. 2 in (B) Hallema 1935: 142–143.
135. (A) Handvesten 1748: 294–295. Copies in GAH, Kast 7-2-3-23 and GAL, Stad: nr. 6526. The date was 11 May 1602.
136. The only exception in the 1602 privilege by the Estates of Holland was the provision that any other town in Holland wishing to erect a tuchthuis was allowed to let its prisoners rasp as much wood as was needed within that town. The Estates of Friesland and Groningen granted similar monopolies to their provincial tuchthuisen in 1663 and 1669, respectively. (B) Hallema 1935: documents 7 and 8; Kampman 1986: 24–25.
137. Keuren of 23 Aug. 1646; 12 Dec. 1657; 2 Jan. 1660. The first (and a marginal remark on the second) in GAA, 5020: nr. I, fo. 272. Copies of all these in GAH, Kast 7-2-3-23 (with references to the Amsterdam keurboeken; for the second and third: N, fos. 50 and 123; book N is missing in the Amsterdam archive). The third has been published in (A) Handvesten 1748: 295 (also in (B) Hallema 1935: nr. 4).
138. GAA, 5025: nr. 21, fo. 161v; GAA, 5059: nr. 27, p. 311; (B) Vis 1943: 16–18, 24–27; (A) Wagenaar 1760–1768, 8: 237.
139. (B) Hallema (1935: 137–139) even speaks of a lawsuit between the parties in the 1670s, but he fails to specify his sources. Such a lawsuit is unlikely; I did not find any reference in the archives of the Court of Holland, the High Council, or the committee of
justice of the Estates of Holland. The text of Hallema's article is completely useless. It even conflicts with the documents which he publishes at the end, giving only vague and unspecified references. I was able to trace some of these documents in the Amsterdam archive and they turned out to have been published with only a few spelling errors. Therefore, I take the others, which could not be traced, to be authentic as well.

140. GAA, 5059: nr. 25, pp. 459–60 and nr. 27, p. 311.
141. GAA, 5024: Gemene Missiven, nr. 7: fo. 8v; GAL, Stad: nr. 6526.
142. See the documents, nrs. 6 and 9–18 in (B) Hallema 1935.
143. (A) Posthumus 1918, 8: nr. 576.
144. (B) Loosma 1930: 184–187.
145. (B) Vis 1943: 89–90.
146. (B) Woude 1972, 1: 320–322.
147. (B) Vis 1943: 31–36.
148. (B) Hallema 1935: nrs. 27–30. Another document (undated, 18th century: GAR, Oud Stadsarchief: nr. 2149) reveals that Rotterdam dye traders were obliged to accept rasped and chopped wood from prison according to a fixed ratio. Strangely, it concerned a trader whose colleagues accused him of exceeding his ratio of rasped wood.
149. GAH, Werkhuis: nr. 15. See also Kast 7.2-3-26 (1760s).
151. (B) Nie 1937: 41.
152. (B) Hallema 1935: nr. 20.
154. (B) Hippel 1932: 42 (art. 22); (A) Dapper 1663: 426.
155. (A) Wagenaar 1760–1768, 8: 243–244. Jews were not eligible for these jobs.
156. (A) Howard 1792: 57–58. For the Republic, he confirms that rasping is “in many places performed at the mills, much cheaper” (45).

In 1798 rasping was still listed as one of its activities, but “weaker inmates” worked for the city’s stocking factory. See the document published in (B) Hallema 1929: 198–206.

158. (B) Vis 1943: 36.
159. SAB, 2-D. 18. n: dossier 11.
161. (A) Wagnitz 1791–1794, 1: 262, 269–273; 2: 47–48, 87, 96, 144–148) lists Zwieckau, Leipzig, Bremen, Erfurt, Gottha, and Hamburg. In the latter town deer horn was also rasped. For Copenhagen, see SAB, 2-D. 18. n: dossier 1a (nr. 31, 1799). The Bremen records, and in some cases Wagnitz himself, confirm that just a few inmates were actually involved in rasping. In the prison workhouse at Brussels rasping was discontinued in 1793: (B) Brunel 1866: 223–224.
162. (B) Vries 1976: 252.
163. (B) Woude 1972, 2: 315–318. “Industrial windmills” do not include those used for milling grain, which were much older.

Chapter Seven. Thieves, Prostitutes, and Aggressors

3. Rijksarchief in Gelderland, Hof van Gelre: nr. 4842.
5. (B) Emmersmann 1921: 1–12.
6. (A) Wagnitz (3 vols., 1791–1794) lists 44 zechthäuser, and a few more, not mentioned by him, appear in historical literature. Recently, (B) Stier (1988: 218–221) counted 77, but some of these may not have been real prisons.
7. There were three prisons in Amsterdam and one each in sixteen other towns. The latter include Dordrecht and Schiedam, whose houses do not seem to have functioned as *tuuthhuisen* in the eighteenth century. Between 1740 and the end of the Ancien Régime, one more *tuuthhuis* was established, at Den Bosch in 1808. See (B) Eerenbeemt 1968: 106–111; Jacobs 1988: 28.

8. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, p. 12. Their report was not recorded.

9. (B) Stroobant 1900: 198.


11. SAB, 2-D. 18: dossier 1a (contains all documents referred to).

12. (B) Streng 1890: 59.

13. (B) Emmersmann 1921: 8.


17. GAA, 5061: nr. 571, fo. 69.

18. GAA, 5061: nr. 268.

19. GAA, 345: nr. 1 (passim) and 3 (dossiers 1797–1811 and 1806). See also (B) Faber 1983: 196 (referring to GAA, 345: nr. 2).

20. GAU, Stad: nr. 1043, fo. 11 and 16v.


22. ARA, Gedeputeerden Haarlem: nr. 843.

23. Zierikzee: 1715: GAD, St. Joris: nr. 69 (referred to in dossier 1736); new general contract with Zierikzee (1736): GAD, Stad: nr. 1237; Court-martial and Generality Lands: GAD, St. Joris: nr. 69 (13 Nov. 1750); Tholen: GA Tholen, V; nr. 592. In the second half of the 18th century Tholen also confined a few offenders at Middelburg.


25. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 119 and Stad, nr. 1237.


27. ARA, HvH: nr. 4686. It is impossible to count the total number of prisoners, since most courts stating they had them gave specifications on a separate list. These lists have not been preserved.


29. (B) Reekers 1981: 67. (A) Wagnitz (1791–1794 3, 22–24) explicitly mentions that foreign delinquents were admitted into the *tuuthhuisen* at Halle and Frankfurt/ Oder. This was probably a policy in other places, too.
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171. GAH, Oud-Rechterlijk Archief: nr. 66-2, fo. 267v.
172. GAH, Burg. Resol.: 6 March 1624.
173. GAU, Stad: nr. 1043, fo. 4v.
174. SAH, 242-1-I: nr. C1-2, pp. 1 and 34–35. No connection between the two cases was recorded.
175. GAA, 5061: nrs. 314, fos. 166, 182, 584, fo. 100v–102v; 585, fo. 114v.
176. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-2, pp. 16 and 202v.
177. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-2, fos 65v, 67–68, 70–72, 81–v, 83, 84–v, 112–114, 125v–127v and Stad: nr. 2120a, p. 184. The 1733 case is the only reference to prisoners sleeping in hammocks, which may have been used in periods of overcrowding when there was too little room in a cage for a mattress for each inmate.
179. SAH, 242-1-I: nrs. C1-1, pp. 202 and 204; C1-2, pp. 1 and 14; A29-1, pp. 96 and 98.
180. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 63–64; GAA, 5061: nr. 407, fo. 14(2) and 14(3). The 1726 case is expounded more elaborately in (B) Spierenburg 1988b: 281–282.
183. SAH, 242-1-I: nr. C1-2, pp. 166, 184, 188.
184. GAD, Stad: nr. 2120a, p. 177.
185. GAD, Oud-Rechterl. Archief: nr. 51, fo. 92 and Stad: nr. 2120a, p. 56.
186. On Jan Alofs: (B) Spierenburg 1984a: 75.
187. GAA, 5061: nrs. 291, fo. 172–174 and 533, fo. 2v–3. Other cases in the raspouse: GAA, 5061: nrs. 291, fo. 170v–171v and 571, fo. 136–139. In the second case the prisoners also obtained a temporary transfer to jail.
188. SAB, 2-D. 18. d: dossier nr. 5 (1754–1757).
190. GAA, 5061: nrs. 366, fo. 29v–32v and 381, fos. 60 and 67v.
191. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 68v–69v.
192. SAH, 242-1-I: nrs. A29-1, pp. 16–17 and C1-1, pp. 2 et seq. Also in (B) Strenge 1890: 74. The women first had enjoyed themselves in the spinhouse, so their determination was apparently not that great.
193. SAH, 242-1-I: nr. C1-1, p. 68.
195. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 88–89v.
196. GAA, 5061: nrs. 367, fo. 105v and 320, fo. 72.
197. GAD, St. Joris: nr. 59-1, fo. 75–v.
198. SAB, 2-D. 18. d: dossier 6b1 (17 August 1746).
200. (B) Rückleben 1970, Loose 1982: 277–286; Whaley 1985: 56–63 and passim. The following paragraph is based on these works.
201. (B) Strenge 1890: 84–85, 88. He has a few errors of detail.
203. See Chapter 6, note 3.
204. SAH, 242-1-I: nr. A29-1, p. 80.
14. The average for the 1800 group is biased because I fixed the year of exit for three prisoners at 1811. These three were still in the biechbuis at the last visitation in 1810. In 1811 the Court of Holland was abolished and its private prisoners could not be traced in other archives.

15. (B) Farge and Foucault 1982: 355.


17. In various dossiers of the Court of Holland sample. For the 1680s: (B) Garrant 1929.


24. Quoted in (B) Geessink 1987: 64.


26. SAB, 2-D. 18. d: dossier 661 (30 Sept. 1727). It is unclear where exactly the petitioners wished to confine their brother. They speak of a "lauch- oder verbesserungsbaas." The latter word is the exact equivalent of the Dutch verbeterbuis, but I cannot tell whether it refers to a separate ward of the prison workhouse at Celle or to a separate institution there. If it was the latter, we would have evidence for the existence of at least one private prison in the Empire.


29. Compare (B) Foucault 1975 and my criticism of this position in Spierenberg 1984a: 203.


31. (B) Funk-Brentano 1903: xxvii–xxviii.

32. I agree with (B) Szasz (1961) that "mental illness" does not really exist. Consequently, the medical view of insanity has to be explained historically.

33. (B) Vie 1930: 138–142.

34. ARA, Hv.H: nr. 291 (11 Nov. 1728).

35. See (B) Hunter and Macalpine 1963: 265–267. Strangely, this work is not discussed in Rendel 1987, despite ample attention paid to Defoe.


37. (B) Byrd 1974: 44.

38. On the accusation of abuse: (B) Parry-Jones 1972; Byrd 1974: 40–44; on similar criticism in the 17th century: Beier 1985: 169. See also Christianson 1985 on the crown's prerogative, contested in the Stuart period, of jailing persons who refused to pay taxes.

39. GAD, Stad: nr. 2022, first page.

40. GAR, Schepenen: nr. 283, fo. 322–323.

41. ARA, Hv.H: nr. 4930, dossier 1790.

42. GAL, Secretarie: nr. 9297, fo. 64.

43. GAL, Secretarie: nr. 9309, fo. 238v.

44. GAL, Secretarie: nr. 9334, fo. 230.

45. ARA, Hv.H: nr. 6086 (dossiers 1770 and 1768).

46. GA Alkmaar, Oud-Rechterlijk Archief: nr. 10, fo. 97–101v and Notariële Archief: nr. 525, fo. 99–100 and 103A et seq. See also (B) Loo 1984: 100–105. I am indebted to Mr. Van Loo for providing me with these references.

47. (B) Quétel 1961b: 76–79.


49. (B) Séneux and Trésel 1931: 454–456.


54. (B) Séneux 1932, 462; Schnapper 1980. This method was used by fathers until 1914; it was formally abolished in 1935.
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55. (B) Fessler 1986.
56. For an overview of the history of madness in preindustrial Europe, see (B) Spiersenburg 1988a: Chapter 6.
57. ARA, HVH: nr. 6087, dossier 1734.
60. On moral treatment, see (B) Binneweld 1985: 16–22.
62. (B) Chijns 1886: 25.
63. Of course, this changed again with the further breakthrough of a medical approach to insanity, in the form of a biologically oriented psychiatry, in the second half of the nineteenth century. By then, being called insane was no longer acceptable to a family, because the defect was hereditary. The age of moral treatment was a transitional era, in which moral and medical terms were fused and physicians acquired control over the mad.

Chapter Eleven. Crossroads

1. See Chapter 3.
2. Figures for Amsterdam in (B) Jüngen 1979: 60–61. On galley warfare in the Netherlands, see Lehmann 1984. Lehmann's study is purely technical and he does not say who manned the Dutch galleys.
4. GAD, Oud-Rechterlijk Archief: nr. 53. The total number of sentences was counted from a card system that included abstracts from the criminal records.
5. (B) Hallena 1953a: 81–2 supposes that the majority of oarsmen were vagrants arrested by the landdrukker, but he fails to document this.
6. King Louis Napoleon suggested including galley servitude for burglary in the penal code of 1809. This idea was vehemently opposed because the penalty was considered contrary to Dutch national character. The opponents even thought it had never been practiced in the Netherlands. See (B) Binsbergen 1949: 25.
7. See Chapter 3.
8. (A) Resolutien Holland: 10 Jan. 1648 (p. 364) and 18 March 1648 (pp. 470–472).
9. (B) Voss 1958: 15.
11. The 12 delinquents who were punished on the scaffold form an absolute number. In addition, about forty delinquents who had not been punished on the scaffold must have been sent to Surinam, since two cases entered my sample of nonpublic punishments.
13. To be concluded from my sample of nonpublic punishments. In 1694, beggars were still threatened with transportation to Surinam upon their second arrest; when the ordinance in question was reissued in 1697, the reference to transportation was dropped: GAA, 5020: nr. R, fos. 37v and 94.
14. (B) Schubert 1903: 292–293.
15. (B) Streng 1890: 79–82. See also SAH, 242-I: nr. A41, where the first document (1751) is on the recruitment of settlers to Nova Scotia. But it does not speak of convicts.
16. SAH, 242-I: nr. A41; (B) Hippel (Reinhard) 1986: 441.
17. (B) Ebeling 1935: 3–17.
18. SAB, 2-D. 18: dossiers 1a (1 Sept. 1717); 6b1 (7 Oct. 1724); 6a (1732).
22. (B) Wilbert 1979: 93. At Wesel forced labor at the ramparts was discontinued when the town founded a asylnatuur in 1776: Reekers 1981: 35.
24. See, especially, (B) Innes 1987 and Beattie 1986: 492–493. The phases I distinguish are based on a combination of the chronologies by these authors. Innes's article is the main reference for the evolution of houses of correction; Beattie (Chapters 9 and 10) gives a detailed account of the history of punishment in England, 1660–1800.
25. (B) Innes 1987: 45, 47–58, 68; Sharpe 1984: 180; Beattie 1986: 492–500. The
tentativeness of these conclusions is illustrated by Innes's formulation: "imprisonment in
bridewell *must* have been one of the penal sanctions most commonly deployed to punish
offences of this kind" (45; my emphasis).

26. From 1706 to about 1718, though, a first wave of felons was sentenced to houses of
correction is relatively large numbers: (B) Beattie 1986: 492–494; Innes 1987: 88–89.
27. James Sharpe. The judicial world in its local context: the evidence of English Justices'
notes, a paper presented at the 16th IAAHCCJ-colloquium, Paris, 18–19 December
1987, with reference to his publication of Holcroft's notebook.
29. (B) Innes 1987: 85, 88.
31. Paper by Sharpe (see note 27).
32. (B) DeLacy 1986: 36.
33. (B) Innes 1987: 76, 91–92.
34. Quoted in (B) Smith 1947: 92–93.
37. (B) Beattie 1986: 507.
excellent analysis of the entire system.
40. (B) Beattie 1986: 520–539.
41. (B) Schmidt 1945: 65/299.
42. (B) Beattie 1986: 546.
43. (B) Beattie 1986: 568. On Howard, see Morgan 1977.
45. (B) Beattie 1986: 612.
46. (B) Benabou 1987: 85–89; Schwartz 1988: 28–34. In 1719–1720 a number of
smugglers and marginals were transported, too.
47. (B) Devon 1975: 41.
49. (B) Schwartz 1988: 95–96.
50. (B) Hufston 1974: 150.
1988: 41–44.
52. (B) Cameron 1981: 158.
55. (B) Williams 1979: 232, 235.
56. (B) Benabou 1987: 84–85. See also pp. 89–95 on a few smaller prisons where pros-
titutes were confined.
57. (B) Farge 1974: 84.
58. Report to Lübeck: AHI, Senate; nr. 1, dossier 5.
ton 1970: 452–457. In some cases, such as at Dijon, plans to establish a *dépôt* did not
materialize and beggars continued to be committed to the *hôpital*: Bigorre 1967: 42–44.
60. (B) Devon 1975: 42.
63. (B) Ruff 1984: 59.
64. (B) Farge 1974: 84.
65. (B) Zysberg 1987: 364–371. Percentages of terms were calculated from table 14 (p.
373; see also p. 65 for information leading to the inference that in the first period 15% of
the terms are missing). For mortality figures, see table 11 (p. 349). Reductions and longer
stays are calculated from tables 13 and 15 (pp. 369, 374). These calculations cannot be
precise because Zysberg groups the terms into crude categories, sometimes comprising more
than one year.
66. André Zysberg in (B) Spierenberg 1984b: 111–120.
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68. (B) Farge 1974: 84.
69. Calculated from the tables in (B) Castan 1980: 279, 281. See p. 273 of Castan's study for a specification of the table sources.
70. (B) Pike 1983.
71. (B) Callahan 1971; Pike 1983: 54–57.
72. (B) Sellin 1929; Scarabello 1979: 189.
77. (B) Olsen 1978: 39.
78. Information kindly provided by Bengt Ankarloo from his research notes.
79. (B) Wieselgren 1895: 142–162.
80. (B) Haesenne-Peremans 1983: 17–45.
82. (B) Bruneel 1967: 42, 56.
83. (B) Macs 1947: 36–37, 459.
84. (B) Stroobant 1900: 221–239; Lis 1976: 155; GA Antwerpen, Vierschaar: nr. 1645 (dossiers 1777b).
85. GA Antwerpen, Vierschaar: nos. 282, 283, 1822 (dossiers on individual committals, 1779–1793; the cited case is in nr. 282, 25 September 1779).
86. (B) Shaw 1966; Rüde 1978.

Chapter Twelve. Conclusion

1. (B) Eichirch 1987: 3, 20, 118. Beattie (1986: 502), on the other hand, argues that 1718 found imprisonment not severe enough compared to transportation.
5. (B) Sohnsman 1970: 150–151, 159–164, 223. See also appendix 1 with Paul Wolfgang Merkel's criticism in 1798. To be sure, Merkel only opposes the subjection of prostitutes and marginals to this form of labor and to imprisonment in the sudelhous generally.
8. For a discussion of that transformation and its relationship with state formation, see (B) Spierenburg 1984a: 183–207.
LIST OF ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Only the main series and documents used are listed here. They appear in the following order: country, record office, archive (sometimes the archive has its own number), inventory number. All abbreviations used in the notes are explained. Records consulted and not listed here have been given a complete reference in the notes.

Netherlands

*Algemeen Rijks-Archief, The Hague (ARA)*

3.03.01: *Hof van Holland* (HvH)
Nrs. 4929–4930, 6086–6087: Reports on the visitations to private prisoners committed at the authorization of the Court of Holland, 1729–1810.

3.20.52: *Familie-Archief Slingelande/ De Vrij Temminck*
Nr. 465: Documents concerning the Amsterdam raphouse, mid-18th century.

*Gemeente-Archief Amsterdam (GAA)*

345: Archive of the raphouse (3 nrs.).
347: Archive of the spinhouse and the workhouse.
Nrs. 116–125: Entry books of the workhouse, 1654–1754.
Nr. 562: Supervision of beggars, 1597–1598
5020: *Keurboeken* (A–T), 15th century to 1750
5059: *Handschriften*
Nrs. 24–40: Manuscripts by Hans Bontemantel, c. 1650 to c. 1672.
Nr. 72: *Memorie van de Regenten van het mannens Tuchthuis*, c. 1750.
5061: *Oud-Rechterlijk Archief*
Nr. 268: *Examinatie Boeken*, 1658.
Nrs. 276–533: *Conflissieboeken*, 1588–1811.

*Gemeente-Archief Delft (GAD)*

*Stadsarchief* (Stad)
Nrs. 2031–2031a: Registers of private prisoners, 1699–1811.
*Archief van het St. Joristuin* (St. Joris)
Nr. 59 (3 vols.): Logbooks of the regents, 1677–1812.
Nr. 69: Various dossiers, 1664–1804.

*Gemeente-Archief Haarlem (GAH)*

*Aalmoezeniers-Armen en Werkhuis* (Werkhuis)
Nrs. 1–18: Archive of the prison workhouse.
*Kosten en Laden*: provisional inventory of various dossiers.
List of Archival Sources

Burgemeesterresoluties (Burg. Resol.), 1598–1786
Vroedschapsschutten (Vroeds. Resol.), 1590–1796

Handschriften

Nr. 158: Manuscripts by Pieter Langendijk, mid-18th century.

Oud-Rechterlijk Archief

Nr. 66-2: Derde Register van den criminele sententies, 1602–1615.

Gemeente-Archief Leiden (GAL)

Stadsarchief, 1574–1816 (Stad)

Nr. 6522: Various dossiers on the Amsterdam raphouse and the Leiden tuchthuis, c. 1590 to c. 1600.

Nr. 6524–6529: Archive of the Leiden tuchthuis.

Secretarie-Archief

Nrs. 9290–9348 and 1021–1026: Gerichtsboeken, 1680–1805.

Gemeente-Archief Rotterdam (GAR)

Schepenen-archief (Schepenen)

Nrs. 280–285: Requests for confinement, 1712–1801.

Gemeente-Archief Utrecht (GAU)

Stadsarchief II (Stad)

Nr. 1048 Notulen van regenten van het tuchthuis, 1616–1633 (private logbook by Arend van Buchell).

German (Federal Republic)

Staatsarchiv Bremen (SAB)

2-D 18.d: Zuchthaus
(dossiers with documents which can be identified only by their date)

Nr. 1a: Einrichtung und Ordnung, 1604–1801.

Nr. 4: Speziesfuerer oder Oekonom, 1695–1867.

Nr. 5: Zuchtrichter oder Zuchtreator, 1711–1862.

Nr. 6: Zuchthausg (subdivided a–d).

Nr. 7: Bau und Besessen, 1608–1869.

Nr. 10: Arbeit, 1646–1769.

Nr. 11: Reisnähe, 1750.

Nr. 12: Englische Besessen, 1761.

Revidiertes Verzeichnis des am 26.3.1987 aus der Deutschen Demokratischen Republic zurück-gegebenen Schriftgutes (DDR)

Nr. 1203/ 3490: Armenpflege und Armenwesen.

Nr. 2308/ 6926: Renner’s Chronik.

Staatsarchiv Hamburg (SAH)

111-1: Senatsacten

Classis VII, Lit. Mb, nr. 2 (Gefängnisse):

Vol. 2: Gefängniskiste

Vol. 3: Spinnhaus (subdivided a–u)

242-1-1: Gefängnisverwaltung

Nr. A12: Ordnung des Zuchthaus, 1622 (also in A13).

List of Archival Sources

Nr. A36 - 1: Stellenbuch der Kirchen im Spinnhaus, 1682.
Nr. A41: Dossiers on transportation.
Nr. C1: Spinnhaus, Aufnahmefücher:

Archiv der Hansestadt Lübeck (AHL)
   Bürgerschaft II (Bürgerschaft)
   Nr. 120: St. Annen Armen- und Wrekhaus (subdivided 1–12).
   Senatsarchiv-Interna: Zucht- und Spinnhaus (Senate)
   Nr. 1: ältere Einrichtungen, neue Planung (5 dossiers, numbered 1–5).

Belgium

Gemeente-Archief Antwerpen (GA Antwerpen)
   Archief van de Vierschaar (Vierschaar)
   Nr. 1645: Documents relating to the dwinghuis, 1612–1779.
   Nr. 1822: Documents relating to imprisonment, 1624–1793.
A differentiation has been made between printed sources (A) and secondary literature (B). Part A includes works published before 1800 as well as contemporary manuscripts edited and published after that date. Because of the rarity of a number of these publications, the library where I consulted them has been listed in all cases (UB = University Library of Amsterdam).

A. Printed Sources

Battus, Carolus. 1650. Secret-boeck van vele diversche en heerliche consten in eerderleye materi-

cen. . . Amsterdam (UB).

Baunartius, Gulielmus. 1624. Memoresy oot Cort Verhael der Gedeck-woerlichte in kerclieke

een wertliche gescheidenissen. . . . Tweede editie, grootelice vermeerderd. 2 vols. Arnheim (Histor-

cical Institute, Amsterdam).

Blainville, J. de. 1743–1745. Travels through Holland, Germany, Switzerland and other parts of


Blek, F. J., ed. 1909 Relazioni Veneziane: Venetiaanse berichten over de Verenigde Nederlanden

den van 1600–1795. Den Haag (Historical Institute, Amsterdam).

Bonnetmantel, Hans. 1897 De regeringe van Amsterdam, soo in’t civiel als crimineel en militaire,


Temple. London (UB).

Brandt, G[ercart]. 1704. Historie der Reformatie en andere kerclieke gescheidenissen en on-


Brock, Johann Franz. 1808. Hamburgische Werk- und Zuchthaus-Sachen. Hamburg (Staatsar-
civ, Hamburg).

Brown, Edward. 1682. Naukeurige en Gedenkworgelijke Rysen van Edward Brown, M. Dr. af-
genomen van’t Collegie to Londen . . . door Nederland. . . . Uit het Engels vertaald door den

Heer Jacob Leew. Amsterdam (UB).


384–388 (UB).


Dellaporta, Giambattista. 1593. De humana physiognomonia. Hanoviae (UB).


Chicago: University of Chicago Press.


Fielen. 1914. "Der Rabauwen oft der Schakken Vocabulaer, ooc de beuyde manieren der

bedeelen oft bedeelen. . . ." Victor de Meyere and Lode Baeckelins, eds., Het boek der

rabauwen en maaerders. Bijdrage tot de studie van het volksleven der 16e en 17e eeuwen.

Aanwerpen (Dutch Institute, Amsterdam).

Fokkens, M[elchior]. 1662. Beschrijvinge der wijde-vermaarde Koop-stads Amsterdam. Am-

sterdam (UB).

Gebouwen, 1736. Gebouwen, gezichten en oudbilden der stad Amsterdam. Met figuuren. Haar-

lern (UB).

Goos, Johan van. 1750–1751. De nieuwe schouburg der Nederlandse kunstschilder en schild-


Grevius, Johannes. 1624. Tribunal reformatum, en qua . . . rejcta et fugita tortura . . . Quam

capitus scriptum in Erastuslo Amstelodamiens. Hamburgi (UB).


Guidelines, Le, ou nouvelle description d’Amsterdam. 1753. Amsterdam (UB).
Bibliography 323


Mountague, William. 1696. The delights of Holland, or a three months travel about that and the other provinces. (UB).


Oeuvres, koudige en ernstige oeschriften op luften, wagens, glazen, wychungsborden, en andere zanoren. 1682. Amsterdam (UB).

Ordinatie der vurteeftiches huch en weirenambten Kauffstadt Amsterdam in Hollantdi miste welcher d'elitzi genzlich abgeschaffet und die armen unterhalten worden. 1598. Hamburg (Gemeente-archief, Amsterdam).


Reinking, Theodorus. 1619, 1622, 1632, 1659. Tractatus de regimine seculari et ecclesiastico. . . . Giessen (1619); Basel (1622); editio altera; Marburg (1632; editio secunda); Francofurti ad Menum (Johannes Martinus Porssius) (1659); (all editions: University Library, Tubingen).


Schaap, Gerard van. 1698. Beschrijvinghe der stad Rotterdam en eene omlogings der dorpen. Rotterdam (UB).


Wagenaar, Jan. 1760–1768. Amsterdam in synne opkomst, aanwas, geschiedenis, vorregen,
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