

STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL HISTORY
OF MEDICINE

Series Editors: Jonathan Barry and Bernard Harris

In recent years, the social history of medicine has become recognized as a major field of historical enquiry. Aspects of health, disease, and medical care now attract the attention not only of social historians but also of researchers in a broad spectrum of historical and social science disciplines. The Society for the Social History of Medicine, founded in 1969, is an interdisciplinary body, based in Great Britain but international in membership. It exists to forward a wide-ranging view of the history of medicine, concerned equally with biological aspects of normal life, experience of and attitudes to illness, medical thought and treatment, and systems of medical care. Although frequently bearing on current issues, this interpretation of the subject makes primary reference to historical context and contemporary priorities. The intention is not to promote a sub-specialism but to conduct research according to the standards and intelligibility required of history in general. The Society publishes a journal, *Social History of Medicine*, and holds at least three conferences a year. Its series, Studies in the Social History of Medicine, does not represent publication of its proceedings, but comprises volumes on selected themes, often arising out of conferences but subsequently developed by the editors.

LIFE, DEATH, AND THE ELDERLY

Edited by Margaret Pelling and Richard M. Smith

MEDICINE AND CHARITY BEFORE THE WELFARE STATE

Edited by Jonathan Barry and Colin Jones

IN THE NAME OF THE CHILD

Edited by Roger Cooter

REASSESSING FOUCAULT: POWER, MEDICINE AND THE BODY

Edited by Colin Jones and Roy Porter

MIGRANTS, MINORITIES AND HEALTH: HISTORICAL
AND CONTEMPORARY STUDIES

Edited by Lara Marks and Michael Worboys

FROM IDIOCY TO MENTAL DEFICIENCY

Edited by David Wright and Anne Digby

NUTRITION IN BRITAIN

Edited by David F. Smith

HEALTH CARE AND POOR RELIEF IN PROTESTANT

EUROPE 1500-1700

Edited by Ole Peter Grell and Andrew Cunningham

MIDWIVES, SOCIETY AND CHILDBIRTH

Edited by Hilary Marland and Anne Marie Rafferty

THE LOCUS OF
CARE

Families, communities, institutions,
and the provision of welfare
since antiquity

*Edited by Peregrine Horden
and Richard Smith*

1995



London and New York

THE HOUSEHOLD AND
THE CARE OF LUNATICS
IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY
LONDON¹

Akihito Suzuki

I

The pattern of care and provision for lunatics in England went through a gradual but fundamental transformation between *c.* 1650 and *c.* 1850. The most remarkable aspect of the shift was the rise of the asylum, or specialist institution for the insane.² The increasing segregation of lunatics into asylums has been studied fairly extensively. Major works have concentrated on the twofold processes of the institutionalization of the insane and the creation of asylum-based specialized medicine, drawing a picture of more or less linear evolution from mixed institutions to mental hospitals. Michel Foucault's *Histoire de la Folie* is centred on the creation of the 'general hospital' which incarcerated the insane indiscriminately with the social outcast, emphasizing the role of the institution in the transformation of madness as an object of social policy and medical discourse.³ Stimulated by Foucault, but largely critical of his conclusions, there is a body of increasingly sophisticated historical monographs dedicated to the study of individual institutions.⁴ The role of the asylum in the making of the psychiatric profession and discipline has been studied in depth. Andrew Scull has examined the process through which English 'mad-doctors' transformed themselves into 'psychiatrists' to consolidate their position in the newly created asylum system and Jan Goldstein has charted the similar strategy of French alienists in a wider political and cultural setting.⁵

Although valuable in reconceptualizing the making of psychiatry as a political and institutional enterprise, those works have created a historiographical bias of concentrating on what happened within institutional walls and neglecting what took place *outside* the institution. This bias has recently been corrected, most notably by Michael MacDonald and Roy Porter.⁶ In particular, there is now rising interest in the extra-institutional care of lunatics in the early modern period. Peter Rushton, Jonathan Andrews, and some others have examined the role of the family and the community to which the poor insane belonged.⁷ These works on extra-institutional care have shown that, in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, the family was the primary locus of care for the insane poor, sometimes with the help of cash doles, nurses, or means of restraint provided by the parish. Only when domestic provision failed was recourse had to institutional care and confinement.⁸ Influenced by the recent trend in the historical/anthropological study of early modern poverty and charity, the works by Rushton, Andrews, and others have supplemented earlier works which dealt almost exclusively with reformers, psychiatrists, and legislators, and have started to throw light on insane recipients of relief.⁹

These works have put us in a better position to look at the rise of the asylum in connection with what happened outside the institution. The aim of the present paper is to further the study of the interaction of institutionalization and extra-institutional care by examining under what circumstances the institutional threshold was crossed – or, in other words, how domestic and private provision for a lunatic failed. The major source on which this paper is based is the record of about 130 lunatics whose ‘settlement’ – right to reside in the parish – and right to poor relief was examined between 1735 and 1783 by the Poor Law officers of the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields in the city of Westminster.¹⁰ I have supplemented these sources with Quarter Sessions records of the County of Middlesex in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as some from other counties, for this type of record contains more detailed and vivid description of the hardship caused by lunatics within their respective households.¹¹

London in the mid-eighteenth century is particularly important in the history of the care of the insane, for it witnessed the growth of a new type of institutional provision, the private madhouse, some instances of which took not only well-off patients but also

poor parish lunatics.¹² As Parry-Jones and Andrews have shown, parishes in and around London from the late seventeenth century onward kept and confined a significant number of parish lunatics in private madhouses, supplementing the limited provision of cheaper public charitable hospitals such as Bethlem Hospital and, from 1751, St Luke’s Hospital.¹³ St Martin-in-the-Fields made quite extensive use of this private institutional provision, as well as of Bethlem and St Luke’s.¹⁴ They utilized first ‘Dr’ Matthew Wright’s madhouse at Bethnal Green (succeeded first by Mrs Wright and then by Thomas Cope) and from 1777 William Harrison’s at Hoxton.¹⁵ Between 1737 and 1783, 227 lunatics were sent from the parish workhouse to these private madhouses, and an unknown number of lunatics were sent there directly from their lodging places.¹⁶ In 1748, it seems that around twenty lunatics from the parish were kept at Mrs Wright’s house.¹⁷ Long before the state-run asylum system came into existence, St Martin’s, like many other London parishes, practised institutional segregation of the poor insane. By the early nineteenth century, the private madhouse at Hoxton boasted about 500 inmates: it was by far the largest asylum in England until beaten by the Middlesex County Asylum at Hanwell, which housed about 900 around 1840.¹⁸

For the growth of private provision for parish lunatics, three factors were necessary: (1) supply – entrepreneurial owners of private madhouses; (2) demand – parish Poor Law officers who would pay for having their lunatics kept there; (3) the basis of demand – poor lunatics who could not be contained within the realm of private care. This paper will investigate the third factor, by studying patterns in the breakdown of the domestic care for the insane poor. It has to be emphasized immediately that failure in domestic provision does not automatically entail the growth of the asylum. As Scull has rightly pointed out, the supply of institutional care for lunatics was not an automatic response to the rising demand for it, and he is certainly right in criticizing the naive functionalist view, which sees the asylum as spontaneously generating in the marsh of industrialized urban slums.¹⁹ On the other hand, early asylums did not recruit their inmates chiefly by pulling lunatics out of their own self-sufficient households. If anything, the early asylums mainly coped with the lunatics who had already fallen out of their domestic realms and had already become public problems. Given that, it seems reasonable to ask whether there was any increase in the number of

lunatics who failed to be contained in their families, a phenomenon which *helped* people to discover lunacy as a special problem and to legitimize the creation of institutional provision. Below I should like to suggest some possible ways to tackle this question.

II

The problem inherent in looking at the ability of a family to contain its insane member is that historians usually have to infer its capacity from the evidence of its incapacity. This difficulty is particularly serious when examining poorer families. Upper- and middle-class families were likely to leave diaries, letters, and memoirs which sometimes include accounts of the madness of their relatives, or to ask for commission *de lunatico inquirendo* to put their insane member under guardianship.²⁰ When poorer lunatics were contained in self-sufficient or semi-self-sufficient households, they were unlikely to leave any records.

There are, however, some cases which suggest a considerable capacity to cope with its insane member on the part of the household of a poor labourer. For instance, the parish officers and inhabitants of Hardington, Somerset, petitioned the Quarter Sessions Court in 1627,

asking for the release from danger of arrest of a poor man Lionel Grange for building a house for which they had given permission; he having [a] great store of children and lunatic wife, [whom] if he be sent to prison, they will be obliged to keep.²¹

Although Lionel Grange was a poor cottage labourer, this petition suggests that the parishioners expected that he would be able to keep his lunatic wife, as well as his children. In another case, a petition was presented in 1657 by Edward Ffox in Nottinghamshire: 'his wife being very much distracted in her witts hath of late pulled down part of his dwelling house wherein she was kept, which by reason of his poverty he is not able to build upp'.²² On hearing the petition, the court just ordered that the house should be rebuilt at the parish's expense. Despite Edward's poverty and the wife's violence, it was still expected that, with this small aid from public resources, he could keep the problem within the private domain.

These cases suggest that the tie formed by marriage was important in containing the problem of lunacy within the domestic realm and that married lunatics were less likely to become a public problem than single lunatics. This assumption is supported by the cases from St Martin-in-the-Fields. Of 127 lunatics examined there, only twenty-eight of them (fifteen husbands and thirteen wives) or 22 per cent were married at the time of their first examination as chargeable lunatics. Of the ninety-nine 'single' lunatics, eighty had never married, twelve were widows, and seven were deserted wives.²³

This low representation of married men and women in the chargeable lunatics was certainly due to economic factors. Marriage meant the capacity of the couple to earn an income high enough to form and sustain their own household.²⁴ Hence, generally speaking, the household of a married lunatic was likely to have a relatively higher income, larger savings, and other helpful resources, on which he or she could rely when insane. In 1657, the Middlesex Quarter Sessions Court ordered the parish officers of Hadley to pay Abigail, the wife of Ralph Note, 2s. 6d. per week for his relief when they learned that Ralph had been 'distracted in his mind and unable to gain his livelihood' for three months and that 'the said Abigail has been forced to hire people to watch him, for fear he shall do himself or others some mischief. *She has spent all her money and good[s] in seeking means for his recovery*' [my emphasis].²⁵ This case indicates that married people first tried to cope with the hardship of the lunacy of their spouses by drawing upon their private resources. The larger the resources, the better the chance of containing the problem within the family sphere.

Another factor, the emotional tie between the spouses, must have to a certain extent contributed to keeping a married lunatic within the household. The mental world of ordinary folk is, however, notoriously difficult to investigate, and the sources I have consulted do not allow any positive assessment of the strength of the emotional commitment to an insane spouse. Indeed, eight lunatic wives were in the end deserted, which suggests that one should not overestimate the affectionate bond in married couples.²⁶ Readiness to take on the burden of a disabled family member was probably weakened in a case of lunacy: the poor prognosis of the disease, the grim reality of attending a lunatic, and the lack of appreciative response from him or her might have lowered the emotional commitment.

In some cases of deserted lunatic wives, it is highly likely that their lunacy itself was the cause of their husbands' absconding. In 1743, Ann Metzger married Swithin Metzger, a journeyman tailor. In 1746, she was sent to a private madhouse by the parish officers of St Martin-in-the-Fields. Next year, when her right to poor relief was examined, she was still accompanied by her husband, and again sent from the workhouse to the madhouse. In 1752, we find her again in the workhouse of the same parish, pregnant but with her husband 'gone from her'.²⁷ Almost certainly Swithin was fed up with taking care of his chronically insane wife and the prospect of the further burden of the baby. The case of Elizabeth Hutchinson, the wife of Thomas Hutchinson, a glass-grinder born and apprenticed in Ireland, was indeed pathetic. She was 60 years old when she was brought to the parish workhouse. Perhaps in delusion, she stated that her husband Thomas then kept a house of £30 per year in Southwark. In fact, as John Godfrey, a local justice of the peace, testified a few days later, Thomas 'hath been gone from her about two months and he [Godfrey] has made search and enquiry after the said Thomas Hutchinson but cannot learn where the said Thomas Hutchinson is gone to'.²⁸ These cases support the picture of marriage in early modern London put forth by Vivien Brodsky and Peter Earle as 'a very fragile institution'.²⁹ The ratio of two deserted lunatic wives to every three non-deserted ones from St Martin-in-the-Fields seems to speak for itself, even when one takes into consideration the presumably large number of 'invisible' husbands who took charge of their lunatic wives without leaving any trace in the historical record.

I have elsewhere constructed an argument about gender imbalance in the capacity to cope with the lunacy of the spouse.³⁰ Mainly relying on the contrasting representations of lunatic husbands and wives in the Quarter Sessions Court, I have argued that lunatic husbands posed more serious problems than insane wives, because of the former's greater capabilities as breadwinners and greater threat of physical violence. The evidence from St Martin-in-the-Fields, however, controverts, or at least significantly modifies, the picture I have drawn. The image of a dependent wife who was helpless with her raging husband was more a product of rhetoric suitable for a petition, shrewdly tuned to the ears of paternalistic magistrates, than a faithful picture.³¹

It is true that there are some cases which suggest that a husband could more easily cope with a lunatic wife than vice versa. In 1746,

Martha Prat, a lunatic wife, was kept in the parish workhouse for about five months, during which time her husband paid 2s. 6d. per week for her maintenance, and Sarah Lamb, another lunatic wife, was taken out of the workhouse by her husband after about three weeks' stay.³² The records from St Martin-in-the-Fields I have examined do not include any wife that contributed to the maintenance of her lunatic husband in the workhouse, nor any who took her lunatic husband out of an institution. Still, the ratio of lunatic husbands to lunatic wives brought to the parish officers was 15 : 13, showing little significant imbalance. When examining how lunatics of different familial positions gained their last 'settlement' (Table 6.1), I found no conclusive evidence that a husband could more easily cope with his lunatic wife in their domestic setting. The distributions of types of 'settlement' in the following three groups – (a) lunatic husbands, (b) husbands of lunatic wives, and (c) late husbands of lunatic widows – are almost the same. Yet the low average rent (a fairly reliable index of income) paid by the husbands of lunatic wives might indicate that a husband with higher income could have kept them from being a burden to the parish.

Table 6.1 Means by which 'settlement' gained

	Husbands	Wives	Widows
Rent above £10 p.a.	6	5	5
Average known rent	£31	£19 12s.	£36
Apprenticeship	4	4	3
Birth in parish	3	2	1
One year's service	2	2	0
Independent widow	–	–	3
Total	15	13	12

Another defect of my own earlier account is that it underestimates the contribution of women, especially that of working wives, to the household economy. A recent study by Peter Earle has shown that women without any gainful employment were a minority (30 per cent of his sample) in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century London.³³ As shown in Table 6.1, three widows earned their own 'settlement' (while they were sane) after the death of their husbands and their becoming chargeable under

the Poor Law, two by domestic service and one by the business of milliner.³⁴ Ann Metcaff, a spinster linen draper, had supported herself well and resided in a house with a rent of £30 until she became insane and was sent to a private madhouse as a parish lunatic.³⁵ Since my sources are concerned only with the occupation and apprenticeship of the husband of a married couple, they 'hide' contributions by working wives. Indeed, there is a telling example from Middlesex Quarter Sessions records, which allows us to glimpse how a working wife could maintain and manage a lunatic husband. In October 1655, the Quarter Sessions Court ordered the withdrawal of the licence of Robert Gregory, victualler, for 'suffering disorders in their houses of the Lord's Day' and for refusing subsequent inspection. In December at the next session, the Court suspended the order, finding that 'the said Gregory is at some times distempered in his braine and that his wife is a sober and well-governed woman'.³⁶ Apparently, the justices thought that the sober wife would carry out both the business of victualling and that of managing her fitful husband.

Instead of an oversimplified model of a household sustained by a single male breadwinner, therefore, a more complex model which considers the earnings and spending of all the members of each household is necessary in order to understand the patterns in the breakdown of domestic care. As Andrews has perceptively pointed out, the life-cycle model is particularly helpful when examining the limits of domestic care of lunatics.³⁷ In some households in my sample, the burden of children seems to have aggravated the situation. Out of twenty-eight households with either a lunatic husband or a lunatic wife, twelve had at least one child. The strain of a new-born child seems to have been crucial: there were four households burdened with a baby under six months old.³⁸ Besides these cases, there are another four entries in the workhouse admission records which suggest the burden placed by a lunatic and a young baby on the family economy.³⁹

There were several ways for a large family to cope with problems caused or aggravated by the existence of a lunatic. When Charles Cook found it difficult to keep both Grace his lunatic wife and Elizabeth their new-born child of five weeks, the father stayed with the child and committed his wife to the workhouse.⁴⁰ The case of the Conner family was more complex. Christian Conner was the wife of John Conner, who had once been a domestic servant with a comfortable £12 a year plus food and lodging. On 24 September

1745, the Conners were in great trouble and were sent to the workhouse, the wife having become insane with three children to maintain, aged 3 years, 2 years, and about 10 weeks respectively. Next day, John went out of the workhouse, leaving the rest of the family behind him, and Christian was sent to the private madhouse. The burden of a lunatic wife and three young children was apparently too heavy for him. After the baby's death two weeks later, however, Christian was discharged from the madhouse. Perhaps John might have found a way to support his family, the burden of which had become significantly smaller because of the death of the youngest child. The question was not only whether the wife was ungovernable, but also whether the family had the capacity to contain her.⁴¹

Despite its limitations and fragile nature, the tie formed by marriage still seems to have provided the most important support for those who became insane. The marriage tie was all the more important because the tie between parent and child, another bond in the nuclear family, does not seem to have contributed greatly to the domestic care of lunatics. In some cases, lunatic children seem to have suffered because of the blatant neglect of their parents.⁴² The limited care lunatic children received from their parents was again, however, mainly due to problems pertaining to the life cycle. When a child was chronically insane or weak-minded from youth, his or her parents could and did look after it. When parents grew older and their income declined, it became harder for them to cope with the problem, for they were themselves having difficulty in making their living. This is exemplified in the petition of George Clark to Middlesex Quarter Sessions Court in 1719:

In the year 1700 he was overseer of the parish of Thisleworth, which parish, being much in debt, did not reimburse the money due to him on the balance of his account, and he is now an aged poor man with a distracted daughter to maintain.⁴³

Likewise, another father in Middlesex stated that he could not maintain his lunatic daughter and three children because he was 'aged sixty-six and much disabled by the dimness of his sight'.⁴⁴

The sample from St Martin-in-the-Fields supplies some similar cases of the long-term care provided by parents, and its inevitable limitations. Although there is a case in which Thomas Chalmers, a

53-year-old smith and widower, discharged his lunatic daughter Margaret from the private madhouse where she had been kept for a year at the parish's expense, not every parent could afford such a display of paternal or maternal concern.⁴⁵ Thomas Chandler, an apparently chronic lunatic, had never been 'married nor bound an apprentice . . . but always with [his father]'. In 1743, when Thomas was 33 years old, his father, a yeoman, finally applied for a place in Bethlem, perhaps finding it difficult to keep Thomas any longer.⁴⁶ Moreover, some lunatic children found one of their parents had already died at the time of their need. Of nine lunatics whose parents appeared in their records, three had widowed mothers.⁴⁷ In 1761, Sarah Summers, a widow, put her daughter Ann to apprenticeship. Six months later, Ann 'went out of her senses', was discharged from apprenticeship, and subsequently kept at the private madhouse as a parish lunatic.⁴⁸ Jemima Dean, a widow, obviously found it beyond her power to cope with Anne Dean, a lunatic daughter of hers, and Sarah Dean, Anne's illegitimate child, whose father was unknown.⁴⁹ The lack of substantial support from the parents of lunatics was thus due more to the incapacitating consequences of old age than to neglect or unwillingness on the parents' side.

When it comes to the filial care of lunatic fathers and mothers, reluctance rather than inability seems to have characterized cases from my sample. There are five cases in which grown-up children were involved in settling the problem of the lunacy of their parents, and none of them invited the insane parents to their own households.⁵⁰ Philip Johnson, a 'glass flowerer' living in the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, testified that he would remove his lunatic father Jerom to the parish of St James, Piccadilly, where the father had once gained 'settlement' by renting a house of £70 per annum.⁵¹ John Eterneau, a leather breeches maker, had lived in the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields with his lunatic mother, who had been widowed for twenty-four years. In 1774 he removed her to the parish of St Anne, the place of her late husband's 'settlement'.⁵²

As for the care provided by brothers and sisters, there is not much evidence from my sample. Although we need further research to confirm this point, it seems unlikely that brothers and sisters invited their lunatic siblings to their own households for a long-term stay without payment. When lunatics were provided with long-term care by their brothers and sisters, the siblings almost

always received money either from the parish or from the property of the lunatics in question. Sometimes reimbursement did not entice the siblings to take care of the lunatics. When Elizabeth Baxter, a widow of some property, became insane in Yorkshire in the early seventeenth century, the parish found 'her kindred and friends utterly refusing to meddle with her'.⁵³ This does not mean that people did not do anything to help their lunatic siblings. The helping hand of brothers and sisters could sometimes become generous: Ann Nott looked after her insane sister Jane Guyver at the house of her husband John for at least a year and a half. In the end, however, Jane was removed to the parish of St Paul Covent Garden, where she had earned 'settlement' by her own service.⁵⁴ The role of the siblings seems to have been mainly limited to providing short-term emergency help and initiating the necessary procedure for a more long-term 'settlement'. Thomas Achison, who was apparently chronically weak-minded and sometimes acutely insane, was first brought to his sister Isabella Clarke living in the parish of Covent Garden. She helped the parish to remove him to St-Martin-in-the-Fields, where Thomas was born, to be provided for at the workhouse.⁵⁵

The limitations of domestic care for lunatics were, therefore, a part of that 'nuclear hardship' held to be inherent in early modern English society.⁵⁶ Support from extended kin outside the nuclear family was scarce, and children often did not help their lunatic parents after leaving the latter's household to form their own. The marriage tie, the core of the nuclear family bond, was the most important private resource one could rely on in time of need, and lunacy created no exception. Lunacy of a spouse, however, made the marriage tie more fragile, which was prone to breakdown at the desertion of one partner.

These conclusions lead us to a further question about local provision for lunacy. Namely, did local community ties and obligations mitigate the nuclear hardship created or exacerbated by lunacy? The same observation of short-term generosity that I have made above about siblings seems to be applicable to neighbourhoods. London in the eighteenth century had not yet witnessed the tendencies towards anonymity inherent in the growth of urban slums, and great concern was paid to maintain and promote the morality and harmony of the local community. A lot of people, whose relation to the lunatics in question is not stated in the records, offered lodging to them at the time of their

examination, and some of them must have been generous neighbours. It is, however, quite understandable that their generosity towards a lunatic neighbour was limited.⁵⁷ Sometimes neighbours took the initiative in bringing a disorderly lunatic to the notice of public authorities. Several neighbours of Lot Beacham, a lunatic, reported to the parish officers that 'he is by lunacy so far disordered in his senses that he is dangerous to be permitted to go abroad having committed several acts of violence'.⁵⁸

III

Above, I have examined the relative importance of ties between kin, especially between spouses and between parents and children. Next, the tie between masters and servants, which constituted the other major bond of the household in this period, should be examined.⁵⁹ Lunatic servants overwhelmingly dominate my sample. Forty-nine lunatics earned their last 'settlement' by a year's service.⁶⁰ The ratio of servants to the total of my sample is about 39 per cent, vastly exceeding the ratio of servants to the total population of London in this period, which is estimated to have been about 8 per cent.⁶¹ Even if one considers that a West End parish, such as St Martin-in-the-Fields, was likely to have a higher proportion of domestic servants, still it seems safe to argue that lunatic servants posed a disproportionately large problem.

How can one explain this bias towards servants in the lunatic population? One cannot entirely exclude the possibility that servants in eighteenth-century London, coming out of rustic simplicity, engaged in psychologically demanding work and indulging in Metropolitan excitements, were more prone to madness than the rest of the population. There seems to be, however, a more straightforward and convincing explanation.

First of all, there was a change in the law. The 1697 amendment of the act regulating 'settlement' expanded the right to poor relief to include those unmarried persons who were hired for a year as servants, as well as those who had already been given the right by renting a tenement worth £10 a year or more, or being bound apprentice.⁶² Now the parish had to provide for the lunatics who had earned their 'settlement' by a year's service.

Moreover, the position of the servants in their respective households was temporary and directly dependent on their ability to work. For obvious reasons, it is hardly imaginable that their

masters, who dismissed servants for the slightest negligence of duties, would be prepared to maintain and keep their lunatic servants for a long period. There were six servants in my sample who had gained their 'settlement' by service to aristocrats.⁶³ Yet the majority of the lunatic servants in my sample had served in middle-class households, for example of two victuallers, a cabinet maker, an upholsterer, a peruke maker, and so on.⁶⁴ The life-style of middle-class masters and mistresses, especially their keen sense of economy in their household finance and their pursuit of domestic comfort, was totally incompatible with keeping an unproductive, disruptive, and sometimes dangerous lunatic servant.⁶⁵

In some cases, lunatic servants dropped into the parish net immediately after they lost the job. In 1751, Peter Warren Esq. testified that 'Robert Combstock a lunatick was a yearly hired servt to this examinant . . . for the space of ten years at the yearly wages of £20 diet and lodging, quitted the same fourteen days ago'.⁶⁶ Yet Combstock's case is exceptional in that his lunacy was reported immediately after his quitting service. The median length of the period between the servants' quitting the service by which they earned 'settlement' and their being examined as lunatics, calculated from the twenty-nine cases in which the figure is available, is twelve months. Some of the servants became insane long after they quitted service, and some probably supported themselves by short service at other places or by other means.

It is reasonable to assume that fired lunatic servants did not become instantly chargeable to the parish. Being temporarily out of service was a part of life for domestic servants in eighteenth-century London, and they were often at pains to furnish themselves with a certain degree of 'cushion' for the time of unemployment.⁶⁷ Since the average wage of the twenty-seven lunatic servants whose wages are known is about £8, perhaps they could live for a short period on their savings after their dismissal.⁶⁸ Some fortunate lunatics could probably go on depending on the hospitality of their relatives, friends, and fellow servants. In 1777, Mary Smythee, a servant to 'Messr. Cox and Biddulph, bankers', stated that Elizabeth Smythee, her former fellow servant and probably a relative, quitted after four years' service. At the time of her examination, ten weeks after her losing the job, Elizabeth still resided at her former master's place, probably with the help of Mary.⁶⁹

When servants became insane during their term of contract, their masters sometimes assumed responsibility for looking after them. In Hertford in 1662, Anthony Grey was ordered by the Quarter Sessions Court to keep Jeremiah Grey, his servant who had become insane, during the contractual term. When the contract expired, the servant was removed to his father's.⁷⁰ A similar example is found in my sample. In January 1760, Sarah Masterman, the wife of William Masterman, a cabinet maker, stated that Mary Masterman was a lunatic and 'was a yearly hired servant to the said Mr Masterman in Old Round Court for the space of two years at the wages of fifty shillings diet and lodging', and 'that she hath not quitted the said service'. In February, Mary was brought to the parish workhouse as a lunatic, but on the same day 'taken out by her mistress'. In the end, however, the Mastermans gave up looking after Mary and committed her to the workhouse five months later.⁷¹

The responsibility of masters during the term of contract was, however, not universally enforced. Mary Masterman bore the same family name as her master and was probably a relative, which almost certainly affected this rather rare display of care by a master. Martha and Robert Ashton, the mistress and master of Mary Desborough, were not as generous. Mary Desborough was committed to the workhouse as a lunatic on 3 November 1766. Next day, Martha testified that Mary 'hath been a yearly hired servant to this examinant . . . and continues with this examinant'. Yet there is nothing to indicate that the Ashtons paid for the maintenance of Mary either in the workhouse or at the private madhouse Mary was sent to in June next year.⁷²

Reflecting the fact that domestic service attracted a lot of young immigrants to London, some servants in my sample came from the countryside.⁷³ Elizabeth Davis was a classic example of the tragedy of a poor country girl coming up to the town. She came to London from Shropshire when she was only 7 years old. She earned her 'settlement' by serving one Mr Snow in St Martin's for three years, which she left when she was about 21 years old. While she was subsequently serving one Mr Suage, a harpsichord maker, Hugh Mahoon, a journeyman lodging at Mr Suage's, 'had carnal knowledge of her body', and in 1735 she was brought to the workhouse pregnant with an illegitimate child of his. On the next occasion that she was brought to the workhouse, in 1737, she was found to be a lunatic and spent a good part of the following few

years in the workhouse and the madhouse.⁷⁴ Sarah Humphreys is another example of an immigrant who became insane in London. She was born at Bridgwater in Somerset, and came to London in 1739 when she was 22 years old. She became a servant to Mrs Pembroke, an upholsterer, 'at the yearly wages of £3, diet, washing, and lodging'. She quitted the place around March 1741, after about a year's service. Half a year later, she was homeless ('hath no lodging') and was put into the parish workhouse. She left the workhouse, only to be readmitted a year later in September 1742. Three months later she was found so insane that she was sent to the private madhouse.⁷⁵ Although we do not know when her mental illness actually started, it seems likely that it was around the time of her losing her job and that it became worse during the period of unemployment and homelessness, the pattern we find quite often today.

The lunatic ex-servants who dominated my sample were, therefore, a part of the larger shift in demographic patterns and household structure in London in the eighteenth century.⁷⁶ London continued to grow in its population thanks to immigration, although the pace of growth became slower than in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The demand for domestic servants increased, for the upper and middle classes were employing a larger number of them for the purposes of making an ostentatious display on the street and of freeing the masters and especially mistresses from menial chores at home. Attracted by high wages, better living conditions, and the excitements of London, a large number of young men and a larger number of young women came to London to be domestic servants. Domestic service also provided a way to earn one's living for London-born people with limited resources. The demand for servants was high, the wages became higher, and, generally speaking, it was a good period for servants.

This large influx of servants into London households meant that there emerged a vulnerable sector in the primary locus of care of lunatics in the early modern period. The households to which the servants belonged offered very little protection when they became insane. Servants' membership of their respective households was directly dependent on their ability to work: when they became insane and unproductive, lunatic servants could not expect from the household the same extent of protection, care, and tolerance as was received by the members of the nuclear

family, or, perhaps, even those of the extended kin. That their wages often included 'diet and lodging' made the situation worse: they lost accommodation at the very moment they were fired.⁷⁷

From the viewpoint of the care of the insane, therefore, there was an inherent fragility in household structure in eighteenth-century London. Moreover, under the 1697 amendment of the law relating to 'settlement', the burden of taking care of this fragile population was put upon the shoulders of London parishes if 'settlement' had been earned by a year's service. This sector turned out to be by far the largest group in the lunatic population which the parish of St Martin's had to look after or cope with. Although one must guard against adopting the naive functionalist view of the 'spontaneous generation' of institutional provision for lunatics, I would like tentatively to suggest that a constant flow of lunatic servants was vital for the rise and growth of private madhouses in eighteenth-century London.

IV

Our present knowledge about the extent of the care of lunatics in extra-institutional and domestic settings is still limited, and we are not in a position to assess the role played in the rise of the asylum by changes affecting the household. A few things which deserve more careful attention, however, have emerged from the analysis above. Firstly, social structure, the rules of household formation, and the private ethos generated by these factors, greatly affected the extent of the private care of lunatics and the pattern of public care. Here, the pattern of care for lunatics in an early modern Japanese village provides a dramatic contrast. There, parents and children, extended kin group, and neighbours were expected to involve themselves in the care and management of lunatics to a much greater extent than were eighteenth-century Londoners. When a lunatic son escaped from his father's house to kill two villagers and himself, the father was punished severely for the neglect of his duty: half of the father's property was confiscated and he was expelled from the village.⁷⁸ Our understanding of the private provision for lunatics in England will benefit greatly from comparison with that in a society with a different social structure and rules of household formation.

Secondly, the capacity of a household to contain its lunatic members varied greatly because of various factors. Its financial

situation, the stage in the life-cycle of its breadwinners and dependants, its emotional solidarity, and the structure of its membership, all affected the extent and the limit of the private and domestic resources available to its lunatic member. Another apparently important factor which does not appear in my sources is the way people utilized their domestic living space: whether the family could afford a separate room for its insane member, in which part of the house it kept the lunatic, and so on. These variables were crucial in turning a private problem into a public one, in bringing a lunatic 'hidden' in his or her own household to the notice of public providers of care and control. Further investigation into these issues will prove to be fruitful for our understanding of the rise of asylum in the late eighteenth century.

Thirdly, the problem of lunatic servants demands further attention. My research supports, although in an oblique way, Andrew Scull's thesis that the coming of a full capitalist market economy and 'commercialization of existence' prompted family and society to expel its insane and unproductive members eventually into asylums.⁷⁹ Servants' subsistence was directly dependent on the sale of their labour, and their position in their masters' households was a product of contract rather than custom in a Weberian sense. The cases from St Martin-in-the-Fields seem to indicate that the increase in demand for the public care of the insane in the eighteenth century was partly due to the growth of a vulnerable sector in the household, dictated by the logic of the contractual labour market.

NOTES

- 1 The research on which this paper was based was funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. My thanks go to JSPS. I am grateful to Jonathan Andrews and Roy Porter for their insightful suggestions on an earlier draft. The staff of the City of Westminster Archive have been extremely generous in their help.
- 2 The best survey of literature on the rise of asylum is R. Porter, 'Madness and its Institutions', in A. Wear (ed.), *Medicine in Society: Historical Essays* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 277-301.
- 3 M. Foucault, *Histoire de la Folie à l'Age Classique* (2nd edn, Paris, 1972).
- 4 To mention only a few, A. Digby, *Madness, Morality and Medicine: A Study of the York Retreat, 1796-1914* (Cambridge, 1985); J. Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited: a History of Bethlem Hospital c. 1634-c. 1770', Ph.D. thesis (London, 1991); C. Mackenzie, *Psychiatry for the Rich: a History of Ticehurst Private Asylum* (London, 1992).

- 5 A. Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions: Madness and Society in Britain, 1700–1900* (New Haven, CT, and London 1993); J. Goldstein, *Console and Classify: the French Psychiatric Profession in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1987).
- 6 M. MacDonald, *Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1981); and R. Porter, *Mind-Forg'd Manacles: a History of Madness in England from the Restoration to the Regency* (London, 1987).
- 7 A. Fessler, 'The Management of Lunacy in Seventeenth-Century England: an Investigation of Quarter-Sessions Records', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 49 (1956), pp. 901–7; P. Rushton, 'Lunatics and Idiots: Mental Disability, the Community and the Poor Law in North-East England 1600–1800', *Medical History* 24 (1980), pp. 34–50; J. Andrews, "'Mad and Poor, and Cannot Be Otherwise Provided For": Lunacy, Bedlam, and the Old Poor Law' (unpublished paper); A. Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England: Analysis of Quarter Sessions Records', parts I and II, *History of Psychiatry* 2 (1991), pp. 437–56, and 3 (1992), pp. 29–44. See also an account of wandering lunatics in N. Hattori, 'The Pleasure of Your Bedlam: the Theatre of Madness in the Renaissance', *History of Psychiatry* 6 (1995), pp. 283–308.
- 8 Rushton, 'Lunatics and Idiots', p. 40; Andrews, "'Mad and Poor"'; Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England', part I, pp. 440–51.
- 9 For recent directions in the study of early modern poverty, see R. Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1994); S. Woolf, *The Poor in Western Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* (London and New York, 1986), pp. 1–46.
- 10 City of Westminster Library (hereafter WCL), MSS records of the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, 'Examination Books', F5027–F5067 (1 Aug. 1734–23 Mar. 1782); Workhouse 'Day Books', F4003–F4016 (3 Oct. 1737–15 July 1784).
- 11 Middlesex Sessions Books (hereafter MXSB) from 1638–1751 are available in typescript at the Greater London Record Office (hereafter GLRO). For the social historical background of eighteenth-century London, I have benefited from D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (Harmondsworth, 1966); P. Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660–1730* (London, 1989), and *A City Full of People: Men and Women of London 1650–1750* (London, 1994).
- 12 W. Parry-Jones, *The Trade in Lunacy* (London, 1972); Porter, *Mind-Forg'd Manacles*, p. 141; Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited', pp. 418–9.
- 13 Andrews, "'Mad and Poor"'; Parry-Jones, *The Trade in Lunacy*, pp. 8–9.
- 14 Private madhouses seem to have functioned as supplementary to Bethlem and St Luke's, used both before committal to the public hospitals and after discharge from them. See Frances Lewin's case (WCL F4004, 27 Nov. 1742 and 1 Jan. 1743) and E. Cornman (F4004, p. 556).
- 15 From the earliest extant Workhouse 'Day Book' from October 1737,

- the parish sent its lunatics to 'Dr Wright's', and later to 'Mrs Wright's'. In 1755, the term 'Mr Cope' first appeared (WCL F4008, 9 Aug. 1755). In December 1777, churchwardens and overseers ordered the removal of 'the lunatics now at Mr Cope's . . . to Mr Harrison's at Hoxton' (WCL F2225, p. 70). Alexander Cruden was confined in Wright's madhouse. See A. Cruden, *Mr Cruden Greatly Injured* (London, 1739), pp. 2, 32.
- 16 For some examples of the lunatics who were sent directly to the private houses, see WCL F2225, pp. 39, 58, and 95. The important role of nineteenth-century workhouses in the care of pauper lunatics is discussed in P. Bartlett, 'The Poor Law of Lunacy: the Administration of Pauper Lunatics in Mid-Nineteenth Century England with Special Emphasis on Leicestershire and Rutland', Ph.D. thesis (London, 1993). For workhouses in the eighteenth century, see T. Hitchcock, 'Paupers and Preachers: the SPCK and the Parochial Workhouse Movement', in L. Davison, T. Hitchcock, T. Keirn and R. B. Shoemaker (eds), *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: the Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689–1750* (Stroud, 1992), pp. 145–66; S. Macfarlane, 'Social Policy and the Poor in the Later Seventeenth Century', in A. L. Beier and R. Finlay (eds), *London 1500–1700: the Making of the Metropolis* (London, 1986), pp. 252–77.
 - 17 WCL F4004, pp. 554–6, 'Lunatics at Mrs Wrights', listed twenty-nine lunatics, nine of whose entries said that they had been discharged or had died.
 - 18 Porter, *Mind-Forg'd Manacles*, p. 141. In the parish of the Liberty of the Roll, there were several lunatics kept in the private madhouses at Kentish Town, Islington, and Bethnal Green, as well as Bethlem, St Luke's, and the parish workhouse. See WCL K346, Sept. 1799, Oct. 1799, Nov. 1801.
 - 19 Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions*, pp. 26–34; Porter, 'Madness and its Institutions', pp. 287–8.
 - 20 R. Porter, *The Social History of Madness* (London, 1987); M. MacDonald, 'Lunatics and the State in Georgian England', *Social History of Medicine* 2 (1989), pp. 299–313.
 - 21 E. H. Bates (ed.), *Quarter Sessions Records for the County of Somerset, 1607–1677*, Somerset Records Society 23–6, 4 vols (London, 1907–12), vol. 2, p. 46.
 - 22 H. Hampton Copnall (ed.), *Notes and Extracts from the Nottinghamshire County Records of the Seventeenth Century*, Nottinghamshire County Records Committee (Nottingham, 1915), p. 122.
 - 23 Out-and-out solitaries were, however, a minority among the 'single' lunatics. William Schwanberg was the only exception. According to his doctor Robert James (of powder and *Dictionary* fame), 'he is a foreigner . . . never gained any settlement in England neither has he any friends or relations or any goods, chattels or effects in England'. WCL F5036, p. 104; F4004, p. 554. Alexander Cruden, too, was a Scot immigrant with no immediate family in London. See Porter, *Social History of Madness*, pp. 126–35.
 - 24 Recent studies of early modern marriage have been surveyed and

- synthesized in K. Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London, 1982), pp. 94-104; R. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London, 1984), pp. 63-126.
- 25 GLRO MXSB, book 173.
 - 26 Ann Metzger was accompanied with her husband at the time of her first examination, but deserted when examined for the second time.
 - 27 WCL F5038, p. 255; F5042, p. 321; F4004, p. 556; F4005, 21 Oct. 1746.
 - 28 WCL F5031, pp. 224, 229. It was often difficult to extract necessary and correct information about lunatics' 'settlement' from their own testimony. Frequently, a person who knew the lunatic in question well was called in. See also Andrews 'Bedlam Revisited', p. 434.
 - 29 V. Brodsky, 'Widows in Late Elizabethan London: Remarriage, Economic Opportunity and Family Orientations', in L. Bonfield, R. M. Smith, and K. Wrightson (eds), *The World We Have Gained: Histories of Population and Social Structure* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 122-54; Earle, *A City Full of People*, pp. 164-5.
 - 30 Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England', part I, pp. 440-4.
 - 31 The strategic use of elite ideology by the poor is discussed in S. Woolf, 'Introduction', in Woolf (ed.), *Domestic Strategies: Work and Family in France and Italy 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 1-19.
 - 32 WCL F4005, 6 June 1746; F4010, 3 and 27 June 1763.
 - 33 Earle, *A City Full of People*, pp. 113-23.
 - 34 M. Whitaker, WCL F5034, p. 103; F4003, pp. 520, 525; F4008, pp. 109, 113; Mary Combe, F5035, p. 208; Susanna French, F5032, pp. 258-9.
 - 35 WCL F5040, p. 47.
 - 36 GLRO MXSB, books 148 and 149.
 - 37 Andrews, "Mad and Poor".
 - 38 John Page, WCL F5031, p. 92, F4003, 16 June 1739 WH lun (30); Thomas Baker, F5054, p. 294, F4010, 10 and 11 Oct. 1765; Grace Cooke and Christian Conner, see nn. 40-1 below.
 - 39 WCL F4003, 22 July and 1 Oct. 1739; F4008, 2 June and 17 July 1753; F4008, 19 and 26 Feb. 1754; F4009, 11 Oct. and 23 Dec. 1759, and 1 Aug. 1760.
 - 40 WCL F5049, p. 334; F4008, 17 and 18 May 1758.
 - 41 WCL F5037, p. 38; F4004, 24 Sept. and 4 Oct. 1745 and p. 554. This example might suggest that recourse to institutional means was temporary and a part of the economy of makeshift for a poor family to cope with its insane member. Among the eleven parish lunatics from St Clement Danes, kept at Harrison's at Hoxton in August 1788, four were 'brought home' in a year and a half. See WCL B1248, Overseers' Order Book, 5 Aug. 1788 and Jan. 1790. For the priority given by Bethlem to 'ungovernable' lunatics, see Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited', pp. 455-7.
 - 42 The father of Mary Jones had failed in his business and ran away to Birmingham, leaving his daughter reduced to 'living by selling greens and fruit about the street'. Five years after, she was admitted to the workhouse as a lunatic. WCL F5033, p. 252; F4005, 11 Sept. and 6 Oct. 1746.

- 43 GLRO MXSB, book 777. Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England', part I, pp. 446-7. For a similar example of domestic long-term care of a lunatic son, which was terminated by the death of the mother, see Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited', p. 433, n. 80.
- 44 GLRO MXSB, book 158. See also the examination of Barnard Page over the 'settlement' of John Page, his lunatic son, with John's wife and two young children in WCL F5031, p. 92; F4003, 16 June 1739.
- 45 WCL F5064, p. 427; F4014, 7 and 11 Feb. 1778 and 20 Mar. 1779.
- 46 WCL F5035, p. 296. See also the cases of Hannah Poole, the daughter of Timothy Poole, in WCL F5028, p. 316.
- 47 Caroline Sechuson (29), WCL F5052, p. 345; F4010, 1 and 3 Mar. 1763; Ann Summers (16); Anne Dean (31).
- 48 WCL F5052, p. 203; F4010, 6 July 1762, 24 Aug. 1765.
- 49 WCL F5059, pp. 170-1.
- 50 Mary Whitaker (38), with a daughter Rebecca (17) then living at Bath, WCL F5034, p. 103; F4003, 24 Nov. 1741, 5 Dec. 1742; F4008, 12, 17 Mar. and 5 Apr. 1754; Thomas Holden (59) and his daughter Sarah Holden, F5050, p. 289; Jerom Johnson; John Eterneau; Ann Hedges. See, however, an affectionate concern expressed for his lunatic mother by a son, quoted in Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited', p. 552.
- 51 WCL F5053, p. 403; F4010, 15 and 24 Nov. 1764.
- 52 WCL F5061, p. 430. James Hedges, a tin plate worker, also removed his mother Ann Hedges to the place of her own 'settlement', which she earned by renting a house of £14 p.a. (WCL F5056, p. 384).
- 53 Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England', part I, pp. 448-9; *The Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* 5 (1879), pp. 403-4.
- 54 WCL F5047, p. 166; F5049, p. 110. See also the example of Mrs Newby, matron of the lying-in hospital in London, who paid 4s. per week for keeping her sister at a private madhouse at Hoxton. WCL E981.
- 55 WCL F5029, p. 194; F5035, p. 407; F4004, 14 Jan. 1744.
- 56 For a general discussion of nuclear hardship, see P. Laslett, 'Family, Kinship and Collectivity as Systems of Support in Pre-industrial Europe: a Consideration of the "Nuclear-Hardship" Hypothesis', *Continuity and Change* 3 (1988), pp. 153-75; also P. Horden, S. Cavallo, this volume.
- 57 My research does not confirm John Walton's model of workplace-centred community solidarity as a significant resource for a lunatic to rely on. J. K. Walton, 'Lunacy in the Industrial Revolution: a Study of Asylum Admissions in Lancashire, 1845-50', *Journal of Social History* 13 (1979), pp. 1-21.
- 58 WCL F5055, p. 166. Likewise, Francis Pope was caught by a constable at four or five o'clock in the morning when wandering in lunacy. Next day, his brother-in-law took him out of custody (WCL F4004, 3 Oct. 1742).
- 59 P. Laslett, *The World We Have Lost - Further Explored* (London, 1983), pp. 1-8.

- 60 With the exception of Arthur Parry, who was reduced to being a workhouse inmate from having been a 'servant' in the capacity of clerk in the City with the handsome wage of £100 p.a. (WCL F5063, p. 331; F4013, 20 and 30 Sept. 1776), all of them were domestic servants. Besides these domestic servants, there are fourteen lunatics who were journeymen, twelve males, and two females. In Andrews' sample of 251 lunatics admitted to Bethlem (1694-1718), only three were servants. Andrews, 'Bedlam Revisited', pp. 523-4.
- 61 Earle, *A City Full of People*, p. 82.
- 62 G. W. Oxley, *Poor Relief in England and Wales 1601-1834* (North Pomfret, VT, 1974), pp. 20-1; P. Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1988), pp. 194-5.
- 63 Mary Combe, WCL F5035, p. 208; Elizabeth Orme, F5042, p. 9; Mary Needham, F5053, p. 25; John Bryant, F5058, p. 373; George Jennings, F5059, p. 8; John Porter, F5059, p. 119.
- 64 WCL F5040, p. 289; F5047, p. 166; F5050, p. 450; E3234, p. 58; F5054, p. 222. There are in total eighteen servants whose masters' 'middle-class' businesses are known. The rest are: a distiller (F5040, p. 431), a grocer (F5037, p. 214), a stationer (F5032, p. 158), a glover (F5055, p. 255), a carpenter (F5030, p. 136), a piece broker (F5040, p. 381), a banker (F5064, p. 199), a paviour (F5035, p. 420), an attorney (F5043, p. 332), a cook (F5047, p. 226), a wineman (F5047, p. 108), a pewterer (B1179, p. 228), a painter (F5054, p. 211).
- 65 Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class*, pp. 213-29. For committal of domestic servants by their masters in France, see Y. Ripa, *Women and Madness: the Incarceration of Women in Nineteenth-Century France* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 55-6.
- 66 WCL F5042, p. 10.
- 67 J. J. Hecht, *The Domestic Servant Class in Eighteenth-Century England* (London, 1956), pp. 81-7; Earle, *A City Full of People*, pp. 128-9.
- 68 The median figure is £5, the average being pushed higher by the exceptional wage of 50 guineas earned by John Porter, a servant to the Duke of Argyle.
- 69 WCL F5064, p. 199; F4014, 29 Aug. 1777, 27 Sept. 1777 and 8 Oct. 1778.
- 70 W. J. Hardy (ed.), *Notes and Extracts from the Sessions Rolls 1581-1690*, Hertford County Records Society, 3 vols (Hertford: 1905), vol. 3, pp. 61-2; Suzuki, 'Lunacy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century England', part I, pp. 450-1.
- 71 WCL F5050, p. 450; F4009, 8 Feb. and 18 July 1760.
- 72 WCL F5055, p. 255; F4011, 3 Nov. 1766, 19 June 1767.
- 73 The records include information on the birthplace of an ex-aminant only when he or she had earned 'settlement'.
- 74 WCL F5027, p. 335; F4003, 10 Dec. 1737, 16 June 1738, 12 Mar. 1739 and 1 Jan. 1740.
- 75 WCL E3234, p. 58; F5034, p. 7; F4004, 3 Sept. and 1 Dec. 1742. See also the case of Margaret Griffith, who came from Chester, in F5037, p. 214; F4004, p. 554; and that of Christian Cruckshank, an immigrant from Scotland, in F5030, p. 276; F4003 7 Dec. 1738, 20 Feb. 1739, etc.

- 76 See Hecht, *The Domestic Servant Class*; Earle, *The Making of English Middle Class*, pp. 218-29; Earle, *A City Full of People*, pp. 38-54, 123-30. For London's place in this period, see E. A. Wrigley, 'A Simple Model of London's Importance in Changing English Society and Economy 1650-1750', *Past and Present* 37 (1967), pp. 44-70.
- 77 There is no servant in my sample who received 'board wage'.
- 78 My account here is dependent on Genshiro Hiruta, *Hayari-yamai to kitsune-tsuki [Epidemics and Fox-Possession]* (Tokyo, 1985), a fascinating study of popular medical belief and practice in a village in early modern Japan.
- 79 Scull, *The Most Solitary of Afflictions*, p. 29.