

Jo Spaans

EARLY MODERN ORPHANAGES BETWEEN CIVIC PRIDE AND SOCIAL DISCIPLINE: FRANCKE'S USE OF DUTCH MODELS

(Udo Sträter und Josef N. Neumann, *Waisenhäuser in der Frühen Neuzeit*, [Hallesche Forschungen 10], Tübingen 2003, 183-196)

The Orphanage of Halle was an institution that had no match in early modern Europe. It was by no means an ordinary orphanage, but rather a powerhouse of the pietist movement. Missions both on the Continent and abroad were supported by the resources generated by the very modern mass-propaganda Francke launched around the successes of his charitable foundation, by its printing press and its patent-medicine production. Through its Bible institute and its schools the orphanage was a machine for the world-wide propagation of the distinct faith of the German pietists, and, as a modern British scholar has argued, also for the support of Prussian international policies, aimed at the weakening of the Catholic powers in Central Europe.¹ Tradition has it that Francke took his inspiration for the Halle Orphanage from the Dutch Republic. This paper will try to answer the question which elements in the Dutch welfare system, especially in its orphanages, particularly appealed to Francke, and how he applied them in his own foundations.

Two of Francke's associates, Johann Overbeck and Georg Heinrich Neubauer, travelled through the Dutch Republic in the years just preceding the founding of the Halle orphanage. They were especially interested in the financial basis of Dutch orphanages.² Finances were of the utmost importance in founding and running an orphanage, or any charitable institution destined for young children. Raising children was expensive. It has been convincingly argued that children were a heavy burden to poor couples, and that even two or three children might be too many to support.³ Orphans and deserted children were the most expensive category of poor supported by early modern welfare-systems. Widows, the aged, the physically disabled and families overburdened with children could be adequately supported by relatively small doles, that supplemented what they themselves could scrape together. Orphans, unless they

¹ W.R. Ward: *The Protestant evangelical awakening*. Cambridge 1992, 61-63, cf. his 'Piety and power. The Origins of Religious Revival in the Early Eighteenth Century'. In: *Faith and Faction*. Ed. by W.R. Ward. London 1993, 75-93 (earlier in: *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 63 (1980) 231-252).

² Wolf Oschlies: *Die Arbeits- und Berufspädagogik August Hermann Franckes (1663-1727). Schule und Leben im Menschenbild des Hauptvertreters des Halleschen Pietismus*. Witten 1969, 18-19, n. 3, 21; Ernst Bartz: *Die Wirtschaftsethik August Hermann Franckes*. Harburg-Wilhelmsburg 1934, 83-95. I owe this reference to Fred van Lieburg.

³ Tim Wales: 'Poverty, poor relief and the life-cycle: some evidence from seventeenth-century Norfolk'. In: *Land, Kinship and Life-cycle*. Ed. by Richard M. Smith. Cambridge 1984, 365; Hugh Cunningham: 'Children, philanthropy and the State in Europe, 1500-1860'. In: *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500*. Ed. by Hugh Cunningham. London and New York 1995, 111-112.

inherited a considerable fortune from their parents, depended on welfare, for their keep and for the basic education and vocational training they needed to become self-supporting adults. Until they had learned a trade or could be put into service they were unable to contribute to their own support.

Orphanages offered the best guarantees that orphans would be decently raised and would receive an adequate education. These guarantees however came at a price, and it is only under rather specific circumstances that governments, churches or private benefactors in the early modern period were prepared to set up an orphanage. In this article I will construct two such moments, embedded in more general waves of institutionalization of poor relief. These two waves occurred in the sixteenth and the second half of the seventeenth century respectively. I will paint on a broad canvas, with the bold stroke of generalization, but eventually this will lead back to the inspiration Francke may have taken from Dutch orphanages.

Sixteenth century reforms

Around the middle of the sixteenth century, begging and almsgiving were being suppressed by governments all over western Europe. Systems of public relief were being put into effect. They benefited the local, settled poor, and were meant to prevent them from taking to the roads in search of work or charity. Wandering, even if with the most honest of intentions, was supposed to degrade the poor into a life of begging and vagrancy, and eventually into crime. Humanist authors discussed the Christian values inherent in these measures, but the decisive factor in these new schemes was the wish of governments, local and supralocal, to preserve public order.⁴ Reorganizations of poor relief — by forming a common fund or common chest from which the local poor were supported in their homes according to their specific needs, usually in the form of a supplement to what they could earn themselves — are visible all over Western Europe, with wide local variations in organization and chronology.⁵

The humanist rethoric surrounding these reforms had something to say about children too. It strongly advocated that poor children should be given basic education in reading and writing, and that they should be taught a trade or put into a service. Poor children should not grow up as begging street-urchins and eventually join the vagrant poor, which the new measures sought to suppress. Juan Luis Vives advocated providing poor children with the opportunity to attend elementary school and vocational training in some sort of boarding-school system. Indeed in the Southern Low Countries schools for poor children were instituted by several city magistrates, and the Paris Parlement in 1545 founded the Hôpital de la Trinité to educate poor

⁴ Historiography has focused mainly on the local nature of these reforms. The importance of ‘national’ legislation can be gleaned from the list given in Robert Jütte: *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge 1994, 201-203.

⁵ General overviews in Bronislaw Geremek: *Poverty, a history*. Oxford 1994, 120-177; Jütte [see note 4], 100-142; Catharina Lis and Hugo Soly: *Poverty and Capitalism in pre-industrial Europe*. Atlantic Highlands 1979, 82-96; Karl H. Metz: ‘Staatsraison und Menschenfreundlichkeit. Formen und Wandlungen der Armenpflege im Ancien Regime Frankreichs, Deutschlands und Grossbritanniens’, in: *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 72 (1985) 1-26.

children.⁶ It is also from this humanistic inspiration that orphans in this period were for the first time admitted into orphanages that were especially designed to provide them with everything they needed to grow up, learn a trade and become economically self-sufficient adults.

Sixteenth-century orphanages differed on exactly this point from the institutions for children that emerged in the later Middle Ages. Foundling homes, which were most common in Southern European cities, provided their little charges with baptism and nursing care during infancy, but settled the children in adoptive families as soon as possible. Education, vocational training and, for girls, arranging a marriage and providing a dowry, then became the responsibility of the adoptive parents. The foundling home merely supervised all this to some extent. As a rule the children were supposed to work for their keep in their new homes.⁷ Another late medieval institution for the benefit of poor children, was the foundation to enable children to learn a trade. Sometimes these children lived together in a home, but it was not unusual that they had to beg for their keep. These colleges or orphanages could be found in England, Germany and Spain. They were not specifically meant for orphans, and besides catered only to boys.⁸ These colleges thus appear to be a parallel to the charitable dowry-funds for girls: both types of foundation were meant to give poor children a start in life. Orphanages founded in the sixteenth century, informed by humanist aspirations, expressly set themselves the task of making orphaned children, boys and girls, economically self-sufficient. They bore the cost of feeding, clothing and teaching them out of their own funds and charitable gifts, working on the assumption that until they were ready to leave the orphanage and enter the labor market, they could only marginally contribute to their own support.

In most countries however, in the sixteenth century, these orphanages appear to have been few and far between. Hardly any mention is made of orphanages in the recent spate of studies on the history of early modern welfare. This makes a comparative approach hazardous, and its results slightly tentative. Lyon had two orphanages, one for girls and one for boys, which were opened in 1534 as part of a general, humanist-inspired reform of the urban welfare system.⁹ In Paris and London royal orphanages

⁶ Hans Scherpner: *Geschichte der Jugendfürsorge*. Göttingen 1979, 33-39; Johan Decavele: *De dageraad van de Reformatie in Vlaanderen (1520-1565)*. Brussel 1975, 137-139; H. Heller: *Labour, Science and Technology in France 1500-1620*. Cambridge 1996, 39-41.

⁷ John Boswell: *The Kindness of Strangers. The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*. New York 1990, 415-427; Ulrich Eisenbach: *Zuchthäuser, Armenanstalten und Waisenhäuser in Nassau*. Wiesbaden 1994, 133; Philip Gavitt: *Charity and Children in Renaissance Florence. The Ospedale degli Innocenti, 1410-1536*. Ann Arbor 1990, 187-190, 243-259; Isabel dos Guimarães Sá: 'Child abandonment in Portugal: legislation and institutional care'. In: *Continuity and Change* 9 (1994) 69-90, p. 72, 77-78, 83-84. In the seventeenth century foundling homes seem to have started to supply their charges with education and vocational training themselves, Brian Pullan: *Orphans and Foundlings in Early Modern Europe*. Reading 1989, 13-14 appears to refer to this later situation.

⁸ Scherpner [see note 6], 16-26; on the Spanish Collegios de los Niños de la Doctrina Linda Martz: *Poverty and Welfare in Habsburg Spain. The Example of Toledo*. Cambridge 1983, 222-223.

⁹ Natalie Zemon Davis: 'Poor Relief, Humanism and Heresy. The Case of Lyon'. In: *Society and Culture in Sixteenth-Century France*. Ed. by Natalie Zemon Davis. London 1975, 17-64, 42-43; Jean

were founded, in 1536 and 1552 respectively. These seem to have been mainly prestige objects for the capitals. If they had been meant as an example to be followed by city magistrates around these countries they were a failure.¹⁰ In Venice one of the *scuole*, or fraternities, had an orphanage for children of deceased members, which inspired a private citizen to organize homes for orphans both in Venice and in neighboring Italian cities.¹¹ Germany had a few. Francke exaggerated when he said he had to go abroad to find a model for his orphanage. Strassbourg and München had late-medieval orphanages, Lübeck, Speyer, Würzburg, Münster and Hamburg founded orphanages in the sixteenth century, and the late-medieval foundlings-home of Cologne was converted into an orphanage in 1605. Besides, Francke must have known first-hand the house founded shortly before his own by Spener in Frankfurt. But on the whole, before the middle of the seventeenth century not many orphanages existed in the Empire.¹²

Most indigent orphans seem to have been fostered out to poor families by local welfare-officers. These foster-parents received regular handouts in money and in kind, both to support the foster-child and to supplement the family-income. When old enough the children were apprenticed or put into service. Sometimes orphans and other needy children were packed together in general hospitals that took in, cared for, disciplined and where needed resocialized the poor, the sick, the very old and the very young, beggars, drunkards, public nuisances and petty thieves. The Royal Orphanage in Copenhagen, founded 1621, within a short time reverted to the model of a general hospital for all these kinds of poor.¹³ The extra outlay needed to build and maintain an orphanage, with a paid staff and all that pertained to such an institution was only sporadically available.

The situation was very different in the Dutch Republic where Francke sent his associates to inquire after the organization of orphanages. The Dutch Republic was rich. In the second half of the seventeenth century it was at the high point of its

Pierre Gutton: *La société et les pauvres. L'Exemple de la généralité de Lyon, 1534-1789*. Paris 1971, 272, 277-278.

¹⁰ Carol Kazmierczak Manzione: *Christi's Hospital of London, 1552-1598. 'A Passing Deed of Piety'*. Selinsgrove and London 1995, on other English cities *ibid.* 35. The Parisian Maison des Enfants Rouges is mentioned in Michel Mollat: *The Poor in the Middle Ages. An Essay in Social History*. New Haven/London 1984, 288.

¹¹ Brian Pullan: *Rich and Poor in Renaissance Venice. The Social Institutions of a Catholic State, to 1620*. Oxford 1971, 259-261, 271-272, 278-279.

¹² Francke on general scarcity of orphanages: Oschlies [see note 2], 18, n. 3; list of known early German orphanages in Markus Meumann: *Findelkinder, Waisenhauser, Kindsmord. Unversorgte Kinder in der frühneuzeitlichen Gesellschaft*. Oldenburg 1995, 259; cf. for Würzburg also Heide Kallert: *Waisenhaus und Arbeitserziehung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt am Main 1964, 6-9; Hamburg followed Dutch examples: Scherpner [see note 6], 59; on Cologne: Robert Jütte: *Obrigkeitliche Armenfürsorge in deutschen Reichsstädten der frühen Neuzeit. Städtisches Armenwesen in Frankfurt am Main und Köln*. Cologne 1984, 269-275.

¹³ Medieval hospitals had all these functions, Jütte [see note 12], 19-22; Harald Jørgensen: 'L'assistance aux pauvres au Danemark jusqu'à la fin du XVIIIe siècle. In: *Aspects of Poverty in early Modern Europe, vol. III: La pauvreté dans les pays nordiques 1500-1800. Etudes d'histoire sociale*. Ed. by Thomas Riis. Odense 1990, 9-34, p. 17-18, 26.

Golden Age. It was highly urbanized and political power was strongly decentralized. Local municipal elites enjoyed far-reaching autonomy and wielded real political influence. This was the basis for strong local civic cultures. Around 1600 practically every Dutch city, many towns of regional importance and even occasional villages, boasted an orphanage.¹⁴ In most cases these were not meant for all local orphans. They were for children of citizen birth, they were ‘citizens orphanages’, in Dutch: *burgerweeshuizen*. They provided these children with the means to grow up and enter a profession compatible with their citizen status. Orphans of mere inhabitants of the town or city were not admitted, nor were those of illegitimate birth, foundlings or abandoned children, whose parents were absent or unknown, but presumably alive. Also excluded were children below schoolgoing age and the physically or intellectually disadvantaged. Although these were also considered wards of the city, and the wardens of the poor were their legal guardians, they were placed in foster-care with poor families. Even the eligible orphans of citizens were not always assured of admission. The orphanages generally took in only as many as they could properly support. Some of these *burgerweeshuizen* were heavily endowed by private donations, which came with the attached obligation that the donors and their descendants had the right to nominate one or more orphans of citizen birth in perpetuity. Citizens orphanages were thus exclusive in more than one sense.

These *burgerweeshuizen*, exclusive though they may have been, were considered civic institutions. Even if a private donor had taken the first initiative for the founding of the orphanage, the local magistrate was usually eager to join the enterprise. In a number of cases it can be assumed that in fact there was a joint initiative, between city fathers and a wealthy, childless benefactor. They were legal entities, and as such could acquire real estate and benefit from legacies. This legal status allowed orphanages to form a consolidated fund which provided them with dependable revenues. The magistrate would endow the new foundation with pieces of land, sources of income like the fines for certain misdemeanors, cuts from local excises and the right to hold an annual collection from door to door. They took upon them to protect and maintain the orphanage. For the local elite orphanages were an expression of civic pride. The group portraits of the boards of trustees, in Dutch *regenten* and *regentessen*, prominent citizens who directed the affairs of the orphanages, vividly evoke this sentiment. The buildings — private houses at first, which were enlarged and rebuilt in a more monumental style as time progressed— were often prominently positioned in a well-to do part of town and well-kept. The children were well-fed and well-dressed, in clothes made of good quality fabrics, and often in very conspicuous color-combinations that marked them as wards of the city. They were decently educated and disciplined. In a period in which the difference between honest, local poor who deserved to be supported by local welfare, and lazy vagrants, who owed their poverty to a dissolute lifestyle, was heavily stressed, the children in these orphanages were so presented as being the most worthy objects of charity.¹⁵

¹⁴ On the international fame accorded to the welfare institutions of the Dutch Republic Jonathan Israel: *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness and Fall 1477-1806*. Oxford 1995, 353-360.

¹⁵ Because there were so many Dutch orphanages there is an extensive literature on this subject, although often in a regrettably commemorative style. A general overview in J.L. van der Gouw: ‘Burgerweeshuizen’. In: *Historiunculæ* 10 (1965) 56-78. Some modern studies are: Anne E.C.

In the Dutch Republic a combination of favorable circumstances allowed the *burgerweeshuizen* to flourish. Wealth, political decentralization and strong civic cultures were prominent among these. Elsewhere conditions were less advantageous. The newly organized public welfare systems throughout Western Europe often simply could not afford orphanages. Fostering out was a cheaper solution. The existing sixteenth-century orphanages were either prestige-objects of princes or rather exclusive institutions accessible only to children who enjoyed considerable patronage. Catholic countries from the seventeenth century confraternities endowed and maintained homes for children, most often girls, of genteel families, to enable them to remain in their social class and find a suitable marriage. These fraternities were part of the Counter-reformation Catholic culture, in which well-to-do citizens and their wives engaged in charitable work as a form of asceticism. They were supposed to be closely involved in directing the affairs of their institutions and the personal well-being of the orphans. This was not taken so far as to admit children of the ragged poor: the orphans were carefully selected for their potential to become decent citizens.¹⁶ Those less connected were fostered out. In England an extra obstacle to the foundation of orphanages was the difficulty for charitable institutions to obtain recognition as a legal entity. This deprived English orphanages of the possibility to form a consolidated fund with a regular yield of revenue and made them entirely dependent on charity. In the long run this was fatal.¹⁷

The orphanage as an artificial family

Life in the Dutch *burgerweeshuizen* was organized on the model of the family.¹⁸ Upbringing and education of the children mirrored those of ordinary citizen's children. When young they went to school and had to help out around the house with household chores. Early sixteenth-century orphanages usually had some cows, pigs and chickens, a vegetable garden and fruit trees. Boys would help with the farm-work, girls with the house-keeping, cleaning and cooking, spinning and sewing. Later on the farms were replaced with bread-ovens and brewing kettles. The orphanages were thus to some extent self-supporting for foodstuffs and textiles. When the children were old enough, they were apprenticed to master artisans or put into service. Ordinary

McCants: *Civic charity in an golden age. Orphan care in early modern Amsterdam*. Urbana/Chicago 1997; *Wezen en boeffjes. Zes eeuwen zorg in wees- en kinderhuizen*. Ed by Simon Groenveld. Hilversum 1997; J.L. Kool- Blokland: *De zorg gewogen. Zeven eeuwen godshuizen in Middelburg*. Middelburg 1990, 385-500; O. Moorman van Kappen: *Tot behouf der arme wesen. Hoofdstukken uit de geschiedenis van het burger weeshuis te Harderwijk*. Zutphen 1981; Joke Spaans: *Armenzorg in Friesland. Publieke zorg en particuliere liefdadigheid in zes Friese steden*. Hilversum 1998, 164-195; G.N.M. Vis: *Het weeshuis van Woerden. 400 Jaar Stadsweeshuis en Gereformeerd Wees- en Oudeliedenhuis te Woerden, 1595-1995*. Hilversum 1996; J.P. Vredenberg: *Als off sij onse eigene kijnder weren. Het Burgerweeshuis te Arnhem, 1583-1742*. Arnhem 1983.

¹⁶ Sandra Cavallo: *Charity and Power in early modern Italy, Turin 1541-1789*. Cambridge 1995, 112-114; Kathryn Norberg: *Rich and poor in Grenoble, 1600-1814*. Berkeley 1985, 20-26; Brian Pullan [see note 11], 388-391.

¹⁷ Ruth K. McClure: *Coram's Children. The London Foundling Hospital in the Eighteenth Century*. New Haven and London 1981, 7-8, a royal charter was needed for establishment as a legal entity, *ibid.* 19-37.

¹⁸ See also the contribution of Fred van Lieburg to this volume.

children would have to pay tuition fees. Orphans did not, but often stayed apprenticed a few years longer than was strictly necessary. Their earnings in those extra years were shared between the master artisan and the orphanage. Children left the orphanage when they were fully grown-up, around 20 to 25 years of age. By that time they had learned a trade and acquired work experience. This, together with a set of clothes, the tools of their trade and some pocket money, made up the dowry with which the orphanage sent them out into the world.

The orphanage-household was led by a mother and a father. These were usually, but not necessarily, a married couple without children of their own, with the social background of petty officialdom or artisanry. Gender-roles between the mother and father seem to have mirrored those in ordinary families. The direction and administration of the orphanage as a legal entity and an economic unit was in the hands of patrician *regenten* and *regentessen*. The division of labor between *regenten* and *regentessen* was also determined by gender roles: the male regents were responsible for the accounts, the upkeep of the building, providing the house with foodstuffs, textiles and fuel bought in bulk, educational matters, discipline and the hiring of male personnel. Their female counterparts oversaw the upbringing of the children, everything concerning the production and care of textiles, the cleanliness of the house, the hiring of maids and the daily shopping and small expenses. The *regenten* and *regentessen* were the legal guardians of the orphans, and were also seen as fathers and mothers of the children, albeit in a more distant and authoritarian way than the father and mother who actually lived with them. Boards made up of male and female directors, which were characteristic for Dutch charitable institutions and enhanced their character of artificial families, seem to have been rather rare elsewhere.¹⁹

The *regenten* and *regentessen* were chosen from the civic elite. Theirs was an honorary office, but far from a sinecure. They were not compensated financially for the considerable amounts of time and energy they spent on the direction of the affairs of the orphanage. In this they resembled the members of the confraternities that organized orphanages in Catholic countries. Membership of an charity-board was part of the lifestyle of the urban elites. As a means to wield patronage it was financially attractive, but as important was the honor it conferred on *regenten* and *regentessen* personally and the heavenly rewards that charity promised. They were expected to provide for the children, the house and its funds as they would do for their own and often did. It can be shown that their concern for the children did not end at the moment they left the house. They used their social contacts to provide grown-up orphans with their first jobs. The institution often maintained a parental relation to its ex-pupils for life, supporting them in need.²⁰ In this the *regenten* and *regentessen* acted on behalf of the citizenry as a whole. The orphanage was to be a worthy object of civic pride, as well as a second home to the citizens' orphan children.

The second half of the seventeenth century

¹⁹ McClure [see note 17], 44-46.

²⁰ *Wezen en boeffjes* [see note 15], 242-245.

Most European societies in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century coped quite well without orphanages. This changed somewhat in the second half of the seventeenth century, when governments all over Europe threw their weight behind more serious measures against begging and vagabondage and towards further social discipline. Protestant countries renewed and expanded their laws and regulations binding the poor to a place where they had some entitlement to relief (settlement) to prevent them from roaming the country begging. Workhouses were set up to keep the local able-bodied poor from the streets. Children also were increasingly set to work, in workhouses or as apprentices, and a new emphasis was laid upon the necessity of elementary schooling. Catholic countries were for religious reasons unable to restrict the freedom of movement of the poor and to outlaw begging. They did however build beggars hospitals, where the wandering poor could find shelter, food and other forms of care. It was hoped that these would eliminate begging in the streets. This was the period which Foucault has characterized as that of the Great Confinement.²¹ Even if his suggestion of forcible confinement of the poor has to be rejected for the middle of the seventeenth century, because entering these beggars' hospitals was usually voluntary, it is a fact that magistrates all over Europe initiated or supported schemes to contain the poor in order to suppress begging and vagabondage.

Children were affected by these measures as well as adult poor. Even stronger than before, childhood came to be regarded as the formative period in a person's life. Children needed to acquire basic education, skills and discipline to grow into useful members of society. In the eyes of magistrates all over Europe, all this was severely neglected in the case of poor children. The only way the young children of the poor could realistically supplement the family income was by begging. Sending children out to beg at a young age was perceived as the high road to a life of begging and petty crime, just the things the new legislation was meant to suppress. Orphans and the children of the poor in general were in this period increasingly obliged to either attend school or to come to work in workhouses or beggars' hospitals.

This trend is very obvious in the Dutch Republic. From the middle of the seventeenth century a new type of orphanage appeared here, alongside the *burgerweeshuis*. This new type of orphanage was meant to take in all local orphans. Changing ideals of civic order lay at the root of this development. In this period many Dutch cities perceived an increase of begging in the streets. It is highly questionable whether this increase was real, as all over Europe in these years the ideals of social discipline were changing. The continuation of casual begging, notwithstanding official prohibitions that were everywhere regularly renewed, offended the sensibilities of the civic elites. Dutch magistrates adopted a two-pronged anti-beggary policy. The first element was the reorganization of pre-existing houses of correction, in Dutch *tuchthuizen*, into penal institutions for obstinate adult beggars and vagrants.²² Secondly, and especially

²¹ On beggars' hospitals as an alternative to tying the poor to a place of settlement: Linda Martz [see note 8], 7-33, 65-77; Michel Foucault: *Madness and civilization. A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York 1965, 38-64.

²² The first houses of correction, *tuchthuizen* or *Zuchthäuser*, built in the late 16th century, were part correctional facilities, part work-houses for the poor, later they often developed into more specifically penal institutions, A. Hallema: *Geschiedenis van het gevangeniswezen, hoofdzakelijk in Nederland*. 's-

relevant to the topic of this paper, they set up workplaces, which guaranteed work and income to those who begged out of necessity.

Although the regulations made around these workplaces were formulated in very general terms, in actual practice they were not meant for the poor, but rather for the children of the poor. Children were supposed to attend school for at least some basic training in reading and possibly writing. Any charitable relief to poor families was often given only on the condition that their children were sent to school. This basic training was considered indispensable for attaining economic self-sufficiency. Poor children in the age group ten to fourteen normally had finished the amount of schooling appropriate to their station in life, but they were too young to start serious vocational training or to get some regular paying job. In the eyes of magistrates they filled their time with mischief and begging, the latter probably condoned by their parents.²³ The workplaces were meant to keep them from the streets. Again welfare to poor families was made conditional, now on sending their children either to school or to these workplaces. The workplaces invariably set the children to spin wool, hemp or cotton for local textile manufacture. This goes to show that they were not intended to teach the children some marketable skill, but just to keep them occupied. Their earnings were often marginal, and parents seem to have sent them grudgingly, and only in order to qualify for regular poor relief.

All that is said here about the children of the poor equally applied to orphans who did not qualify for the disciplined environment of the *burgerweeshuizen*, but were put in foster care with poor families by the welfare officers. Around the middle of the seventeenth century magistrates and welfare officers grew increasingly critical about the treatment these children received. Foster-parents were perceived to cut short the schooling of their charges, using them as drudges or sending them out on the streets to beg. These fostered-out orphans were however not sent to the new workplaces. For them city magistrates and welfare officers had something else in store, presumably because they found that, as wards of the city, these orphans deserved a better treatment, one that was more in accord with the civic pride of their legal guardians themselves. In a number of towns magistrate and welfare officers started negotiations with the *burgerweeshuis* to get the orphans of non-citizen birth admitted there. Financial matters loomed large in these negotiations. For many *burgerweeshuizen* the propositions of the magistrate fell short on this point, and they retained their traditional exclusive form. Some however were willing to transform themselves from exclusive *burgerweeshuizen* into public orphanages, in which all and sundry could be admitted, always excepting those too young or the handicapped. What is important for now is that in the eyes of the urban elites in the Republic in the second half of the seventeenth century all local orphans, whether or not of citizen birth, were considered wards of the city, and thus eligible for maintainance, basic education and vocational training on a level that befitted local civic pride.²⁴

Gravenhage 1958, 147-170; Eisenbach [see note 7], 77-84; Hannes Stekl: *Österreichs Zucht- und Arbeitshäuser 1671-1920. Institutionen zwischen Fürsorge und Strafvollzug*. München 1978, 53-87.

²³ Hugh Cunningham: 'The employment and unemployment of children in England, c. 1680-1851'. In: *Past and Present* 126 (1990) 115-150.

²⁴ Spaans [see note 15], 335-347. I heavily rely here on my own research in Frisian towns, but the same pattern also applies to other parts of the country.

In those cities and towns where the *burgerweeshuis* was unwilling to take in all local orphans, a second, public orphanage was founded. The initiative was usually taken either by the civil magistrate, or the welfare officers of the Reformed Church, the so-called *diakenen*, or both in close cooperation. In these public orphanages all the local orphans were eligible, except those whose parents had belonged to one of the tolerated churches: Roman Catholic, Mennonite, Lutheran or Jewish. Those would still be fostered out among poor families of their own religion. In time these tolerated churches would build their own orphanages. In the eighteenth century it was not uncommon for larger cities to have a number of orphanages, each specifically destined for children of different civic and confessional backgrounds.²⁵ Not much is known of the conditions of life in the confessional orphanages. But most of the new public orphanages within a short time after their foundation housed many more children than the *burgerweeshuis* in the same locality. The public orphanages however, because they were new, did not have the kind of estate, in landed wealth and other regular sources of income, that the older *burgerweeshuizen* relied on. The cities usually accorded them a number of privileges, often even subsidies from the city treasury. Life in a public orphanage however always compared unfavorably with that in a *burgerweeshuis*. The children had to accept simpler clothing, coarser food, more crowded living conditions and stricter discipline.

Moreover in the larger public orphanages some kind of textile manufacture was introduced: spinning, knitting, lace-making and sewing, sometimes also weaving. As with the children of the poor generally, the orphans in the age group too old for school and too young to work were kept busy with work that demanded few specialized skills. The public orphanages were often simply too big to keep all the smaller children occupied with household chores. Unlike the workplaces for poor children however, the textile manufactures in the orphanages did teach some marketable skills, and often brought the house some much needed financial gain. Sometimes the young workforce of the public orphanage was more or less hired out to local manufacturers. In this way industries could be attracted to the city. City, manufacturers and orphanage all benefited from these arrangements. In the mean time the children were kept in good discipline. The textile manufacture was not their only preparation for adulthood: they too, like the orphans in the *burgerweeshuizen* were eventually apprenticed or put into service, as soon as they reached the appropriate age, in order to make them economically self-sufficient. They too left at the age of 20 to 25, and were supplied with a dowry. They also were seen as an artificial family, with the same internal organization and administrative structure as the *burgerweeshuizen*.

Although the public orphanages thus shared some of the characteristics of the workplaces for poor children, at the same time everything possible was done to approach the prestige the *burgerweeshuizen* enjoyed. The public orphanages needed

²⁵ Amsterdam at the end of the seventeenth century possessed a *burgerweeshuis* (1520), a public orphanage (*aalmoezeniersweeshuis*, 1666), and several confessional orphanages: Reformed (1657), two Roman Catholic, one for girls (1629, enlarged 1787) and one for boys (1672), one each for three different Mennonite communities (1672, 1675, 1677), Lutheran (1678), French Reformed (1631, enlarged 1669), English Presbyterian (1651), *Wezen en boefjes* [see note 15], 59-69. The Jewish communities of Amsterdam built orphanages in the first half of the 19th century, J.Th. Engels: *Kinderen van Amsterdam, Burgerweeshuis, Aalmoezeniersweeshuis, Diakonieweeshuis, Sociaal-Agogisch centrum*. Zwolle 1989, 52.

large buildings. They were often decorated on the outside in a style that imitated that of the *burgerweeshuizen* and thus unmistakably demonstrated that they too were civic charitable institutions, expressions of civic pride. They too had boards of *regenten* and *regentessen*, made up, not like those of the *burgerweeshuizen* of members of patrician families, but of those just below, mostly well-to-do master artisans. Theirs were positions of civic honor. Most of the public orphanages dressed their orphans in uniform clothing, sometimes in vivid colors, that contrasted sharply with the drab garb of the general poor and rivalled the uniforms of the *burgerwezen*. They were presented to the local population as eminently worthy recipients of charity. This method of advertizing the virtues of the orphans of the public orphanages paid off: public support tended to be generous.²⁶

This may well be the background of Francke's pointed interest in the Dutch orphanages. Elsewhere in Europe in this period orphans and other poor children were taken off the streets wholesale and subjected to some sort of disciplined life. In Southern European countries privileged orphans could be admitted in orphanages led by religious fraternities, but most of them ended up in general hospitals where they were housed, fed, clothed and put to work among the unemployed poor, vagrant beggars and sometimes also petty criminals. Zürich combined its orphanage with a workhouse for the poor. Under pietist influence Germany saw a number of orphanage foundations around 1700, some of which appear little different from these arrangements. Workhouses or *Zuchthäuser*, which could be part penal institutions, rather than orphanages or charitable boarding-schools were given the task of disciplining the children of the poor by inuring them to work from an early age, often together with adults.²⁷ Setting the poor and their children to work, as a means to keep them in discipline, according to their station in life, and to force them to earn their living with the work of their hands, rather than depend on charity, was to have the future. The Enlightened philanthropy of the eighteenth century would everywhere be based upon these principles.²⁸ Against Foucault it could be argued that the Great Confinement started only with Enlightened philanthropy.

Francke rejected this option. He went against the spirit of his age and introduced into his Orphanage some of the principles which underlay the organization of the Dutch orphanages, and contributed to their success. He founded an institution that was destined for children only, and in which they were decently housed, fed, dressed and educated. Discipline was kept by setting them to work, as befitted their station in life both by birth and for their futures, but in a way which put them apart from the mass of

²⁶ Spaans [see note 15], 230-240, 330-335.

²⁷ Olwen Hufton: *The poor of eighteenth-century France, 1750-1789*. Oxford 1974, 139-159; Cavallo [see note 16], 120-125; Markus Erb: *Das Waisenhaus der Stadt Zürich von der Reformation bis zur Regeneration*. Zürich 1987; Scherpner [see note 6], 63-68; Eisenbach [see note 7], 134-139; the orphanages described in Meumann [see note 12], 259-312 resemble the Dutch public orphanages.

²⁸ Donna Andrew: *Philanthropy and Police. London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton 1989, 135-162; Cavallo [see note 16], 183-249; Lotte Koch: *Wandlungen der Wohlfahrtspflege im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*. Erlangen 1933; Mary Lindemann: *Patriots and Paupers. Hamburg, 1712-1830*. New York 1990; Spaans [see note 15], 347-366.

the poor. Like the Dutch public orphanages it was the kind of institution that the charitable public could identify with and take pride in.

In its turn the Halle foundations became the model for developments not only within Germany, but also abroad. In England the Dutch workplaces for poor children were known and approved by some. As in the Dutch Republic before the second wave of city-orphanages, English orphans were fostered out with poor families, where a decent education and christian discipline were not guaranteed. In some larger cities workhouses for poor children, run by the Corporations of the Poor, were tried out, but unsuccessfully.²⁹ The charity school developed into a far more successful means to discipline poor children in England. The charity school movement gained momentum at the very end of the seventeenth century and partly followed the example of Halle. In some cases, notably when the disciplining efforts of the school were seen to be undone by the harmful influences of their home environment, the schools developed into charitable boarding schools. Here the children were reared in a manner not unlike that just described for the Dutch orphanages. For financial reasons these boarding schools never became common in England.³⁰ In Sweden also compulsory schooling was introduced under pietist influence as a means to keep children from begging and in good discipline.³¹

As we all know, Francke far surpassed his Dutch models. Through the communication networks of the pietist movement and its close association with the centralized political power of the Prussian state, Francke could mobilize a measure of support for his orphanage that was beyond anything mere civic pride could achieve. He used the youthful energy of his pupils not for the modest encouragement of an urban textile manufacturing industry, but invested it in the machinery of the pietistic movement and Prussian state policies. Thus he made the orphanage of Halle a unique institution.

²⁹ Sydney and Beatrice Webb: *English Local Government: English Poor Law History. Vol. I: The Old Poor Law*. London 1927, 160; Stephen Macfarlane: 'Social Policy and the Poor in the later Seventeenth Century'. In: *London 1500-1700. The Making of the Metropolis*. Ed. by A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay. London and New York 1986, 252-277.

³⁰ M.G. Jones: *The Charity School Movement. A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action*. London 1964, 31-52.

³¹ Bengt Sandin: 'Education, popular culture and the surveillance of the population in Stockholm between 1600 and the 1840's'. In: *Continuity and change* 3 (1988) 357-390.