

**For ‘the younge and very poore children of Norwich’: A Study of Anguish’s
Children’s Hospital**

Joseph William Henley

© This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognise that its copyright rests with the author and that no quotation from the thesis, nor any information derived therefrom, may be published without the author’s prior consent.

September 2008

Précis

This dissertation is primarily concerned with the analysis of a seventeenth-century children's hospital, opened in Norwich in 1621. An ex-mayor named Thomas Anguish bequeathed to the corporation a part of the houses and lands that he held in the parish of St. Edmund, by way of his will dated 22 June 1617. His will stipulated that the grounds should be used to set up and found a children's hospital, for the sick poor children of Norwich. We will determine *why*, at that time and in that place, there was such a call for the social reform of the young, within several important historical contexts.

We will see how the seventeenth-century climate necessitated a more institutional approach to child welfare, as a result of the failings of the more *ad-hoc* welfare schemes that were already in place in Norwich. These failings had all been made plain in the 1570 Census of the Poor, a revolutionary move by the Norwich magistrates to count and number Norvicians as a way of better dealing with increasing levels of disorder.

Likewise, the Hospital would take great inspiration from the important example set by the magistrates of London, whose first experiments with child institutionalisation – Christ's Hospital – had proven to be a marked success.

This dissertation also highlights the often underrated role of the individual in cases of private philanthropy. While wider circumstances were paramount in the Hospital's founding, it would require the generosity of one individual to get it up and running. We will look, in detail, at Anguish's personal situation in order to determine how far this influenced the setting up of his Hospital.

The dissertation ends by analysing the opening of the Hospital doors and its first few years in operation. Using the Hospital Account Books, we have been able to show how Anguish's Hospital offered, to some extent, the ideal realisation of a seventeenth-century institution concerned with caring for the health of the young.

In short, we will uncover why Norwich required the founding of a children's hospital in 1621, and how the desires of the corporation manifested themselves, using the wealth of primary and comparative evidence available.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost my thanks go to those at the Harry Watson Bursary, without whose generous financial support this thesis would not have been possible.

By no means less influential has been the constant support and guiding hand of Professor Carole Rawcliffe, who advised me throughout the process of completing this dissertation. She has been patient, informative and kind, and her suggestions and corrections have been invaluable.

I am grateful also for the assistance offered to me by all of the staff at the Norfolk Record Office, who have given a good degree of their time helping a very lost young man find his way. Similarly, I thank all those at the UEA library.

My fellow Ma students offered various suggestions which have helped me greatly this year, and I hope that I might have gone some way to returning the favour. My parents were, as always, pillars of emotional (and financial!) support throughout.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations have been used throughout:

<i>ANW</i>	The Archdeaconry Court of Norwich
<i>BHAB</i>	NRO, NCR, 25f, Boys' Hospital Account Book, 1620/1-1688
<i>BHFC</i>	NRO, NCR 25e, Boys' Hospital Foundation Charter, 1628
<i>HIH</i>	L. Granshaw and R. Porter (eds.), <i>The Hospital in History</i> (London, 1989)
<i>HN</i>	C. Rawcliffe and R. Wilson (eds.), <i>The History of Norwich</i> , (2 vols. London, 2004)
<i>MCB</i>	NRO, NCR, 16a, Mayor's Court Book (various dates)
<i>NCC</i>	Norwich Consistory Court
<i>NCR</i>	Norfolk City Records
<i>NRO</i>	Norfolk Record Office, Norwich
<i>TNA</i>	The National Archives

Introduction

There needs to be a national debate about the extent to which it is acceptable for local authorities to take action in cases where the welfare of children is in real jeopardy. The nation's expanding waistline threatens to have a devastating impact on our public services. Obesity is increasingly costing the council taxpayer dear. It falls to social services to care for the house-bound obese adults, to invest money in encouraging people to be active and to replace school furniture that is just too small for larger pupils. Council equipment and infrastructure is having to be modified to deal with a population that is getting larger and larger.¹

David Rogers, spokesperson on public health for the Local Government Association (August 2008)

In 2008, days rarely pass without mention of the health or welfare of the nation's children. Political debates over childhood obesity, vaccinations, and 'saviour siblings', sexual health, adolescent drug-use, sex offenders, and poverty (to name but a handful from a near inexhaustible list) rage so frequently that we might consider this a peak in the level of national concern over the state of our young. David Rogers, in his evaluation of rising childhood obesity rates, has highlighted some key themes: what exactly is the acceptable level of government involvement in the private lives of British families? Is it even the welfare of children, or that of wider society, that is at the greater risk? The very same obese children whose wellbeing is such a matter of concern are also having a 'devastating impact on our public services.' Should the welfare of the children involved always be the main priority?

Such debates have, in fact, been conducted for centuries, with differing levels of vigour, and will doubtless continue for the foreseeable future. The extent to which historical events and issues inform contemporary policy, or are at least revisited in it, can be both fascinating and highly informative. Without doubt, the study of history is of no small value to those who are actively involved today in tackling the challenges

¹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/7564682.stm>, viewed 20/08/08 at 13.50

of child poverty and the health of the young. With such considerations in mind, this thesis is concerned with the founding and early existence of a seventeenth-century Children's Hospital in the city of Norwich. Founded posthumously in 1617, by a former mayor named Thomas Anguish, the Hospital was opened in 1621 and aimed to deal with the many problems that then faced the city's poor. Just like the men and women engaged in the modern struggle with childhood obesity, those who governed Norwich sought to deal a decisive blow in the prevailing battle of their own time, namely that against childhood destitution and vagrancy. But the authorities also recognised the negative implications that unhealthy children had for wider society, foreshadowing David Rogers' fears about the devastating effect of the ever-expanding waistline on public services. Certainly, the subject of our study was not merely a philanthropic foundation, but part of a wider move for social reform.

The study benefits from its access to a wealth of archival evidence, most of which is located in the Norfolk Record Office and remains largely untouched by historians. This includes the Boys' Hospital Foundation Charter of 1628, and the Hospital's Account Books, which began in the early part of the 1620s, along with a range of documents relating to the politics of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Norwich, particularly regarding the treatment of the poor.² Because of the city's highly developed legal infrastructure in the period, we are also able to refer to numerous wills, diligently recorded by city officials, as a way of better understanding the personal circumstances of the individuals involved, and their economic situation.³

² *BHFC*: This has been fully transcribed and reproduced in Appendix A, and references are given by line number. It has also been photographed (Appendix B, Fig 1); *BHAB*: since this MS is neither foliated nor paginated, references have been given by date. It has also been photographed (Appendix B, Fig 2); *MCB*, 1603-15; *MCB*, 1615-24; W. L. Sachse (ed.), *Minutes of the Norwich Court of Mayoralty 1630-1631*, Norfolk Record Society XV, (1942); W. L. Sachse (ed.), *Minutes of the Norwich Court of Mayoralty 1632-1635*, Norfolk Record Society XXXVI, (1967); NRO, NCR, 20c, Mayor's Book of the Poor, 1571-9.

³ NRO, ANW22, MF/RO 312, w. 205, The Will of Thomas Anguish; TNA, prob/11/140, The Will of Thomas Anguish Jr., 1622; NRO, NCC, will register, Mason, w. 243, The Will of Elizabeth Anguish.

The lack of attention hitherto paid to the Hospital's records means that it has received little more than a few cursory references, rather than the much fuller study it deserves. The contributions made to the history of early modern Norwich by Paul Griffiths, Margaret Pelling and John Pound are invaluable, but they only briefly refer to Anguish's Hospital, if at all, as part of more general surveys.⁴ The eminent eighteenth-century Norfolk antiquary, Francis Blomefield, recorded several items of information about the Hospital in his *History of Norfolk*, but his account is by no means analytical, and offers little more than a useful description of the institution.⁵ As a result, there remains an unquestionable need for a study focussing specifically upon Anguish's Hospital, which is placed in its proper historical context. In essence, this dissertation offers a contribution to the history of Norwich, but it has also benefited greatly from the various revisionist histories of childhood and the family that have emerged in recent years. Scholars such as Ralph Houlbrooke, David Cressy and, again, Paul Griffiths have made invaluable contributions to the historiography of this important topic, helping to topple the now outdated and anachronistic accounts of Lawrence Stone and Edward Shorter.⁶ As a result of their work, we no longer accept the notion that children were not 'loved' by their parents in the Early Modern period, which is something that Anguish will himself help to demonstrate in Chapter Two. The very core of this thesis hinges upon the importance of children in early modern life. The subject of our study also fits within the wider history of Hospitals, being influenced by the lively and informative volume of essays edited by Lindsay

⁴ P. Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', in *HN*, vol. 2, pp. 63-88; M. Pelling, *The Common Lot: Sickness, Medical Occupations and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England*, (London, 1998); J. Pound, 'Government to 1660', in *HN*, vol. 2, pp. 35-61.

⁵ F. Blomefield, *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, 11 vols, (vol. 4, Norfolk, 1806), pp. 407-11.

⁶ R. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London, 1984); D. Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997); P. Griffiths, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560-1640* (Oxford, 1996); L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London, 1977); E. Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (London, 1975).

Granshaw and Roy Porter,⁷ and also by the numerous studies of Christ's, a children's hospital opened almost a century earlier in London.⁸ Using comparative material from these works, we hope to demonstrate the *medical* connotations of Anguish's Hospital, as well as its custodial and rehabilitative purposes. Anguish's bequest can also be studied as a demonstration of philanthropy in the Early Modern period, a topic for which there is also a rich historiography.⁹

The research presented in the following pages lays the foundations for a wider study. Particular attention might be paid to the other people (besides Anguish) who were involved in the founding and administration of the Hospital. As will become clear, many of Norwich's eminent citizens donated money and land to the Hospital, and would continue to do so for years; a better knowledge of their personal motives might advance our understanding of charitable trends in early modern England. Likewise, an extended narrative account of the Hospital might allow future scholars a more accessible entrance point into the neglected history of early children's hospitals. Given the extent to which The Anguish Educational Facility, the modern day offspring of Anguish's original bequest, still benefits educational activities in Norwich, the Hospital's early history remains relevant today, and is far from simply academic interest.

This thesis falls into three chapters. Broadly speaking, they consider 'problem', 'solution' and 'result' respectively. Each relies on a different type of documentary evidence but, where possible, our sources have been varied to retain the attention of the reader. Chapter One sets the scene by describing and analysing the circumstances

⁷ *HHH*.

⁸ E. Blunden, *Christ's Hospital: a retrospect* (London, 1923); C. Kazmierczak Manzione, *Christ's Hospital of London, 1552-1598: A Passing Deed of Pity* (London, 1995).

⁹ S. Cavallo, 'The Motivations of Benefactors: An overview of approaches to the study of charity', in J. Barry and C. Jones (eds.), *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State* (London, 1991); W. K. Jordan, *The Charities of London 1480-1660: The Aspirations and the Achievements of the Urban Society* (London, 1960).

that encouraged the founding of the Hospital. Specifically, we will assess the social and political climate of Norwich in the Early Modern period (particularly with reference to the 1570 Census of the Poor), but, in a broader context, we will examine some of the national concerns regarding child health.¹⁰ In doing so, we aim to uncover the motives which led to the founding of the Hospital, at that time and in that place.

Chapter Two takes a personal look at the endowment of the Hospital by revealing more about the major players involved, particularly members of the Anguish family. Using Thomas Anguish's will, we can learn a good deal, not only about his domestic life, but also his economic situation, and can venture a rough estimate of the extent of his wealth. How was he able to make such a generous bequest at his death? The chapter ends by examining the endowment itself, largely through the text of the Foundation Charter, in order firmly to establish the situation before the opening of the Hospital doors.

Chapter Three presents a detailed account of the Hospital's first few years. We will look at its administration and, particularly, its relationship with the Mayor's Court: who was in charge, and what managerial decisions were taken, after Anguish's death? We shall determine how far the intentions of the founders were met and, when they were not, why this was the case. We will challenge claims made by the historian Edward Seidler, who has suggested that pre-modern children's hospitals were not in any sense medical institutions, by contending that the subject of our study, in fact, offered the perfect combination of physical and spiritual therapy according to the tenets of the period.¹¹ Chapter Three will also discover the type of children who gained admission to the Hospital, and will assess the provision that was made for them during and after their period of custody.

¹⁰ J. Pound (ed.), *Norwich Census of the Poor 1570*, Norfolk Record Society XL (1971).

¹¹ E. Seidler, 'An historical survey of children's hospitals' in *HHH*, pp. 181-2.

Did the men and women of seventeenth-century England, like those of today, enter ‘a national debate about the extent to which it [was] acceptable for local authorities to take action in cases where the welfare of children [was] in real jeopardy?’ Were the poor children of Norwich exerting a ‘devastating impact’ on local amenities, and ‘placing an unprecedented amount of pressure’ on the city’s magistrates? What circumstances led Thomas Anguish to found a Children’s Hospital?

Chapter One – Child health in early modern England: A local and national context

The *Tame Rogue* begets a *Wilde Rogue*; and this is a spirit that cares not into what circle he rifes, nor into the company of what Diuels hee falles: In his swadling clouts is he marked to be a villaine, and in his breeding is instructed to be so: the mother of him (who was deliuered of her burden vnder a hedge)... will rather endure to see his braynes beaten out, than to haue him taken fro[m] her, to be put to an honest course of life...¹²

...such orphans, who having nothing left unto them and being destitute of all relief and help, are left to their own dispositions, [they]... swarme in clusters in every corner and quarter of your Citie, and for want of good education and nurturing, also growe to be thornes and thistles... [they] shalbe the plagues of this your common welth, and if remedy be not provided: shall utterly deuoure and destroy the same... it is your parte and bounded dutie to provide the education, instruction, and what soeuer is necessary for such... let them be provided for that by your meanes and under your government they being taught and instructed in some honest art and discipline, they may become to be profitable members to the common welth...¹³

In order to establish the important legacy of Anguish’s Hospital, it is necessary to begin around a century before its foundation and the opening of its doors – to a time notable for an often complex and conflicting attitude to the socially disadvantaged. On the one hand, disorder and intense paranoia abounded. Tudor and Stuart England

¹² Thomas Dekker, ‘The Belman of London’ (London, 1608), in A. B. Grosart (ed.), *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 5 vols., (vol. 3, New York, 1963) p. 97.

¹³ John Vowell, alias Hooker, *Orders enacted for Orphans and for their portions within the citie of Excester*, (Exeter, 1575) f. 11-12.

is often characterised by increased disorder caused by a growing divide between rich and poor within a strictly hierarchical society. Court books and other legal records frequently suggest an increase in the number of presentments of those subverting the social order: such as vagrants, beggars, criminals and female scolds. This was no more the case than in Norwich, where wounds from the rebellion led by Robert Kett in 1549 remained sore even into the eighteenth century.¹⁴ The period appears notable for strict forms of discipline, both within the home and in the context of wider public initiatives. Children, or so contemporary thought dictated, were of particular interest within this framework. While they themselves made a big contribution to public disorder, their formative years were recognised as being vital to the future of a successful society;¹⁵ would they contribute to the next generation of sturdy beggars, or could magistrates prevent this through stricter forms of control, such as complete separation from the family? If children could be removed from the impoverished conditions that were so detrimental to their physical and spiritual health (even at the cost of severing the ties of natural parenthood) and be placed in a carefully regulated environment, where they could enjoy an adequate diet (the ‘first instrument of medicine’) and receive an education, then perhaps future generations would walk safer streets, not haunted by the lurching image of the desperate, destitute beggar.¹⁶

¹⁴ For more see: A. Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2007).

¹⁵ The puritan Philip Stubbes, writing in about 1595, wondered ‘Was there ever seen less obedience in youth of all sorts... towards their superiors, parents, masters and governors?’, as cited in: D. Underdown, ‘The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England’, in A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.), *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1987). See also: M Ingram, ‘Reformation of Manners in Early Modern England’, in P. Griffiths, A. Fox and S. Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke, 1996) pp. 70-3.

¹⁶ For the corporation’s willingness to sever familial ties see: Sachse, *Minutes 1630-1631*, p. 162, for the case of Ann Heynes, a fortune teller who had her child taken from her after being sent to Bridewell. Likewise, authorities in sixteenth-century London aimed to ‘take oute of the streates all the fatherles children and other poore mens children that were not able to kepe them’: R. H. Tawney and E. Power (eds.), *Tudor Economic Documents*, 3 vols (London, 1924), vol. 3 p. 416.

On the other hand, however, attitudes to children and the poor at large in the period could be perceived in a different way, particularly in relation to Norwich. When we consider its position as the second city in the realm and the extensive damage it sustained during Kett's Rebellion, Norwich seems increasingly to have been concerned with improving its own image. The production of William Cuninghame's map in 1558 shows the blueprint for a perfect early modern city; but, less than ten years after the rebellion, the sceptic might wonder to what extent it was an accurate depiction of streets that still bore the mark of arson.¹⁷ Within such a context, it is quite likely that the authorities made so much of their harsh treatment of crime and vagrancy as a means of presenting Norwich as a well-governed city that led the way in dealing with disorder and other social problems. The evidence suggests that it already possessed a highly developed political and charitable structure, with a long history of institutional care for children. While it certainly did suffer from significant levels of crime, which it aimed systematically to stamp out, perhaps Norwich was not quite the 'city in distress' that it might first seem in the Early Modern period.¹⁸

Ideas about the role of children in society were also often ambiguous if not entirely contradictory, as is clear in the two quotations that precede this chapter. There existed lively, indeed sometimes melodramatic, concerns about the *potential* of children as they matured into adulthood; whether one interpreted this potential positively or negatively prompted entirely different modes of treating children. As a result of this dichotomy, historians have often been confused about the relationship between the early modern child and his or her parents, as we alluded to in our introduction.¹⁹

¹⁷ See above, pp. 8-9.

¹⁸ As has been suggested in: Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', p. 64.

¹⁹ See above, p. viii.

In 1570, when Norwich began undertaking its revolutionary Census of the Poor, it employed the rhetoric of a city in distress. The authorities would have us believe that times were bleak, with increased disorder signified by ‘begging crewes camped at everie mans dore.’²⁰ After the horror of Kett’s Rebellion, and the threat of a further uprising engineered by the Northern Earls, the broad gulf between the lives of rich and poor seemed as threatening as ever. One social commentator, writing in 1550, appealed to both sides to consider the damage they had done, but it seems he particularly blamed the authorities for their continued suppression of the poor.

... if their [the poor] offence wer laied in an equall balaunce with yours... doubt not but you should sone be ashamed of youre parte. For what can you laye vnto their charge, but they haue had examples of the same in you?²¹

In early modern Norwich, the rich/poor divide appeared to be as wide as ever, and the authorities continued to suppress the poor because of their potential for disorder.

The corporation moved quickly, frequently and ruthlessly to put down any real or perceived acts of insurgence, which involved the harsh subordination and punishment of those who might carry out such uprisings – the poor of Norwich. The Mayor’s Court Books, which record the minutes of the regular meetings of this governing body, are an excellent source for the historian who seeks to understand how the poor were perceived by the authorities and how they were treated as a result of their poverty. The elimination of ‘vagrancie’, ‘begging’ and living ‘idely’ was a top priority in the corporation’s move to clear the streets, and people without gainful employment were numerous: like Richard Powell, Robert Barnard and Miles Tilney who were all ‘whiped for vagrancie’ in the first half of 1615.²² A cursory glance through the minute books suggests something akin to an epidemic in vagrancy, and

²⁰ NRO, NCR, 20c, Mayor’s Book of the Poor, 1571-9, f. 1

²¹ ‘Robert Crowley on the Causes of Ket’s Rebellion, 1550’ as reproduced in Tawney and Power, *Tudor Economic Documents*, p. 59.

²² MCB, 1615-24, (1615) ff. 1, 4. See ff. 13, 14, 15 for further examples.

references to whipping appear frequently. Corporal punishment would soon be replaced with a spell in Bridewell, which became the standard punishment.²³

Authorities across the country appear to have grown increasingly paranoid about potential uprisings and aimed to discourage them even before they began. Early modern magistrates exercised surveillance over those who subverted, or threatened to subvert, the established order within the intensely hierarchical society that prevailed. Frequently, court presentments show us how the urban elite kept a constant watchful eye on those they felt were straying outside the lines of acceptable behaviour, and punished them accordingly.²⁴

Tudor and Stuart England is epitomised by a top down concern about children as the building blocks of society. There existed an increased desire to control their actions and preserve their health. This was not least because of the association made between homeless children and the spread of disease in early modern England. Prevailing medical theories in the period maintained that the vagrant children who littered the streets represented a source of contagion; an understandable notion when we consider the overwhelming numbers who lost their lives in the plague epidemics that visited and revisited English towns so frequently from the fourteenth century onwards. Such fears were originally based in superstition. It was believed that the young children who ‘flocked themselves together’ in the streets or played at funerals ‘in a mournful sort’ were a sign that the onset of plague was about to occur.²⁵ Into the seventeenth century, scientific opinion confirmed that such large gatherings of filthy and noisome street urchins were themselves a source of contagion: an increasingly fashionable and

²³ As was the case for the likes of Edward Benton, William Lister, Henry Bussey and Peter Durrant: Sachse, *Minutes 1630-1*, pp. 96-8.

²⁴ Griffiths, ‘Inhabitants’, pp. 63-8. For a specific example, see John Scorwby: *MCB*, 1603-15, (1611) f. 330.

²⁵ P. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1985) pp. 34.

plausible assumption.²⁶ Furthermore, it appeared to early modern men and women that young children were especially susceptible to plague. *Infant* mortality was no surprise in the period, but the fact that so many older children died after surviving the most vulnerable period of human life aroused suspicion and further associated the disease with childhood.²⁷ That vagrant children were considered to be a particular source of contagion was obviously a major factor in determining moves to remove them from the streets and have them institutionalised, particularly in Norwich where the experience of plague was especially devastating.²⁸

The treatment of children was also influenced by current social, political and economic ideas. Under the umbrella of poor relief, which was amended by the Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601, but had changed little in this respect from the 1570s, churchwardens and overseers of the poor were charged with ensuring that poor children were set to work or apprenticed. Such individuals included not only the vagrant and destitute, but all those children who could not be provided for by their parents.²⁹ This was a society that expected children to contribute to the community.

Setting poor children to work had strong social implications too. Without an occupation, children too often turned to a life of crime and vagrancy – fears that they would simply become the next generation of beggars and vagrants, as we have seen, were rife and frequently influenced social policy. Attempts by the authorities to put children to gainful employment can be understood in the context of their perceived *potential* nuisance value. Sometimes, though, these schemes were hampered by periods of economic depression, seasonal unemployment, gluts in the labour market

²⁶ For more on contagion theories see: C. Rawcliffe, *Medicine and Society in Later Medieval England*, (Sutton Publishing, 1995) pp. 40-3.

²⁷ Slack, *The Impact of Plague*, p. 183.

²⁸ In 1579, one epidemic alone saw a third of the population perish: J. Pound, 'Government to 1660', pp. 35-6.

²⁹ I. Pinchbeck and M. Hewitt, *Children in English Society: Volume 1: From Tudor Times to the Eighteenth Century* (London and Toronto, 1969), p. 98.

and the absence of schools for the poorer classes.³⁰ Such problems perhaps prompted the development of public and private institutions like Anguish's Hospital to tend to the physical and moral health of children. This argument gains particular weight when we consider that magistrates were especially concerned about young boys – although it was planned to be mixed sex, Anguish's Hospital did not take in girls until after the Commonwealth period.³¹

As the sixteenth century wore on, frequent amendments were made to poor law legislation as authorities became more and more preoccupied with the problem of vagrant and delinquent children. The extent to which vagrancy had begun to dominate the political agenda is apparent from the Act passed in 1547, in which adult vagabonds who refused to work were to be branded and chastised by magistrates. Paternal ties were slashed in such circumstances, largely due to fears that their children, who were 'brought up in idleness', might be so damaged by such an upbringing that they would never be capable of 'thrift and labour'. The offspring of such vagrants, as well as any child between the age of five and fourteen found begging or wandering alone, could be taken away from their parents or 'keeper' by 'any manner of person' who promised to care for them and see that they were put to some honest labour or occupation.³² As we will see, this very age-group was the focus of Anguish's benevolence.³³

This trend towards social surveillance and the control of the poorer classes is best illustrated in Norwich's pioneering Census of the Poor, undertaken by the civic authorities in 1570.³⁴ In light of ever-worsening social conditions, city officials began

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp 98-9.

³¹ See below, pp. 38, 48.

³² Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, p. 96

³³ See below, p. 8

³⁴ See: Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', *passim*; Pound, *Census*, *passim*

to ‘count and number Norvicians... [which] revealed the shape of the problems.’³⁵

Paul Griffiths has suggested that the Census occurred as a result of the troubled times to which we have already referred. It was a ‘sweeping indictment of a city in distress.’

Among the principal concerns, which also included jobless drones and ‘brute’ nomads, were the very children who we have seen were at risk of being ‘trained’ in idleness, disposed to taking handouts rather than working for their bread. Further to this, the city recognised the increased threat of the pox and other ‘incurable diseases’, which we have also observed as a powerful factor in the shaping of social policy.³⁶

The resulting ‘poore booke’ was ‘openlye redd’ and approved with full ‘force and effecte’ by the Assembly in June 1571, and ‘ratefyed’ twelve months later. It became the starting point for the integrated social welfare scheme that followed, and a ‘blueprint for similar schemes across the land.’³⁷ The chief aims of the authorities, after their counting and numbering of all and sundry in Norwich, were:

the better provision of the poore, punishmente of vacabonds, setting at worke the ydle and loyterers and expulcinge of stought and strange beggers, maintayning the indigent and nedye, and *trayninge youth in work and learnynge to utterly prohibite open beggyng*.³⁸

The last sentence sets out the agenda that led to the eventual founding of Anguish’s Hospital, but it also reveals the extent to which increased disorder among the younger generation had become a problem for the corporation – a wholesale welfare scheme had become necessary to curb the actions of those who subverted the norms of the social order. The education and control of children was clearly a matter of pressing concern for early modern authorities, which makes it hard to agree with claims by historians such as Lawrence Stone that children were of little concern either privately

³⁵ Griffiths, ‘Inhabitants’, p. 63

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 63-4

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 63

³⁸ NRO, NCR, 20C, Mayor’s Book of the Poor, 1571-9, f. 57 [emphasis added]

or publicly in the early modern period.³⁹ It was within this framework of comprehensive social reform and the numbering of, and accounting for, every Norvician, that Anguish's Hospital was founded; the influence of the Census of the Poor as a starting point for the shaping of welfare initiatives should not be understated.

Removing poor children from the conditions that bred their poverty was the accepted way of integrating them within the workforce, and thus within the common wealth. It was, in many ways, an extension of the system of apprenticeship, a corner-stone of the late medieval and early modern urban economy.⁴⁰ It is significant that Anguish stipulated that children admitted to the Hospital should be discharged at age fourteen or fifteen 'as they may be fittinge for Service, or able to Mainteyne themselves by their workes'.⁴¹ The Hospital would be 'a place fitt to imploye and sett them [the children] on worke in theire tender years... to educate and nourish them untill such tyme as they should come to be able to worke' in order to prevent them becoming 'unprofitable and burthensome in the com[m]on wealth.'⁴²

Clearly, with their eyes on the national picture, the powers who assumed the task of realising Anguish's wishes recognised, and aimed to exploit, the economic value of healthy, morally reformed children. As one member of the Paston family, whose correspondence constitutes a barometer of the social climate in Norwich, remarked, '... every poor man that hath brought up his children to the age of twelve year waiteth then to be helped and profited by his children.'⁴³ Instead of contributing to Norwich's

³⁹ Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 114

⁴⁰ For more see: Pelling, *Common Lot*, pp. 120-133.

⁴¹ *BHFC*, lines 39-40.

⁴² *Ibid.*, lines 1-5.

⁴³ Reproduced in: R. Bucholz and N. Key, *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1715*, (Oxford, 2004) p. 4.

future social and economic burden, the ‘poore, sicke and diseased Orphanes’ could represent the future workforce: profitable and *unburdensome* to the common wealth.

An entirely different approach might, however, be taken by historians of early modern Norwich, which is not so concerned with the assumed levels of disorder. Was the corporation trying to *appear* forward thinking and hard on vagrancy following its unfortunate association with disorder and rebellion in the sixteenth century? A preoccupation with appearances is particularly evident in William Cuninghams’ celebrated map of 1558, tellingly produced nine years *after* Kett’s Rebellion (see Appendix B, Fig. 3). The city was often described as having been greatly damaged, but the map shows it as the perfect realisation of an early modern city concerned with maintaining public health. The wide streets, strong walls (which were in fact partly destroyed), and easterly facing prospect all conform to classical theories regarding the best environment for a healthy body politic.⁴⁴ Actually, Norwich presented itself as a city with a robust political infrastructure that merited its place as a forward-thinking inspiration to the rest of the realm.⁴⁵ From this perspective, the Census of the Poor (which combined measures for public health and social welfare) was not just an attempt to survey citizens and curb disorder, but a well-thought-out political response to genuine problems such as high morbidity and mortality rates.⁴⁶

A highly developed, socially aware system of charitable relief is certainly evident in the long history of institutional care that Norwich already boasted.⁴⁷ It had, for example, moved towards the private keeping of young, poor or orphaned children by

⁴⁴ For more on the impact of propaganda in Cuninghams’ map see: I. Fay, ‘Health and Disease in Medieval and Tudor Norwich’ (Ph. D Thesis, University of East Anglia, 2007) esp. ch. 2, and p. 127. For some background about the map itself see: Frostick, *Printed Plans*, pp. 1-4.

⁴⁵ For more see: Pound, ‘Government’, pp. 36-7; M. C. McClendon, *The Quiet Reformation: Magistrates and the Emergence of Protestantism in Tudor Norwich* (California, 1999) pp. 34-5.

⁴⁶ Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 131; R. Schofield and E. A. Wrigley, ‘Infant and child mortality in England in the late Tudor and early Stuart period’, in C. Webster (ed.), *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1979) pp. 61-95.

⁴⁷ C. Rawcliffe, *Medicine for the Soul: The Life, Death and Resurrection of an English Medieval Hospital* (Sutton Publishing, 1999), p. 219.

families who received financial support from the churchwardens and overseers: like the young Richard and Mary Dickens, who, in 1630, were either orphaned or perhaps removed from their family due to their parents' inability to provide for them. The records show that the boy, who was 'under Five yeares of Age', was to be kept by his aunt, Elizabeth Dickens, at the cost of '10*d.* the weke to be paid by the Churchwardens & Overseers of St Michaells.' Mary, a 'Childe of the Age of two yeares & a halfe', was not assigned to relatives, however, but was entrusted to John Oliver of St Giles parish at the slightly higher value of 12*d.* a week.⁴⁸

Furthermore, by paying comparatively poor men and women for supporting and providing medical treatment for sick poor children, Norwich often killed two birds with one stone. We can see this system at work in the case of Rose Wright, who, in 1630, was to be paid 20*s.* to heal the head of the young Stephen Tye. Several days later it was agreed that she should be paid an additional sum of 20*s.* for the *keeping* of the child, and a further 20*s.* if she were able to cure him completely. In any event, she would receive the extra 20*s.* 'at Easter next yf he live so longe.'⁴⁹ While she was not herself dependent on poor relief, this illustrates the established practice of helping poor (often widowed) women financially in return for their adoption of poor children. The relationships they forged were supposed to be beneficial to all involved, as the children were often entrusted to people suffering from some sort of physical disability or the impairments of old age. Carers would be paid by the city for their outgoings and reap the benefits of having a healthy young child around the house in a period when a physically demanding way of life was unavoidable. Meanwhile, the child would benefit from being removed from beggary and neglect, and the city could clear the streets of the vagrant, destitute and fatherless children that posed such a

⁴⁸ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 95.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

problem.⁵⁰ The Census of the Poor offers numerous examples of these reciprocal, mutually beneficial relationships at work. Richard Sandlyng, for example, a blind man of 54, ran a household containing a working wife and ‘child’ of 21, but also ‘a fatherless child of 12 yere that lede hym.’⁵¹

However, although these arrangements did assist those teetering on the edge of financial collapse and absolute poverty, they had limited value in real economic or cash terms.⁵² Similarly, there was also too much scope for abuse on the part of those ‘keeping’ the children, as well as on the part of the children’s parents. As a result, the welfare of children in these private arrangements increasingly became a problem for authorities. For example, in 1608 the mother of Ann Love made a complaint against the grocer, John Jaxon, with whom the seven year old was privately ‘dwelling’. The Mayor’s Court ruled that the private arrangement would remain, but that Ann should only be *reasonably* corrected and by Jaxon’s wife, not the grocer himself. Conversely, Ann Love’s mother would be whipped if she attempted to violate the agreement by enticing her child away from Jaxon.⁵³ Cases such as this would increasingly take up the Court’s time. It became clear that an institutional approach, whereby children enjoyed the immediate protection of the Court and were all cared for under one roof, would be a much more suitable solution for the care of sick poor children, although it would require a large private or public investment.

In order for these private relationships to work, the children involved had to remain healthy. The treatment of children in service is very difficult to describe on the basis of anything more than anecdotal evidence,⁵⁴ but one point can be made without

⁵⁰ Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 115.

⁵¹ Pound, *Census*, p. 66. See also pp. 40, 84, 90 for further examples.

⁵² Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 116.

⁵³ *MCB*, 1603-15, Jan. 1607/8.

⁵⁴ Discussed further in: Pelling, *Common Lot*, pp. 125-8.

contention: no master or mistress would ever want to take on an unhealthy child.⁵⁵ This is reflected in the Hospital's preoccupation with admitting children well below the age of apprenticeship, and reflects wider concerns apparent in early modern England. Most companies of merchants and craftsmen enforced regulations that excluded potential apprentices on the basis of illness, deformity, bastardy or alien birth.⁵⁶ One such was the London Barber-Surgeons' Company, whose ordinances of 1530 ruled that all prospective apprentices should be checked to confirm that they were 'clean without continual diseases or grievous infirmities whereby the king's liege people might take hurt.'⁵⁷ Put simply, the health of children was paramount in terms of their potential for service. If they were unable to work, they were, of course, already sliding further down the slippery slope to future vagrancy.

We must finally address early modern Norwich's relationship with London, the rest of the kingdom and, indeed, the rest of Europe in terms of its readiness to set or follow trends in child welfare, for it was the wider picture that would so influence the founding of Anguish's Hospital. From an English perspective, the aforementioned Census of the Poor was entirely novel – London, in fact, undertook a similar survey, clearly as a result of the work done in Norwich, twelve years later in 1582.⁵⁸ Magistrates in the capital set about cataloguing the poor and, just as in Norwich, began organising them in separate groups with particular problems.⁵⁹ The poor, the sick and the 'lustie roge' each required different institutions for their treatment and reformation – for the sick, London founded St Thomas' hospital, and for those who

⁵⁵ Increasing levels of vagrancy, illegitimacy and idleness led to the age of youth became intensely 'contested territory': Griffiths, *Youth and Authority*, pp. 60-1; For more on early modern definitions of adolescence see: Houlbrooke, *English Family*, pp. 166-7.

⁵⁶ Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 128.

⁵⁷ As cited in: *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁵⁸ 'Soon after [the Census of the Poor] was drafted, the city's trained administrators were being headhunted by other corporations to help them cope in these testing times': Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', p. 63.

⁵⁹ Tawney and Power (eds.), *Tudor Economic Documents*, p. 415-6.

would not work was the infamous Bridewell. For ‘all the fatherles children and other poore men’s children’, however, London was ahead of Norwich. Christ’s Hospital had already been founded and was admitting over 300 children from 1552.⁶⁰ It combined physical and moral concerns about health, reflected in its employment of both school masters *and* surgeons (who earned roughly the same wage).⁶¹ In Chapter Three, we will see how, while Anguish and the administrators of the Boys’ Hospital were heavily influenced by Christ’s, they would constantly struggle to match it for scale.

But it was Norwich’s relationship with the Continent that was perhaps most influential in its development of child welfare. The influx of between five and six thousand Dutch and Walloon refugees, called upon to save the floundering worsted trade, into Norwich in the 1560s and 1570s cannot be ignored, as it changed the social face of the city permanently.⁶² On balance, they are indicative of the mutually beneficial relations with the Low Countries that would be so influential in formulating the city’s child welfare policy. Trade across the North Sea, where child health had long figured on the political agenda, was commonplace. Likewise, the increase in literacy and emergence of a print culture further exposed Norvicians to continental ideas. They were, for example, influenced by Juan Luis Vives, the Spanish humanist who advised the citizens of Bruges and visited the Court of Henry VIII, and who emphasised the importance of educating children for their own moral improvement. He noted how poor children were ‘villainously brought up’ and overexposed to vagrancy and destitution to the point that they could not be ‘drawn away from this most evil way of life.’ He proposed that hospitals should be built for the destitute child, where he or she ‘may be nurtured, [and] to whom appointed women shall act as

⁶⁰ Blunden, *Christ’s Hospital*, p. 8.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6-7. Christ’s employed two surgeons, Robert Ballthroppe and Henry Browne: Kazmierczak Manzione, *Christ’s Hospital of London*, p. 49.

⁶² For more on the influx of Dutch and Walloon refugees see: Pound, ‘Government’, pp. 35-7; J. Pound, *Tudor and Stuart Norwich*, (Surrey, 1988) p. 24.

mothers.’⁶³ This treatise had a significant impact on Norwich, especially as the city’s international trade and cultural exposure to the Continent had long made it receptive to influences from abroad. Likewise, the citizens of Norwich clearly looked to cities such as Florence, for example, with its highly developed institutional approach to child welfare.⁶⁴ Norwich looked east, across the North Sea, a point that cannot be overstated in relation to the development of the city’s social policy.

The picture regarding childcare in Tudor and Stuart Norwich and England is, therefore, both full and ambiguous. We have seen how the authorities were concerned about widespread levels of disorder in what was becoming an increasingly observant and anxious society. At the same time, they were preoccupied with the behaviour and morality of children both in the private and public spheres; contradictory responses developed in relation to the perceived *potential* of children, and whether they could be prevented from becoming the next generation of vagrants. However, Norwich boasted an established political and philanthropic infrastructure that had a long history of dealing with such problems efficiently. Evidence of apprenticeships and the private ‘keeping’ of poor children demonstrates the city’s ability to overcome the pressing problem of poverty at a time when the gap between rich and poor was growing. However, these systems were not without their shortcomings, an important factor in prompting the eventual moves to institutionalise children. Norwich’s contribution to both the national and international development of child welfare is also worth stressing. Both its reception of Dutch and Walloon refugees, and its strong cultural and commercial links across the North Sea made Norwich a hot-bed for the cultivation of continental ideas which were often light years ahead. It would be as a

⁶³ As cited in: Rawcliffe, *Medicine For the Soul*, p. 219.

⁶⁴ J. Henderson, ‘The hospitals of late-medieval and Renaissance Florence: a preliminary survey’, in *HIH*, pp. 78-9.

result of his long relationship with Norwich and the continent that Anguish would decide to found a children's hospital.

Chapter Two: The founders and their motives/The endowment

... the Citty... hath byn from tyme to tyme for many yeares wished and desired to create, sett upp and found an Hospitall or conveniente place for the keepinge, bringinge up and teachinge of younge and very poore children borne and brought up in this Citty of Norwich, and specially such as for want lye in the street[es], vaughtes, doores and windowes, whereby many of them fall into greate and greivous diseases and lamenes as that they are fittinge for noe profession ever after... I doe acknowledge my selfe the weakest among many either in ability in haveing many Children my selfe or in wisdom to directe for the keepinge and bringinge up of poore Children, notwithstandinge as a begininge to my small power I have given and bequeathed this said howse and grownd aforesaid to the end and intente aforesaid...⁶⁵

Thomas Anguish, through his private endowment of houses and lands to the corporation, for the uses stipulated in his will dated 22 June 1617, offered a permanent solution to at least some of the problems that were uncovered in the previous chapter. He wished to 'sett upp and found an Hospitall or conveniente place for the keepinge, bringinge up and teachinge of younge and very poore children borne and brought up in this Citty of Norwich.'⁶⁶ Anguish's bequest occurred at a time when private charity, particularly given for the education and healthcare of children, was *en vogue*; wealthy men, and sometimes women, who wished to maintain their posthumous reputations gave handsomely to authorities across the kingdom. Figures from London reflect the almost unparalleled peak which private charity attained in the early Stuart period (1601-40). In this relatively short time, the citizens gave an estimated total of £959,032 to charitable causes, of which £388,272 (40.49 per cent) was dedicated to the poor.⁶⁷ While just over half of this figure, £172,587, was

⁶⁵ *BHFC*, lines 31-36.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, lines 32-3.

⁶⁷ Jordan, *Charities of London*, p. 24.

earmarked for the development of household relief, the rest was intended for the founding of new almshouses and the improvement of older establishments of the same sort.⁶⁸ Overall, more than a quarter (25.70 per cent) of Londoners' charitable relief in the period went towards the development of educational facilities both in the City and across the kingdom as a whole. The principal concern here was for the creation of schools, for which about £148,263 was provided.⁶⁹ That Anguish's desire to found a children's hospital was influenced by the wider charitable trends of the period is unquestionable, and constitutes a key theme in our study. An appreciation of the general context in which such a philanthropic bequest was made remains paramount to our understanding of the subject.

Although Anguish's bequest came at a time when the provision of private charity was apparently at a peak, we should recognise that there is always scope for historical debate. One particular viewpoint, put forward by John Pound, maintains that the early part of the seventeenth century was a period in which private individuals were actually *reluctant* to assist the poor. Acts of Parliament, for example, increasingly moved closer to enforcing compulsory contributions, and, while parish priests advocated philanthropy from the pulpit, this seldom had any real effect. From such a perspective, donors did not accept that there could be unemployed but deserving poor people. They simply believed that there was always work available, and that those who trod the slippery slope to vagrancy did so of their own free will. According to Pound, it was only in times of turmoil, such as plagues or failed harvests, that the rich willingly gave to the poor, and then only to the most needy until the crisis had abated.⁷⁰ The generosity of Anguish and so many of his contemporaries makes it

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁷⁰ Pound, *Census*, pp. 9-10 .

harder to accept this argument, which none the less provides a valuable corrective to the rather effusive approach of other scholars.

On the other hand, studies of endowments of the kind made by Anguish can be *too* preoccupied with the complex social, political and economic background of the period, at the cost of neglecting to explore the private lives and motives of individual philanthropists. For example, the historian Sandra Cavallo has shown how trends in the giving of private charity were not, as is commonly assumed, always indicative of changes in the religious climate. Figures relating to such activities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries do *not* automatically reflect the effects of the Counter-Reformation or the period of ‘dechristianization’ that ensued, as one might expect. The giving of private charity was not, it would seem, a ‘barometer of piety’. Further, early modern men and women did not always make fewer or more charitable bequests as a result of changing attitudes to the poor and poverty in general. One might well assume that levels and types of relief would reflect such variables, but ‘various models of assistance [often] coexist[ed] or at least recur[red] spasmodically and with renewed intensity within a given period.’ We should actually view private endowments as personally-motivated, well-timed initiatives within a political framework.⁷¹

With these considerations in mind, we will now explore Anguish’s personal life, in order to discover why *he* was the one, in a city that had ‘forr many yeares wished and desired to create, sett upp and found’ a children’s hospital, who actually bequeathed such a sizeable piece of land for this purpose. Was he simply a kind and benevolent man who cared deeply for those whom his foundation was intended to help? In that event, *why* did he feel such a personal responsibility to the poor children of Norwich?

⁷¹ Cavallo, ‘The Motivations of Benefactors’, pp. 47, 48, 50-3.

To pursue Pound's argument, we might ask why, if others were so reluctant to give to the poor of Norwich, did Anguish wish to do so? Were his motives political? And what of the possibility that at least some wealthy individuals could have made generous donations to poor relief while recognising the inherent dangers of establishing a culture of dependency? In short, we aim to establish whether Anguish's philanthropy was typical of the period by investigating the personal circumstances that inspired him. Why *him*? And why *then*? We will analyse, in some detail, the will that he left on his death in 1617 in an attempt to answer these questions. We will also devote some attention to the Mayor's Court Books for 1611, the year in which Anguish presided over the government of Norwich, in order to ascertain if any particular events or civic issues might have influenced his desire to found a children's hospital. The last part of the chapter will be devoted to the endowment itself, so that we may better understand the precise details of what was an extremely complicated bequest.

First, some very brief points of biography are necessary. Thomas Anguish died, aged seventy-nine, in 1617, and was buried at the east end of the north aisle of St George's Church, in Tombland. He was descended from an ancient family of the same name from Walsingham, in Norfolk.⁷² A mercer by trade, he married Elizabeth, the daughter of Edmund Thurston, esquire (perhaps the source of his vast wealth), and had nine sons and three daughters.⁷³ At his death, only five of his sons, and none of his daughters, remained alive, while his wife lived until 1619.⁷⁴ His surviving sons were John, Alexander and Edmund (the three eldest), and Thomas and William (the

⁷² W. Rye, *Norfolk Families* (Norwich, 1913) pp. 4-5.

⁷³ For a more detailed biography see: B. Cozens-Hardy and E. A. Kent, *The Mayors of Norwich 1403-1835: Being Biographical Notes on the Mayors of the old Corporation* (Norwich, 1938) pp. 70-1.

⁷⁴ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 365.

youngest).⁷⁵ Anguish was actively involved in the politics of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Norwich, acting as sheriff in 1595 and 1596, mayor in 1611 and alderman for the ward of Coslany from 1600 until death (see Appendix B, Fig. 4).⁷⁶

As might be expected of someone who made such a major bequest to the poor children of Norwich, his will, in the first instance, shows that Anguish was a man who sought to help the disadvantaged. He left £10 to be given to the city's poor on the day of his burial, 'where most and greatest neade shall requyer.' The sum was to be distributed between the various parishes at the discretion of the mayor and aldermen, with the assistance of the churchwardens.⁷⁷ Anguish also gave 20s. towards the purchase of bread and meat (10s. to be deposited at the Guildhall and 10s. at the castle) for consumption by the poor residents.⁷⁸ Not surprisingly, Anguish felt a particular obligation to provide for those parishes with which he had been closely involved in his lifetime. For general maintenance and church repairs in St. George's Tombland (where he lived) he gave £5, and for the same purpose in St Edmund's Fishergate, 40s.⁷⁹ The poor people of St Edmund's, where he held the property that would become the Hospital, also received a gift of 10s., while those of Coslany, the ward he had represented as alderman, were left 30s.⁸⁰ It was by no means uncommon for early modern testators to remember the poor members of the community in which they lived. As we have seen, such people were the main beneficiaries of the 'prodigally generous years' of the early Stuart period.⁸¹ Once again, the influence of

⁷⁵ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 199.

⁷⁶ Cozens-Hardy and Kent, *The Mayors of Norwich* pp. 70-1; Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 191; T. Hawes (ed.), *An Index to Norwich City Officers 1453-1835*, Norfolk Record Society LII (1986), p. 4.

⁷⁷ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 191.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, f. 191.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 191.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 191.

⁸¹ See above, pp. 16-17.

the kingdom's fashionable capital made Anguish especially disposed to helping the poor of Norwich.

In particular, it would seem that he was keen to use his wealth to support those 'minority' groups in Norwich, who were often neglected by existing social welfare schemes. Among them were the '12 pore aged men' who, at Anguish's request, were each to have 'one gowne of cloath ready made upp'.⁸² Although it is important to note that Anguish's donations of outdoor relief were by no means staggering, and were certainly not uncommon in the period, it was his awareness of the problems faced by such minority groups who could not provide for themselves that, perhaps, encouraged him to make such a generous endowment upon Norwich's poor children.⁸³ While there would always be those who 'chose' vagrancy and idleness, clearly Anguish believed that aged people, just like the young, were unable to provide for themselves because of their circumstances and that, often, the authorities were powerless to rectify the situation.

Whatever his precise motives, Anguish aimed to ensure the survival of those institutions that *did* support the city's most vulnerable residents. For example, the hostels 'com[m]only called the Spittle or Laizer Howses' that cared for and treated victims of the pox and other contagious diseases outside the city gates each received 2s. 6d.⁸⁴ These were little more than token sums, but he also ruled that, if the corporation were to find the property he bequeathed unsuitable for the development of a children's hospital, a portion of the rents was to go instead towards supporting the

⁸² Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 191.

⁸³ By 1609, a 'heavy responsibility of tradition' frequently led magistrates to bequeath sums of money to minority groups in their wills. Francis Tirrel, for example, was a contemporary of Anguish and a fellow grocer, and left a total of £781 for the care of the poor in London in 1609: Jordan, *Charities of London*, pp. 106. This tradition continued after Anguish's death. His son and namesake, Thomas, made exactly the same bequest of twelve cloaks for twelve poor men when he died in 1622: TNA, prob/11/140, Will of Thomas Anguish Jr. (1622), f. 145.

⁸⁴ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 191.

curable sick in the Great Hospital.⁸⁵ Clearly, Anguish regarded rehabilitative institutional care for the indigent and the sick as the best possible solution to their problems. Whereas donations and out-relief could help in the short term, he recognised the benefits of more permanent residential provision; a point made obvious in the Children's Hospital foundation charter, which quotes directly from Anguish's will: children admitted to the hospital were to be accommodated until 'they may be fitting for service or able to maineteyne themselves by their workes.'⁸⁶ In other words, their transformation into useful members of society was paramount.

Perhaps this preference for institutionalisation developed during the time that Anguish spent as mayor of Norwich, a position he took up in 1611. By this point, Bridewell was slowly becoming the accepted mode of punishment for beggars and vagrants.⁸⁷ As mayor, Anguish was frequently made aware of the potentially beneficial effects that a period of confinement, rather than corporal punishment, could have on the poor, since he would have personally encountered the numerous cases of individuals being discharged from Bridewell on the grounds of 'good behavio[ur]'.⁸⁸ That is not to say that his Court was reluctant to employ corporal punishment in cases of vagrancy, but it would appear that he was somewhat forward-thinking in his preference for rehabilitative, rather than punitive, solutions.

As mayor, Anguish also presided over admissions into, and out of, the Great Hospital, and would have learnt at first-hand how such decisions were made.⁸⁹ Perhaps this was why he was happy to found his own hospital posthumously –

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 198.

⁸⁶ *BHFC*, lines 39-40.

⁸⁷ See, for example, the cases of Master Edony and William Worthy: *MCB*, 1603-1615, (1611) f. 324, 325.

⁸⁸ For example, William Waley (good behavio[ur] granted) and Thomas Thompson (discharged): *Ibid.*, 1603-1615, (1611) ff. 324.

⁸⁹ For example, Audry Younges, Alice Ciggs and Joane Manwell were all admitted during Anguish's spell as Mayor: *Ibid.*, 1603-1615, (1611) ff. 324, 329.

because he knew that the Mayor's Court was more than capable of managing its affairs.⁹⁰ Similarly, he would have been well aware of the ways in which the Great Hospital benefited the sick, poor and needy of Norwich, and inspired to make a similar endowment to the young. Anguish had lived through a period when the authorities were increasingly committed to the creation of charitable and custodial institutions and, as a result, was disposed to using his great wealth to continue such a policy.⁹¹

As a magistrate, Anguish was also exposed at first-hand to the plight of the numerous poor children of Norwich, and to the Court's inability to ameliorate their circumstances in any permanent manner.⁹² In 1611, several 'poore children' were 'viewed' by the aldermen.⁹³ None of the children was named, but simply described - as 'poore', 'sicke' or 'base' - and no further provision was offered by the Court. The children were also all said to have been 'brought in' or 'brought up' by someone's wife (for example, 'Boavis wife'), but it is unclear precisely what these arrangements involved, particularly as the women were not named individually. Nor can we be sure of their social status or economic situation, or whether they were supposed to be the children's full-time guardians, or even parents. Presumably, as parties to the reciprocal relationships described in Chapter One, they were poor women paid by the corporation to look after vulnerable children.⁹⁴ However, most striking is the fact that the children were simply 'seene and allowed' by the Court, and that their situation

⁹⁰ As we will see, it would be this very Court that was responsible for running Anguish's Hospital after his death: See below, pp. 36-7.

⁹¹ For more on the corporation's inclination towards institutional responses to social problems see: Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', pp. 65-9.

⁹² He first became involved in politics in constable in 1571, as constable for Fyebridge Ward: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, p. 4. This was one year after the Census of the Poor had highlighted the shortcomings of existing social policies: Griffiths, 'Inhabitants', pp. 64-5.

⁹³ *MCB*, 1603-1615, (1611) f. 330.

⁹⁴ See above, pp. 9-12.

was not apparently remedied in any way.⁹⁵ As we have seen, early modern civic authorities were increasingly concerned with the welfare of children, but, in Norwich at least, it seems that they were powerless to provide many of them with any further support. Particularly in Coslany, the hub of industry situated over the water, with its striking mixture of rich, poor and alien populations, exposure to the city's social problems would have been all the more extreme. Without doubt, Anguish's involvement in the politics of Norwich, as both an alderman and as mayor, helped to formulate his plans to found the Boys' Hospital. Had any events in his personal or family life helped to shape his bequest?

Throughout his adult life, Anguish was revered both publicly and privately. When he entered his mayoralty, the citizens of Norwich gathered in a large crowd, seemingly enthused by the prevailing view of him as a generous and fair man. Certainly, he was popular. During the ceremony, there was a great display of fireworks when several people were killed in the crush, presumably as a result of the general hysteria. Henceforth, fireworks were banned on any feast or guild day in Norwich.⁹⁶ Anguish was also apparently loved and respected in his private life. In his will, he requested that his executors provide £10 at least for 'some handsome and playne monument' to be placed on the wall where he sat at church. His executors were the two youngest Anguish children, Thomas and William. His eldest son's John, Alexander and Edmund, supervised the will.⁹⁷ They ended up spending £20 on the monument, twice the amount stipulated by their father, and commissioned Nicholas Stone of Southwark, perhaps the best-known English sculptor of the seventeenth century, to

⁹⁵ Although one 'poore sicke childe' had 'six pence a weke allowed her more than before': *MCB*, 1603-1615, (1611) f. 330.

⁹⁶ Cozens-Hardy and Kent, *Mayors of Norwich*, pp. 70-1.

⁹⁷ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 199.

produce it (see Appendix B, Fig. 5).⁹⁸ Clearly, Anguish's children had a considerable regard for their father and were eager to honour his memory with a fine monument.

The reason for their solicitude is apparent from his will. Rarely, as historians, are we able to find much overt evidence of personal emotion in legal documents such as wills, but one request in particular made by Anguish suggests he was a man who cared deeply for his family, and especially his children:

I doe will and desire my saide loving wife, all love and friendshipp that ever hath byn betwixt us, that shee will always... be loving and kynde unto all hers and my children and especially unto her younger sones myne Executors, and that at the ending of her dayes... shee will deale equally and indifferently with what she leaveth behynde her amonge all her children and as their wants and neades shall requyre.⁹⁹

The importance that he placed upon the welfare of his wife and children went beyond the practical matter of financial support (with which they were rewarded handsomely!), to embrace the requirement that they would always care for each other after his death. While the bond between a father and his sons was by no means unusual in the period, such evidence casts further light upon the possible motives behind Anguish's hospital foundation.¹⁰⁰

Anguish's wealth and position did not protect his family from at least some of the problems encountered by the city's poor. As we have seen, he outlived seven of his twelve children, and his wife died shortly after him. The 'shortcomings' of early modern medicine meant that young children of all stations faced perilous early years. Death in childbirth, for example, remained common until anaesthesia and antiseptics

⁹⁸ J. Finch, *Church Monuments in Norfolk before 1850: An archaeology of commemoration* (BAR British Series 317, 2000) p. 89.

⁹⁹ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 194.

¹⁰⁰ Early modern fathers had increasingly closer relationships with *all* of their children, particularly younger sons. Thomas Fanshawe (d. 1601), for example, urged his three eldest sons to be 'natural loving and careful' in their treatment of their younger brothers and sisters after his death: Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 180.

became part of the medical repertoire.¹⁰¹ Judging by Anguish's monument, he lost several children at birth or in early infancy – at least two are depicted holding skulls. Furthermore, young children were far more vulnerable to the domestic accidents, epidemics and famines, and low levels of hygiene that threatened all levels of the social spectrum in early modern England.¹⁰² That Anguish had seen so many of his own children perish, despite their privileged background, perhaps increased his sympathy for the poor and sick children of Norwich – for what chance did the friendless orphan have in the face of so many hazards without outside assistance?

We must not, however, be too hasty in presenting such an uncritical analysis of Anguish's motives. Many of the accounts of his activities, both as mayor and as founder of the Children's Hospital, were written towards the end of the nineteenth century and during the early part of the twentieth century, at a time when public education had begun to flourish.¹⁰³ It is no surprise, then, that Anguish's role as the founder of a hospital specifically for children was singled out for praise. This rather anachronistic approach is, for example, particularly evident in one short description of Anguish's life, in which the authors suggest that 'his name is probably better known, *and rightly so*, than any of the old mayors on account of his beneficence in promoting the Boys' and the Girls' Hospitals.'¹⁰⁴ Likewise, Blomefield's account praises Anguish's 'charitable disposition', and also the 'pious disposition' of his sons who, as we will see, relinquished the Hospital grounds to the corporation.¹⁰⁵ Clearly, no small amount of civic pride and commitment to the idea of progress has gone into the creation of such histories. Indeed, the aforementioned tale of spectators being crushed

¹⁰¹ B. Jordan, *Birth in Four Cultures* (Eden, 1980), p. 96.

¹⁰² Rawcliffe, *Medicine and Society*, p. 3.

¹⁰³ M. Sanderson, 'Education since 1750', in *HN*, vol. 2, p. 296.

¹⁰⁴ Cozens-Hardy and Kent, *Mayors of Norwich*, pp. 70-1, [emphasis added].

¹⁰⁵ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 407.

in the hysteria of Anguish's ascension to mayor, from Cozens-Hardy and Kent's *Mayor's of Norwich*, has been played down as nothing more than a simple accident by another historian – the result of the congregation's general fright at the fireworks – not an expression of over-zealous celebration at welcoming Anguish as mayor.¹⁰⁶ A consideration of the role of this type of local hagiography in shaping the 'legend' of Thomas Anguish is necessary if we are to achieve a more balanced view of the man himself.

The quest for reputation, or 'civic fame', was important in this period, and we might ask if, during his life, Anguish *consciously* intended to create an image of himself as a kind, benevolent gentleman. Did he establish a hospital as a means of assuring his place among the worthies of Norwich? A desire for commemoration is evident in his will, in which he left around £60 to a variety of different people so that they could buy decent 'gownes or cloakes' the better to mourn him in.¹⁰⁷ Anguish, it would seem, wanted a suitably grand and memorable funeral in order to underscore his reputation as a philanthropist. One could argue that all the charitable bequests set out in his will, particularly that of the Hospital, were made with an eye upon posterity. Perhaps the Hospital had a political purpose, being designed to consolidate the authority of the Anguish family name and guarantee the place of his descendents in Norwich. Further, as we will see in Chapter Three, there was also a sacred motive to such philanthropy. Was Anguish trying to settle his account with God?¹⁰⁸

It is certainly interesting to note that his surviving sons were very supportive of his plans to found the Children's Hospital. His will made provision for William to occupy the property in St Edmund's parish before handing it over to the community 'after the

¹⁰⁶ M. J. Armstrong, *History and Antiquities of the County of Norfolk* (10 vols. Vol. 10, Norwich, 1781), p. 159.

¹⁰⁷ Will of Thomas Anguish, ff. 191, 194.

¹⁰⁸ See below, pp. 42-3

feast of St Michael the Archangel [a] full tenne yeares after my death'.¹⁰⁹ However, the land was surrendered by William and his brothers straight away and a start was made on the Hospital before 1620, when a code of rules and orders was drawn up.¹¹⁰ It was opened on the first day of 1621, fewer than four years after Anguish's death.¹¹¹ His two elder sons followed in his footsteps, becoming involved in the politics of seventeenth-century Norwich; Alexander and John both served as aldermen, and also attained to the position of mayor, in 1629 and 1635 respectively.¹¹² The family tradition of concern for the needy was clearly maintained. In October 1625, Alexander travelled to London to petition the King, on behalf of the city, for financial support to put the sick poor back to work after a particularly virulent outbreak of plague.¹¹³ He was treasurer for the Children's Hospital at the time of this outbreak, and witnessed eight of the children perish.¹¹⁴ Whether or not Anguish had aimed to perpetuate his own reputation by founding the Children's Hospital, it is undeniable that the project was supported zealously by his sons and the civic community.

Perhaps the most uncontentious observation that can be made about Anguish is that he died a wealthy man. Although it is impossible to calculate precise figures on the basis of his will, it appears that he was worth roughly £1850 at his death, in addition to yearly rents well in excess of £75 from the five Norwich properties, at least, that he owned (see Appendix B, Fig. 6). This sum does not include the value of the many material possessions that he owned, among which were quantities of furnishings and

¹⁰⁹ *BHFC*, lines 21-2

¹¹⁰ The relationship between the Anguish children is typical of the period. Certainly, Lawrence Stone was well off the mark when suggesting that 'primogeniture inevitably created a gulf between the eldest son and heir and his younger brothers...': Stone, *Family, Sex and Marriage*, p. 87.

¹¹¹ W. Hudson and J. Tingey (eds.), *The Records of The City of Norwich*, (2 vols., vol. 2, Norwich, 1906), pp. cx-cxi.

¹¹² Alexander was alderman for St Stephen's Ward, and John for St Peter Mancroft Ward, for large parts of the seventeenth century: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, p. 4.

¹¹³ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 3, p. 373.

¹¹⁴ *BHAB*, 1625-6.

numerous cloaks and gowns. Put crudely, Anguish was able to give so much to the community because he *had* so much to give. At no point does it seem that his wife or children ever had to go wanting as a result of his charitable endeavours. On the contrary, his wife and, particularly, his children benefited handsomely from his will.

John, presumably Anguish's eldest son, was given the lease to the shop where his father had traded as a mercer, including all the stock, fittings and furnishings that came with this property in Tombland. Essentially, the business was handed down from father to son.¹¹⁵ John received £50 in cash from his father, and was also promised a further £200, should he enter into equal partnership with his younger brother, Thomas, for at least two years. The welfare of Anguish's younger children was clearly one of his chief concerns, underscored by the fact that John faced a £140 penalty if he did *not* go into business with his younger brother when the latter came of age.¹¹⁶

It would appear that young Thomas was his father's favourite.¹¹⁷ As well as the promise of an equal partnership in the family firm, he had already received a loan of £500 during Anguish's lifetime to help him better 'begynn the world with', and yet he only repaid £200. The will wrote off the outstanding debt on the condition that Thomas helped to support his mother, Elizabeth, with weekly payments of 6s. 8d. for the rest of her life, or a one off sum of £100.¹¹⁸ Further to this, Thomas was bequeathed *another* property, which his father had purchased for him in Tombland, presumably as a place to live when he came of age.¹¹⁹ These bequests were by no

¹¹⁵ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 192. It was common practice among the landed classes in the period for the eldest son and heir to maintain his fathers estate and, often, inherit his business: Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 179.

¹¹⁶ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 192.

¹¹⁷ It was not uncommon for fathers to have a closer relationship with their younger children in the period, as they were less bound by law and custom than with their heirs. 'Indeed, men often loved a younger son or sons better than the heir': Houlbrooke, *English Family*, p. 180.

¹¹⁸ Will of Thomas Anguish, f. 193.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 193.

means uncommon, but demonstrate the fact that Anguish was wealthy enough to support his children before making the endowment of the Hospital.¹²⁰

The Endowment

Anguish's endowment comprised the 'howses, yard[es] and grownd[es] with ther appurten[a]nc[es]... lyeing and beinge in the Parish of St. Edmond of ffishergate,' which, as we have seen, were to be occupied for the decade following his death by his youngest son, William.¹²¹ The extent of the property remains unclear, but in places we can make an informed guess. The fact that the houses were to be converted into a hospital would suggest that they were bigger than an ordinary family home, or the other properties which Anguish bequeathed in his will. The Foundation Charter contains a brief description of the land itself, which conveys a good impression of its size:

... it lyeth and abutteth upon the com[m]on Drayne and Dyke, in the greatest parte toward the North and in parte toward the North, upon the ground[es] of Hamond Thurston, somtimes Peter Petersons, and also abutteth upon the Kinges high way in the greatest parte toward the South, and alsoe in parte upon a parte of the West parte of the houses or howse formerly given by my will unto my said Sonne William Anguish. And it abutteth in all upon the howses and growndes of Haman Thurston, sometymes Peter Petersons towards the East, and likewise it abutteth in all upon the howses and grownd[es] of me Thomas Anguishe before in this my will given and bequeathed to my said Sonne William toward the West.¹²²

Clearly, the buildings that would become the Hospital stood on a substantial piece of land. The houses themselves were also 'large, spacious and new builte and [had]

¹²⁰ Thomas the younger made similar bequests himself when he died in 1622, like the £500 he left at the Guildhall for his son Francis, to be collected when the latter turned twenty one: TNA, prob/11/140, Will of Thomas Anguish Jr., f. 145.

¹²¹ *BHFC*, lines 10-12.

¹²² *Ibid.*, lines 12-15.

many roomes'; enough, in fact, to allow separate quarters for boys and girls.¹²³ By Anguish's estimation, the property would accommodate 'fforty Bedd[es] at the least', as well as 'sufficiente Roomes beside for a Master, Dame and Servant[es] beside lowe Roomes to place them the said Children to worke...'¹²⁴ Moreover, it offered additional space for the children, presumably intended to number about forty, to engage in useful labour, such as spinning.

Thanks to William's generosity, the Hospital opened its doors with remarkable speed, but, had this not been the case, Anguish was adamant that the property should, in some way, be employed to alleviate the plight of the poor, sick and diseased children of Norwich. He stipulated that, if the houses were found unsuitable for their intended purpose, then the rent should contribute towards the cost of equipping a 'place more conveniente within the Citty'¹²⁵ Although this was not to be the case, the provision offers an interesting insight into the extent of Anguish's desire to help the poor children of Norwich, if not through the gift of a hospital, then in some other way.

A combination of concern and pragmatism resulted in the number of stipulations regarding the general running of the Hospital that Anguish recorded in his will. Although it was to be managed by the Mayor's Court, Anguish's will suggests that he had a personal vision of how and why he wanted the Hospital to function. It was to take in children 'that be very poore and have not freindes to helpe them' from the age of five, six or seven.¹²⁶ They were to stay until they reached the age of fourteen or fifteen, during which time they would be taught 'accordinge to their disposic[i]on' by a master and dame, or other teachers, who were to be employed at the discretion of

¹²³ *Ibid.*, line 37.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, lines 40-2.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, lines 49-55.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, line 38.

the Mayor's Court.¹²⁷ When the children were discharged, they should 'be fittinge for service or able to maineteyne themselves by their workes.'¹²⁸ Clearly, the suggestion made in the previous chapter that early modern society recognised the economic value of healthy children was correct.¹²⁹ This is particularly apparent when we consider Anguish's insistence that only children 'borne and brought up in this City of Norwich' were to be admitted into the Hospital, for it was not economically viable for the corporation to support those who were not their responsibility.¹³⁰ It is clear that Anguish intended to found a place where the poor children of Norwich could be rehabilitated from a young age, so as not to be, or become, a continual drain on the common purse.

What makes the endowment of Anguish's Hospital so interesting is that, unlike Christ's Hospital, its counterpart in the capital, it was solely the result of private philanthropy. As we have seen, Christ's was founded as a result of social and religious pressures on the civic authorities, whereas Anguish's sprang from his initiative alone.¹³¹ Both hospitals were subsequently sustained by private donations, Christ's being the principal beneficiary of the Londoners' generosity in the early Stuart period.¹³² More and more private capital was being given to the corporation of London for the specific purpose of ensuring the welfare and education of the city's children. Two such donors were Alice Middleton who, in 1589, left £500 to Christ's, and William Bennett whose bequest of £180 in 1609 supported the education of six poor boys to be chosen from his birthplace in Abingdon, Berkshire.¹³³ We will see in

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, lines 38-40.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, line 40.

¹²⁹ See above, pp. 8-10.

¹³⁰ *BHFC*, line 33.

¹³¹ Although civic authorities had recognised the need for such an institution for many years: *Ibid.*, lines 31-5; See above pp. 11-12

¹³² Jordan, *The Charities of London*, p. 212.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

the next chapter how Anguish's hospital followed a similar trend by consistently attracting support of this kind during its early existence and beyond.¹³⁴ However, the fact that it required such a remarkable individual endowment at the outset, whereas Christ's was founded as part of a public initiative, is in part a reflection of Norwich's smaller size and greater reliance upon private philanthropy.

The Hospital offers a prime example of one man's personal attachment to the city of Norwich and its youth. We have seen how Anguish was influenced by a significant increase in the number of private donations to the poor, particularly in London, and particularly for the education for children. He became more committed to institutional solutions for the problem of child poverty as a result of his time at the centre of the government of Norwich. He understood the perceived benefits of rehabilitating the poor and realised that it was especially desirable in Norwich, a city which, from personal experience, he had seen to be in desperate need of a less *ad hoc* approach to the care and training of orphans and other vulnerable children. As a father, he had come to appreciate first hand the dangers that confronted early modern children, having lost two of his own in infancy. He was a wealthy man who enjoyed the privileged position of being able to provide for his family while still being able to donate handsomely to the corporation. Duly appreciative of his generosity, the latter lost no time in implementing Anguish's wishes. By 1620, rules and ordinances had been drafted for the new Hospital and, on the first day of 1621, it received its first patients.

Chapter Three: The opening of the doors and the early years in the Hospital

June 1617

¹³⁴ See below, pp. 46-48

I doe suppose there may be found convenient chambers... for **fforty Bedd[es]** at the least and sufficiente Roomes beside for a Master, Dame and Servant[es]...¹³⁵

March 1620

And yt ys thought fitt that there shalbe **twenty children** placed there in the beginning...

June 1620

Tenn Children to be p[re]sently placed there...

October 1620

‘And yt ys thought fitt that **tenn Boyes** shalbe taken in... And hereafter **some gyrls** may be taken into the said howse, **if need shall require**.’¹³⁶

One might expect the Foundation Charter to be the earliest official document that relates to the Children’s Hospital. However, the fact that it was not drafted until 1628,¹³⁷ over seven years after the doors had opened, is indicative of one of the initial problems faced by the Hospital. In this period, civic authorities were required to obtain a permit for the acquisition of any houses or lands given over for public use, in accordance with the still operative terms of the thirteenth-century Statute of Mortmain.¹³⁸ Earlier expansion by the Church, which had too often assumed the ownership of property to the detriment of the royal exchequer, meant that the crown had then been keen to protect its interests. As a civic foundation, Anguish’s Hospital was not directly obligated to the monarch himself, but by seeking an official foundation charter in the name of the new King, Charles I (effectively making him the Hospital’s *de-facto* founder), the corporation could avoid having to pay to obtain a licence: a cost which many felt was excessive and outdated.¹³⁹ The very fact that the

¹³⁵ *BHFC*, lines 40-2.

¹³⁶ *MCB*, 1615-24, (March, June and October 1620) ff. 284, 298, 318.

¹³⁷ Sir William Borny received the sum of 20s. in the early part of 1628 for going to London to have the Charter viewed and sealed: *BHAB*, 1628-9.

¹³⁸ For a fuller explanation of the statute of mortmain and its implications for both lay and religious institutions see: S. Raban, *Mortmain Legislation and the English Church 1279-1500*, (Cambridge, 1982), esp. chapters. 2, 3 and 4.

¹³⁹ Hudson and Tingey, *Records*, vol. 2, pp. cx-cxi.

people of Norwich continued to acknowledge Anguish as the founder is testament to the respect and gratitude afforded to him.

What other problems did the Hospital face in its early years? How far did it meet Anguish's expectations? When it did not, *why* was this the case?

After the property had been formally relinquished by Anguish's children, work quickly began on bringing it up to the required standard. A wholesale rebuilding programme seemed necessary before it was considered viable and safe for children to be admitted into the Hospital. As Anguish only donated the property, the necessary capital required to fund these works would have to come from elsewhere, and did so in the form of several private donations from the city's eminent politicians. The first two entries in the Hospital's account book record the receipt of several of these private endowments into its treasury (Appendix B, Fig. 7). To fund the building work, a total of £46, from several sources, was contributed over all, from the likes of Hamond Thurston (Anguish's brother-in-law), Thomas Blossé and Thomas Shipdham.¹⁴⁰ All three were contemporaries of Anguish, having served in the Mayor's Court throughout the first half of the seventeenth century.¹⁴¹ The city's magistrates obviously supported the proposed Children's Hospital, and their continuing bequests would become a mainstay of its early history.

However, the very fact that successive donations were required illustrates the relatively modest scale of Anguish's original bequest. The amount of building work that was required to bring the property up to an accepted standard would suggest that it was either too small, or in a state of disrepair. In some respects, it seems that the

¹⁴⁰ Thurston donated £10, Blossé £30, and Thomas Shipdham 46s. 6d.: *BHAB*, first two entries. Apparently, Thurston's £10 specifically went towards the purchase of eight beds, but this is not recorded in the accounts: Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 408.

¹⁴¹ Blossé was alderman for Coslany Ward, the same ward as Anguish, from 1607-32, and mayor in 1612; Shipdham was alderman for Fyebridge Ward from 1620-1642, and mayor in 1631; and Thurston was a councillor for Northern Ward from 1615-17: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, pp. 20, 138, 152.

work was intended to increase the size of the property. ‘Two skeppes’ were purchased, along with bricks, sand (over eighty loads), clay, tiles and ‘lyme’; and the work of a number of labourers was required.¹⁴² One of them, Henry Kettle, received pay for over twenty days’ worth of labour.¹⁴³ Other labourers simply helped in ‘repairinge the aforesaid house,’ which was not yet habitable.¹⁴⁴ It lacked adequate heating and ventilation, which were both deemed essential in any medical institution of the period. Over £5 was spent on the ‘making up of a new chymny in the said howse’, which would suggest that the administrators of Anguish’s Hospital understood miasma theory; a ubiquitous medical concept of the period.¹⁴⁵ Clearly this was a place dedicated to health, not just rehabilitation and learning.

The Mayor’s Court controlled the governing body of Anguish’s Hospital and was, in the first instance, responsible for making the decisions that directly affected its administration. For example, the Court chose to admit just ten boys and two girls when the hospital first opened its doors in 1621.¹⁴⁶ Its members also elected the Hospital’s governing body, a group that would be known as the Surveyors of the Children’s Hospital.¹⁴⁷ They represented the Hospital at meetings of the Mayor’s Court and were responsible for administrative matters involving the payment and duties of the keeper, as well as the admission and discharge of inmates, their care, diet, education and general conduct – the Surveyors were essentially the Hospital’s

¹⁴² *BHAB*, first and second entry.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, second entry.

¹⁴⁴ For example, M[aster] Edmund Costlynge received £4 for work ‘toward[es] the repairinge of the aforesaid house’: *Ibid.*, first entry.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, second entry. Miasma theory suggested that ‘bad-air’ spread disease. Its avoidance, using chimneys and high ceilings, ensured the optimum health of patients in late-medieval and early modern hospitals. See: Rawcliffe, *Medicine for the Soul*, (pp. 41-3, 55-64). For its inclusion in seventeenth-century advice literature see: A. Wear, *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680*, (Cambridge, 2000) pp. 200-1.

¹⁴⁶ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 319.

¹⁴⁷ It was eventually settled upon that the Surveyors would consist of the mayor, two justices and two aldermen. The longest serving one of each would be replaced yearly: *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) ff. 298, 319.

managerial body.¹⁴⁸ Their decisions were recorded in the various rules and ordinances that they were frequently required to draft by the Mayor's Court, as in 1631, for example, when they were charged with drawing up a contract for the employment of a new keeper, John Stone.¹⁴⁹

It would seem that one had to be an alderman to be eligible to serve as a Surveyor of the Children's Hospital. However, Anguish's sons remained heavily involved with the running of the Hospital, particularly as treasurers. Alexander oversaw the accounts from 1624 until 1629, after which his brother John took over for two years (see Appendix B, Fig. 8).¹⁵⁰ Their desire to remain so closely involved further suggests that they felt a significant amount of respect, and no small manner of obligation, towards their father.¹⁵¹ No doubt the Anguishes wished to remain associated with a project that bore their name, but we must recognise that considerable financial experience and commitment were also required on their part.

The Hospital's first keeper, Christopher Giles, was chosen in December 1620, shortly before the opening of the doors at the beginning of January.¹⁵² At first, fourteen boys were admitted.¹⁵³ As the quotes that precede this chapter demonstrate, this number changed several times throughout 1620 and was well below the potential forty inmates that Anguish had wanted. As one of the fundamental differences between Anguish's expectations and the eventual reality of the Hospital, this discrepancy warrants further examination.

¹⁴⁸ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 34.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 185. These ordinances were delivered on 30 June 1632: Sasche, *Minutes 1632-5*, p. 15.

¹⁵⁰ It was not until 1630-31, when Thomas Atkyn took over, that the Anguishes monopoly on keeping the Hospital accounts was broken: *BHAB*, 1630-1.

¹⁵¹ See above, pp. 23, 26-7.

¹⁵² *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 325.

¹⁵³ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620/1) ff. 329-31.

Firstly, there might have been insufficient funds to maintain the number of children that Anguish had hoped to accommodate. The first two entries in the accounts show that all the available cash was spent on the building works described above, and, as we have already noted, Anguish only left property, not money, to the corporation.¹⁵⁴ If no further capital was forthcoming, the Surveyors could only admit those children that they could afford to support. The very fact that the £10 donated by Hamond Thurston only covered the cost of eight beds would suggest a financial shortfall.¹⁵⁵ Certainly, Blomefield believed that more children were received over time as revenues increased.¹⁵⁶ One wonders if it was these early financial constraints that prevented the Mayor's Court from admitting more than seven of the twelve children presented to them in June 1631.¹⁵⁷ Seemingly, numbers continued to prove a contentious issue for the Hospital's administrators, even a decade after it opened. However, the citizens of Norwich made handsome endowments on the Hospital, and the accounts show that there *was* than enough money to sustain the children once they were admitted.¹⁵⁸ Still, to some degree at least, cash flow posed a problem for the Surveyors in the early years, although one wonders if this was a deciding factor in preventing the admission of forty children, as Anguish had first wished.

The Surveyors might have admitted fewer children because the property that Anguish donated was not big enough. More likely, however, is the probability that the corporation did not utilise all the available parts of the estate so that the rents from the rest of it could be deployed to fund the maintenance of the inmates.¹⁵⁹ At all events, rents from adjacent tenements held by the Hospital came to represent a significant

¹⁵⁴ *BHAB*, first and second entry.

¹⁵⁵ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 408.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.* p. 412.

¹⁵⁷ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 160.

¹⁵⁸ Even by 1625, the Hospital had arrearages of over £23: *BHAB*, 1625-6.

¹⁵⁹ This idea was proposed in October 1620: *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 319.

portion of its income.¹⁶⁰ A desire to husband resources might also have been the reason why girls were not initially admitted into the Hospital. When they finally gained entry, it was in completely separate grounds, in a completely separate institution. Robert Baron (d. 1649) was the first to donate money for a Girls' Hospital, which functioned until 1802 and is most often referred to as Baron's Hospital.¹⁶¹ The very fact that it was boys who were admitted rather than girls, however, is indicative of the attitude towards homeless boys that prevailed in the period, and which has been discussed in Chapter One.¹⁶²

On the other hand, it may be that levels of disorder in seventeenth-century Norwich were not quite as high as the authorities liked to claim.¹⁶³ Taking in fourteen orphan boys can hardly be considered a viable solution to the reputed problem of uncontrollable 'begging crewes camped at everie mans dore.'¹⁶⁴ In fact, the number of boys in the Hospital never seems to have risen above fourteen in the first fifteen years of its existence.¹⁶⁵ Given this modest outcome, we might even suggest that the corporation was more interested in appearances than action, and that, in supporting the Hospital, it wished to consolidate Norwich's reputation as a forward-thinking city in its attempts to deal with social issues. Even though it operated on a much smaller scale than Christ's, Anguish's Hospital helped to underscore Norwich's position as the second city in the realm.

The historian Edward Seidler has suggested that, before the eighteenth century, 'it would not be correct to call any institution of the Christian social service system a

¹⁶⁰ See below, pp. 46-47

¹⁶¹ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 450; Baron continued the tradition of magistrates making endowments to the children's charities. He was alderman for St Giles Ward from 1643-9 and mayor at his death in 1649: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, p. 13.

¹⁶² See above, p. 6.

¹⁶³ See above, pp. 8-9

¹⁶⁴ NRO, NCR, 20c, Mayor's Book of the Poor, 1571-9, f. 1.

¹⁶⁵ *BHAB*, 1620-1635.

‘hospital’ as we understand the term today... [They were] never conceived as institution[s] of medicine. [They] belonged, rather, to the Church.’¹⁶⁶ From this perspective, it might be misleading to refer to the subject of *our* study as a ‘Hospital’, not least in view of its obvious similarities with a school or orphanage. But, of course, this would be entirely to ignore the assumptions of the period. In response to these claims, we should examine exactly what was provided for the physical health of the children in Anguish’s Hospital, in order better to understand and define its objectives.

One point that can be made without contention is that, consistently, each child in the Hospital cost £4 per year, which was paid to the keeper, for their ‘diet and maintenance.’¹⁶⁷ In 1624, for example, when there were eleven children in the Hospital, the Surveyors paid £11 ‘to John Everard, keeper of the said howse, for the diet & maintenance of the said children for the quarter to end at the ffeast of the nativity of S[aint] John Baptist 1624, as by warrant appeareth.’¹⁶⁸ As the number of children in the Hospital changed, so too, proportionately, did the amount of money provided for their support, though it always remained £4 per annum for each child. In 1629 and 1630, for example, the Hospital only contained ten and nine inmates respectively, and the same amount sufficed for each child’s diet.¹⁶⁹ They were to be given bread, butter and cheese throughout the week, but on Sundays, Tuesdays and Thursdays they ate beef and pottage.¹⁷⁰ The positive somatic effect that a change in diet would have had on these poor children cannot be overstated, even in a modern context. But, in the period in question, diet remained ‘the first instrument of medicine’. Medical theory maintained that food was cooked in the stomach, before its

¹⁶⁶ Seidler, ‘Children’s hospitals’ in *HHH*, pp. 181-2.

¹⁶⁷ *BHAB*, passim. This was decreed by the Court in December 1620: *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 325.

¹⁶⁸ *BHAB*, 1624.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1629/30: By this point, the diet and maintenance bill was shared by two funding agencies. Three quarters was paid by the Hospital, while the other quarter was drawn from Terry’s Chest, a sum of money left to the city for philanthropic purposes by a former mayor.

¹⁷⁰ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 320.

nutrients were transported around the body to aid growth, life, movement and general wellbeing. A good diet, as part of a well balanced *regimen*, ensured the health of the children in the Hospital.¹⁷¹ Clearly, the Surveyors subscribed to the predominant scientific beliefs of the period.

A substantial part of the Hospital budget was also earmarked for the supply and proper care of clothing for the children, many of whom would have worn dirty rags. In 1624, the Surveyors spent about £7 on providing them with decent clothes. The following year, they spent £3 on caring for these clothes and purchasing more where necessary. By 1628, the Hospital treasury allocated, on average, around £4 a year for clothing. As well as purchasing new apparel, this budget allowed for the cost of repairing the children's clothes, a job for which one civic official was responsible: M[aster] Rob[er]t Gedge, swordbearer, often received between £3 and £5 yearly for 'mendinge the Clothes of the said Children.'¹⁷² Sometimes, churchwardens from the children's parish of origin were responsible for providing them with garments.¹⁷³ In common with a regulated diet, clean clothes would also have had a positive effect on the physical health of the poor children, but the introduction of a uniform makes Anguish's Hospital seem much more like an educational or rehabilitative institution. Just like the children admitted to Christ's, who wore the now-famous blue coats, the children in Anguish's Hospital were surely admired in their uniforms by the citizens of Norwich.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ For more on the *regimen sanitatis* see: Rawcliffe, *Medicine and Society*, ch. 2; C. Bonfield, 'The Regimen Sanitatis and its Dissemination in England c. 1348-1550', (Ph. D thesis, University of East Anglia, 2006), passim.

¹⁷² *BHAB*, yearly: For example, Gedge was paid £3 8s. 3d. between 1623 and 1624.

¹⁷³ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 160.

¹⁷⁴ Blunden, *Christ's*, pp. 8-9.

The Surveyors also provided an oven, for which ‘14 redd tiles’ were purchased in the early part of 1624.¹⁷⁵ The construction of an oven is also indicative of the quality of the food that was prepared for the children, possibly on the advice of an apothecary.¹⁷⁶ The importance of a properly cooked diet was recognised at all levels of society by this date. Indeed, as early as the fifteenth century, the poet John Lydgate had reminded the populace of the negative effects of consuming raw meat, unwholesome wine and ‘heavy’, indigestible bread:

For helthe of body keep fro cold thyn hed,
Ete no rawe mete, take good heed herto,
Drynk holsom wyn, feede the on lyht bred...¹⁷⁷

The average outgoings of the Hospital in its early years were around £57. Of this, £48 was paid to the keeper for the diet and support of the children, over £3 was spent on coal, and just under £3 on clothes. The rest generally went towards the necessary repairs and building work on the house.¹⁷⁸ Although it was not a ‘hospital’ by modern standards, in that no physician or surgeon was retained, there is no doubt that it subscribed to the tenets of early modern medicine wherever possible, in terms of diet and hygiene.¹⁷⁹ The employment of a keeper without professional medical *training* should not be regarded as a lack of medical understanding. In a period of increasing literacy, accompanied by growing demand for the production of medical texts in the vernacular, specialists in the treatment of children who did *not* possess a formal education were much more active than their university-trained counterparts.¹⁸⁰ It is likely that every keeper of Anguish’s Hospital had read and understood at least one or

¹⁷⁵ *BHAB*, 1623-4.

¹⁷⁶ Although there is no direct evidence to suggest the employment of an apothecary until the eighteenth century, this is not to say that one was not consulted on a casual basis from the 1620s: Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 413.

¹⁷⁷ John Lydgate, *The Minor Poems: Secular Poems*, ed. H. D. MacCracken, (Early English Text Society, CXCII, 1939), p. 703.

¹⁷⁸ *BHAB*, averages taken from 1624-5.

¹⁷⁹ While Christ’s employed a surgeon, generally drastic intervention in the case of children was rare in the period: Blunden, *Christ’s*, p. 6-7; Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 109.

¹⁸⁰ Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 109.

two medical texts, if only in the form of the growing number of simplified tracts that had become available from the fourteenth century onwards.¹⁸¹ Likewise, early conduct books regarding the treatment of children had become more readily available since the early sixteenth century.¹⁸² Under such circumstances, the absence of a qualified practitioner did not necessarily suggest an absence of medical care.¹⁸³

Anguish's Hospital also cared for the health of the souls of the children it admitted, this being a staple part of the early modern defence against physical, as well as spiritual, disease. By 1628, a teacher was employed by the Hospital, as Anguish had requested in his will.¹⁸⁴ Thomas Hill received 20s. per quarter.¹⁸⁵ While the education of children might not appear to reflect a sacred motive *per-se*, in this period it had profoundly religious connotations. Current medical theory dictated that the key to good health was balance and moderation in *all* walks of life; one could not survive simply on the strength of a healthy body. A healthy mind was also vital, and, of course, the argument followed that a life of vagrancy and idleness could cause irreparable damage. By rescuing the poor children of Norwich from such a destructive existence, and equipping them with the necessary skills that would aid their search for work, Anguish's Hospital made every endeavour to promote the spiritual health of its patients. The employment of a teacher also followed the example that had been set by Christ's in London, where both a writing master and a grammar school master had

¹⁸¹ Although the poorest part of the population remained illiterate, higher social groups, such as the gentry, yeomen and merchants, enjoyed increased literacy rates between 1558 and the 1640's. Publishers of medical tracts in the vernacular responded to this increasing demand with vigour. The Renaissance bred a desire to re-evaluate the work of the Classical authors, resulting in the production of countless translations. Between 1500 and 1600, nearly 600 different editions of Galen were published: Wear, *Knowledge and Practice*, pp. 40 n74, 43.

¹⁸² For example, see: T. Elyot, *The Boke Named The Governour* (first published 1531, reprint: London, 1970), passim; J. Goeurot, *The Boke of Chyldren* (London, 1546), passim.

¹⁸³ Pelling, *Common Lot*, p. 109.

¹⁸⁴ *BHFC*, lines 32-3.

¹⁸⁵ He was employed as the result of a warrant dated October 1628: *BHAB*, 1628-9, yearly thereafter. It was originally intended that a master should be employed to teach the children English for two hours every working day at the cost of £10 per annum: *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 284.

been engaged from 1552 at the significantly higher cost of £10 (the salary originally intended for the writing master at Anguish's Hospital) and £15 a year respectively.¹⁸⁶

The children also had a strong, more overtly religious, obligation to the benefactors of Anguish's Hospital. The set of rules and orders promulgated in June 1632 required the children to attend the benefactors' funerals dressed in their uniforms,¹⁸⁷ in an attempt to teach them the value of gratitude and respect for their superiors. The idea that patients could pray for the souls of their benefactors had been common since the Middle Ages, when it was hoped to expedite the latter's path through purgatory. Such a belief was reflected in the majority of late-medieval hospitals, not least the Hotel Dieu in Paris and The Savoy in London, which were decorated with Christian iconography to heighten the devotional atmosphere and ensure that patients' prayers were directed firmly towards the salvation of their earthly saviours.¹⁸⁸ Even in a Protestant society, commemoration and civic fame remained paramount and, with this in mind, the Surveyors of Anguish's Hospital paid out 13s. 4d. yearly to the minister at the parish church of St Edmund.¹⁸⁹ This agreement was the result of a gift given by John and Edmund Anguish, along with John Ward, in 1623.¹⁹⁰ They donated land on the condition that 'yearly for ever on the feast of Epiphany, there shall be a sermon in the afternoon in the Church of St Edmund... [in which] the names, gifts, and bequests of all the benefactors are to be read in the Church, out of a book which shall be kept for that purpose, to preserve their memories for all posterity.'¹⁹¹ Donations to Anguish's Hospital, and indeed the Hospital's very foundation, may be regarded as the fulfilment of the benefactors' perceived obligation to God, as well as to their

¹⁸⁶ John Watson and John Robinson were both employed when Christ's opened its doors in November 1552: Blunden, *Christ's*, pp. 2, 6-7.

¹⁸⁷ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 410.

¹⁸⁸ Rawcliffe, *Medicine for the Soul*, pp. 104-5.

¹⁸⁹ *BHAB*, 1623-4.

¹⁹⁰ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, pp. 408-9.

¹⁹¹ Although this does not accord with Sandra Cavallo's thesis: 'Motivations of Benefactors', p. 47.

fellow citizens. They also gave to ensure that their piety was made public, and that their philanthropy received due recognition.

At around the same time that Thomas Hill was employed, the Surveyors began paying a yearly sum of 5s. to Christofer Marshall for accompanying the children to church on a Sunday.¹⁹² Attendance and proper conduct at church were obviously crucial in a period when the Church was so closely aligned with the State and the concept of responsible citizenship. Clearly, the future welfare of these children was paramount, as time and money were invested in ensuring their moral, as well as physical, health. A place in Anguish's Hospital would thus, ideally, have set the child on the right road for physical *and* spiritual development. Not surprisingly though, there were also significant benefits for the founder and patrons.

As we have seen, Anguish was rather unspecific about the type of child that he wished to support in his Hospital. He only stipulated that they were to be 'very poore' and 'borne and brought up in this Citty of Norwich', though priority was accorded to the destitute orphan, for whom there was no hope for a brighter future: those that 'lye in the street[es], vaughtes, doores and windowes whereby many of them fall into greate and greivous diseases and lamenes as that they are fittinge for noe profession ever.'¹⁹³ Admittance into Anguish's Hospital was not a matter solely for the Surveyors to decide. During sessions of the Mayor's Court, those in attendance frequently discussed 'what boyes [were] fitt to be admitted into the Childrens Hospitall.'¹⁹⁴ There do not seem to have been any hard-and-fast prerequisites that made certain children more eligible than others; the members of the Court often simply chose a few of the most deserving from the larger groups presented to them. Such was the case in June 1631, when seven children were admitted from a potential

¹⁹² *BHAB*, 1628-9, yearly thereafter.

¹⁹³ *BHFC*, lines 33-34.

¹⁹⁴ Sasche, *Minutes 1632-5*, p. 72.

group of twelve.¹⁹⁵ No reasons were given for the selection of some but not others, which, from the historians viewpoint, represents a frustrating trend that continued into the following decade.¹⁹⁶

It was, however, sometimes necessary to prove that the child had been born or raised in Norwich, for the reasons stated in the previous chapter.¹⁹⁷ When the first fourteen children were admitted in 1621, the Court diligently recorded their individual parishes of origin.¹⁹⁸ This was the experience of John Burstall, ‘born and baptized in the parish of St Michael at Thorne’, who was admitted to the Hospital in February 1632.¹⁹⁹ Yet his case also shows that the Court was not as strict about the age of the children who were accepted as perhaps Anguish might have wished. Burstall was baptized on 24 June 1621, making him nearly eleven years old when he entered the Hospital.²⁰⁰

Perhaps the most uncontentious observation that can be made at this point is that the patrons who had given lands and money to the Hospital, often members of the Mayor’s Court, had a voice in deciding admissions. Indeed, some benefactors actually donated on the condition that they could play a part in the decision making process. This was certainly the case when John Anguish offered to settle part of the profits of the sale of his estate in Honing on the Hospital in 1622. He offered half of the £200 that he would receive to the Hospital treasury, providing that he, his wife, or anyone that inherited his name would be permitted to ‘name one child, born and dwelling in this city, to be kept in the hospital.’²⁰¹ In light of the limited information that is now

¹⁹⁵ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 160.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

¹⁹⁷ See above, p. 30.

¹⁹⁸ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) ff. 328-331.

¹⁹⁹ Sasche, *Minutes 1632-5*, p. 56.

²⁰⁰ Of the original fourteen children admitted to the Hospital in 1621, only four were within Anguish’s desired age bracket. Five were of unknown age, one was eight, one was nine, two were ten, and one was twelve. A full list was reproduced in the Mayor’s Court Book: *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) ff. 328-331.

²⁰¹ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 408.

available, it might be reasonable to assume that the support of a benefactor was a major factor in gaining admittance into the Hospital.²⁰²

There is some evidence to suggest that at least a few of the children who were admitted had been previously involved in the private arrangements for care discussed in Chapter One.²⁰³ In February 1631, for example, it was ruled that Thomas Atkyn, then treasurer of the Hospital, should ‘pay the widow Allen for the maintenance of Robert Falthorp.’²⁰⁴ It had been agreed that Falthorp should be admitted to the Hospital in the previous June but, for reasons unknown, he was not. As a result, the Hospital Treasury had to incur the cost of his support until he could be ‘received into the said howse.’ The reference to ‘the widow Allen’ suggests that Falthorp was a party to one of the aforementioned ‘reciprocal relationships’. Likewise, two of the children admitted in 1621 were then living with the widowed women – Jackson and Baldwin.²⁰⁵ In such instances, the Hospital may have been attempting, on the part of the authorities, to offer a better solution to come of Norwich’s existing social problems.

Perhaps the best way of understanding the ethos of the Hospital is to try to discover what happened to the children *after* they were discharged. This will be both indicative of the Surveyors’ motives, and of the extent to which they achieved their objectives.

As we have seen, Anguish intended the Hospital to be a place that could house and

²⁰² The idea that a donation might be given in exchange for a stake in the control of a hospital continued to be fashionable among the eighteenth-century voluntary hospitals. During this period, longer-term subscriptions were encouraged, and the extent of one’s generosity might allow them more control over administration or patient nomination: R. Porter, ‘The gift relation: philanthropy and provincial hospitals in eighteenth-century England’, in *HHH*, pp. 156-7. A similar model was also used in hospitals on the continent, where a benefactor might donate a bed in return for the right to choose one incurable patient to occupy it until their death. The Hospital of San Giovanni in Turin, for example, grew exponentially from 1752 as a result of such philanthropy: S. Cavallo, ‘Charity, power and patronage in eighteenth-century Italian hospitals: the case of Turin’, in *HHH*, pp. 101-118.

²⁰³ See above, pp. 9-11.

²⁰⁴ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 224.

²⁰⁵ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620/1) f. 325.

train young children, so that they could go into service or other employment after they were discharged. He clearly sought to address the pressing problem of childhood vagrancy, and the effect that it would have on the children's future prospects. We would expect, then, that the Hospital's administrators would have been supportive of the children after they were discharged, and would have helped them, as far as possible, to find work. In some cases, they clearly discharged these obligations. One entry in the account book certainly suggests that aftercare was high on the administrators' agenda. In 1625, the treasurer paid 14*s.* 2*d.* 'for a sute of Apparrell for Fokes when he was put forth app[re]ntice: 10*s.* For a hatt for him: 2*s.* For a paire of shoes: 14*d.* And for a paire of hoase: 12*d.* in all.'²⁰⁶ Fokes would have been one of the first children to be discharged from the Hospital (he was aged 10 when he was admitted with the first group of children in 1621²⁰⁷), and his case suggests that the Surveyors assisted him in learning a reputable trade. At the outset, it had been stipulated that, on being discharged, every child should be apprenticed, and that any master craftsman able to take on an apprentice (at the discretion of the authorities) *had* to do so.²⁰⁸

However, cases where so much practical support was offered proved rare. In August 1633, when Henry Munford and John Eastowe were discharged, they were simply sent back to the parishes 'from whence [they were] admitted.'²⁰⁹ In the case of Munford, the Court bluntly added, 'And so the hospitall is discharged of him.' The circumstances surrounding the admission of the seven children in June 1631, mentioned above, also suggest that the Surveyors saw their future employment as the responsibility of the parish wardens, who were to 'certify the names and age of the

²⁰⁶ *BHAB*, 1624-5.

²⁰⁷ *MCB*, 1615-24, (1620) f. 329.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, (1620) f. 284.

²⁰⁹ Sasche, *Minutes 1632-5*, p. 96.

said Children' on admission, and 'provide meanes for their employment at Fiften yeares of age.'²¹⁰ Regardless of Anguish's intentions, his Hospital did not intend to solve the problem of childhood vagrancy on a large scale, or even in more than a few individual cases, because the Surveyors rarely assisted the children in securing employment.

We should finally determine exactly how the Hospital was funded in the early years of its existence. Before 1632, when a significant amount of money was raised to purchase land from Lany Rowse, most of its income came from private rents and obligations that were paid yearly.²¹¹ These derived from land acquisitions made by the corporation, or private endowments from the citizens of Norwich. Every year, for example, William Boulter and Robert Fawcett paid £8 to the Hospital treasurer 'for the use of the £100 given by Samuell Garrard.'²¹² Like Terry's Chest, this sum constituted a loan fund, from which reputable citizens, such as Boulter and Fawcett, might borrow at a specified rate of interest, which, in this instance, was assigned for the benefit of the Hospital.

The Hospital relied mainly upon its rental income, which grew steadily thanks to the generosity of individual benefactors. Thomas Bilby paid a yearly sum of £24 on a property in East Derham,²¹³ which had been purchased by the Surveyors in 1624, at a cost of 103*li*, from a private donation made by Henry Fawcett.²¹⁴ This pattern seems

²¹⁰ Sasche, *Minutes 1630-1*, p. 160.

²¹¹ This point has been taken as a watershed because it signals the end of the formative period of the Hospital, before a number of purchases were made that affected its scale. Thereafter, the accounts become more detailed and formalised, reflecting the increased investment in the Hospital: *BHAB*, 1631, and thereafter.

²¹² *BHAB*, yearly.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, yearly.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1623-4.

to have been far from unusual. John Briggs and William Tompson also paid 40s. every year for the use of two other tenements acquired by the Hospital.²¹⁵

It also became common for the Hospital to raise money by employing the children to work for members of the local community. For the first time in 1627-8, while John Anguish managed the accounts, Humphrey Basey (then keeper) paid the treasurers over £5 ‘for the work and earnyng[es] of the children in the hospital.’²¹⁶ This quickly became an established practice, the sum received for the children’s work rising to over £10 in the following year and staying at a similar level thereafter.²¹⁷ Further developments followed under the next keeper, John Stone, which would suggest that individuals had the power to introduce their own initiatives for the running of the Hospital. Clearly, the children were expected to contribute to the local economy, as well as preparing for their future full-time employment.

By 1628, when Charles I granted the Hospital its foundation charter, it had a regular annual income of around £36, augmented by a sum of around £10, derived from the childrens’ labour in the community.²¹⁸ The rest came on an *ad-hoc* basis, as a result of the individual philanthropy of the citizens of Norwich. Both the Boys’ Hospital, and eventually the Girls’ Hospital, were fashionable institutions, favoured by the city’s rich elite. Shortly after Anguish’s death, Emmanuel Garret, goldsmith, bequeathed £100 to the Hospital treasury.²¹⁹ Likewise, in 1619, Henry Fawcett posthumously donated a similar sum of £100, which, as we have seen, made possible the purchase of the property in East Derham.²²⁰ The Girls’ Hospital was, indeed, a product of the philanthropy of Robert Baron, who, at his death in 1649, bequeathed £250 to the

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, yearly.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1627-8.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1628-9, yearly thereafter.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1628-9.

²¹⁹ In January 1618: Blomfield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4., p. 408.

²²⁰ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 3, pp. 369.

corporation for that purpose.²²¹ As might be expected, these men were all eminent citizens of Norwich, most of whom had served as members of the Mayor's Court.²²² As we saw in the previous chapter, this type of civic philanthropy was a following trend set by Londoners in their unparalleled levels of support for Christ's Hospital.²²³

The Children's Hospital, finally up and running by 1620, operated on a much smaller scale than was initially anticipated by Anguish, and at first intended by the Mayor's Court. In almost every aspect of its administration, some type of economy or readjustment seems to have occurred. Significantly fewer children were admitted, and they received less support on being discharged; the proposed ages at admission were not adhered to; and fewer staff were employed, at a lower wage (a master, dame and teacher were originally accounted for, but never materialised). There existed a long tradition of downscaling hospitals after their initial foundation throughout Europe. John Henderson has shown how many of the hospitals of Renaissance Florence, struggled with significant debts as a result of insufficient funds being available after their original investment. The Innocenti, one of the pioneering orphanages founded in fifteenth-century Florence, incurred a debt of more than 100 florins because it could not afford the necessary expenses required for building work, just as the administrators of Anguish's Hospital struggled with maintenance cost in the early years.²²⁴ However, downscaling did not necessarily signify a negative effect on an institution, as is illustrated by the Santa Maria Nuova, one of the great hospitals of late-medieval Florence. It was originally intended to provide for all of the poor of

²²¹ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 450.

²²² For Baron's dates, see above, p. 39 n. 27. Fawcett was alderman for Fyebridge Ward from 1614-19, and candidate for mayor in 1614, 1615 and 1618. Interestingly, Garret does not seem to have served as a magistrate: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, p. 59. A citizen need not, however, have been rich and powerful to make a donation to the Boys' Hospital. In 1624, John Dethick, the new husband of Anguish's widow, gave a lesser sum of £20, and Mr Andrew Martin, baker, gave £5: Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, p. 409.

²²³ See above, p. 30

²²⁴ Henderson, 'Hospitals', in *HHH*, pp. 78-9.

Christ, however, by the late 1320s, and particularly after the Black Death, the focus shifted to catering more for the sick so that, by 1374, paupers who had no physical disability were not allowed to stay for more than three days. The Santa Maria Nuova was regarded extremely highly by contemporaries for its ‘diligence and abundance’ in dealing with sick men and women.²²⁵ Thus, the changing aims of an institution simply reflect changes in circumstance, not necessarily some kind of shortfall. Anguish’s Hospital, notwithstanding these compromises, should be viewed in this context. The evidence suggests that, for the children who were admitted, it provided a safe, hygienic environment in which the fundamental principles of early modern medicine were followed.

Conclusion

John Hooker, writing in 1575, was addressing a national problem that, by the time of his death in 1601, was becoming a major consideration in the formation of local and national social policy.²²⁶ It is both alarming and apposite to remember that, in 2008, a similar call-to-arms is being made by a spokesperson for the Local Government Association.²²⁷ The ‘miserable state and condicion of many [of the] poore, sicke, and diseased Orphanes and Children’ of Norwich likewise inspired the city’s magistrates to seek a pragmatic solution at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The root of the problem? The children of Norwich, like the children of Exeter about whom John Vowell was specifically concerned, had ‘become unprofitable and burthensome [to] the com[m]on wealth.’²²⁸ Norwich was threatened by rising levels of disorder, with the looming spectre of Kett’s Rebellion continuing to haunt the city well into the seventeenth century.

²²⁵ Henderson, ‘Hospitals’, in *HHH*, pp. 70-1.

²²⁶ See above, pp. 1

²²⁷ See above, pp. vii

²²⁸ *BHFC*, lines 2 and 5

Nonetheless, Norvicians prided themselves on being the second city in the realm, with a reputation for leading the way in terms of social policy. The corporation was desperate to restore its tarnished reputation and did so by appearing proactive when dealing with disorder. The extent to which Norwich's streets were actually populated with feral children and vagabonds at the turn of the sixteenth century has, perhaps, been overstated. The corporation, or so the argument follows, consciously manufactured an image of latent disorder so that its attempts to solve the problem seemed all the more successful.

The city already boasted a rich history of institutional care for the sick poor, particularly with regard to children. At an individual level, the Mayor's Court arranged mutually beneficial relationships, in which many of the poor widows of the city were charged with the care of vulnerable and defenceless orphans. The children were given a home, and the women benefited from the assistance of a young child in an intensely physically demanding environment. The economic burden shouldered by such women was, at least partially, lifted. However, it had become increasingly evident that this *ad hoc* approach simply was not enough: a more comprehensive system of indoor relief was required. Local authorities would have to intervene further.

Thomas Anguish, a former mayor and Norwich merchant, would be the man to set the wheels in motion. Although social and economic factors played their part in increasing the necessity for further intervention to support the children of Norwich, Anguish is evidence that, in the founding of an institution such as the Boys' Hospital, a striking degree of personal commitment was necessary. He lived at a time when the giving of private charity had reached an unprecedented peak, particularly among Londoners, by whom Anguish was clearly influenced. He came from a comfortable

financial background and was able to make his bequest to the corporation without neglecting his family. He was a proud man, keen to cultivate an image of benevolence, but he was also eager to settle his account with God. So too were the men who would eventually run his Hospital, as we can see from their frequent commissioning of sermons of remembrance to be preached in honour of the benefactors. Without doubt, the Hospital benefited from a desire, on the part of the richer citizens of Norwich, to ‘preserve their memories for all posterity.’²²⁹ But there was also a more politically motivated element to early modern philanthropy, which is apparent in the early history of the Boys’ Hospital. An endowment on the Hospital might allow a patron to become involved in its administration, or have some control over admissions, a trend that would continue into the eighteenth century.

Like so many other institutions of the period, the Boys’ Hospital in its early years was characterised by compromise, particularly regarding the significantly smaller number of children who were admitted. These cutbacks were in no small part due to the inflated role of the patron. The benefits that one could enjoy as the result of one’s individual philanthropy were considerable, and those who made donations to Anguish’s Hospital certainly did so with an eye upon their own reputations and spiritual wellbeing. But this is not to say that the health and welfare of the children was not important.

In this respect, the experience of the children in the Hospital was typical of most early modern medical institutions. A combination of physical and spiritual therapies ensured that, in contemporary terms, they were better equipped to resist the threat of disease in a period before anaesthesia and antiseptics. To judge such institutions by modern standards of medical excellence, as Edward Seidler has done, is to negate any

²²⁹ Blomefield, *Norfolk*, vol. 4, pp. 408-9

such analysis. By these anachronistic standards, *of course* Anguish's Hospital will be found wanting, but it would be a mistake to underestimate its therapeutic role. The absence of a university-trained practitioner, or a comprehensive pharmacopoeia, *did not* suggest a lack of medical care to Anguish and his contemporaries. The very act of training the children to undertake reputable work was of considerable benefit to their physical and spiritual health, according to the scientific theories of the time. This is a topic which clearly merits further study, as constraints of space make it impossible to examine the medical initiatives subsequently adopted in the Hospital. Our intentions are to demonstrate that Anguish's Hospital was more than just a rehabilitative institution for the poor children of Norwich: it offered medical and moral solutions to a problem that was widespread and acknowledged at the time. Some idea of what an average day for the children entailed could further extend our understanding of the administration of early modern children's hospitals, and the archival evidence available in Norwich would allow such a study.

The Boys' Hospital in Norwich, then, came into being as the result of a combination of factors, which demanded a solution from the city's magistrates. They had 'for many yeares wished and desired to create, sett upp and found an Hospitall', and, with the aid of a generous individual bequest, were able to do so.²³⁰ It closed its doors in 1885, when the endowment's income was allocated instead towards helping boys in secondary education and apprenticeships. The aims of the resulting Anguish Educational Facility, established properly in 1952, would be a fitting place to draw our study to a close. While the medical element is all but gone, the similarities with the aims of the old Boys' Hospital are striking. Today, the administrators of the

²³⁰ *BHFC*, line 32

charity intend to 'make educational grants and provide other benefits to young people resident in the City of Norwich and certain adjoining parishes.'²³¹ Custom, it would seem, has returned full circle to favouring out-relief, but the desire to help those in need remains and, we hope, will continue to do so.

Appendix A - NRO, NCR 25e, Boys' Hospital Foundation Charter, 1628

CHARLES BY THE GRACE OF GOD

1. Kinge of England, Scotland, ffraunce and Ireland. Defendor of the faith etc;²³² **TO**
all to whome these presente shall come greetinge; Wee takeing into our princely
2. care and consideracon the miserable state and condicion of many poore sicke and diseased Orphanes and Children of poore parent within our Citty of Norwich
3. which is a place fitt to imploye and sett them on worke if in their tender yeares there were meanes to educate and nourish them untill such tyme as they should come
4. to be able to worke. ffor want whereof many of the said poore Children are either fostered in some rougish and wandring course of life or for wante of lodgeinge
5. and other meanes doe growe into incurable diseases, and soe become unprofitable and burthensome in the com[m]on wealth. And for that Thomas Anguish Esquire
6. late maior and one of the aldermen of our said Citty nowe deceased piously affected in that behalfe did heretofore make his last will and testamente in
7. writing bearinge date the two and twentieth day of June in the yeare of our lord one thousand sixe hundred and seaventeene the tenor whereof concerninge the

²³¹ The aims of the Anguish Educational facility can be found online at:
<http://www.charitiesdirect.com/charitydetail.asp?orgid=14453>

²³² Charles I was king from March 1625 until his execution and the subsequent emergence of the Commonwealth in 1649: C. R. Cheney (ed.), *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History* (first published: 1945, reprint: Suffolk, 1991), p. 26.

8. releife and maineten[a]nce of the said poore Children followeth in these word[es]:
Item, I doe alsoe give graunte and bequeath by this my last will and testamente
9. unto the Maior, Sheriffes, Citizens and Cominaltye of the Citty of Norwich and to their successors all that east, parte, porcion and residue of those my
10. howses, yardes and growndes with the apparten[a]nc[es] and not before given unto my said youngest Sonne William Anguish which I bought and purchased together with the
11. West parte of the said houses and growndes of Anthony Stile sonne and heire of Anthony Stile deceased as aforesaid stituate. Lyeing and beinge in the Parish of St.
12. Edmond of ffishergate in Norwiche aforesaid as it lyeth and abutteth²³³ upon the com[m]on Drayne and Dyke in the greatest parte toward the North and in parte toward the North upon the ground[es]
13. of Hamond Thurston somtimes Peter Petersons and also abutteth upon the Kinges high way in the greatest parte toward the South, and alsoe in parte upon a parte of the West parte of the
14. houses or howse formerly given by my will unto my said Sonne William Anguish. And it abutteth in all upon the howses and growndes of Haman Thurston sometymes Peter Petersons
15. towards the East, and likewise it abutteth in all upon the howses and grownd[es] of me Thomas Anguishe before in this my will given and bequeathed to my said Sonne William toward the West.

²³³ The bounds of land; the part at which it abuts on other lands: M. Woodley et. al. (ed.), *Osborn's Concise Law Dictionary* (tenth edition, London, 2005), p. 5.

16. All which last recited East parte is nowe in the occupacion and use of John Lath Glasier and Thomas fflower Tailor by vertue of a lease by me graunted unto them for the yearely Rente
17. and ffarme of fowerteen powndes by yeare att which said last recited howses, yard[es] and grownd[es] with ther appurten[a]nc[es] I doe by this my will and testamente in all good conscience
18. and good meaninge give graunte and bequeath unto the Maior, Sherifes, Cittizens and Cominalty of the Citty of Norwich for the tyme beinge and to their Successors only for and to the use
19. and uses hereunder and hereafter limited expressed and appointed by this my will and testamente and not otherwise to be conveyed or appointed, the Draynes wall and necessary unto the
20. west parte of the said whole purchase bought of Anthony Stile as aforesaid and before given by this my will unto my said sonne William Anguishe and his heires alwaies excepted and
21. reserved; **TO HAVE** and to hold all and singuler the last recited lastparte with the howses yarden and growndes with the appaten[a]nc[es] excepte before excepted from and after the feast
22. of St Michaell the Archangell full tenne yeares after my death unto the Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominalty and their Successors for ever onley for and to the use and uses hereafter
23. in this my will sett down limited and appointed and not otherwise be altered, converted or appointed upon payne of forfeitinge the said last parte of the said howses and growndes and yarden

24. unto the heires of me the said Thomas Anguishe the testator if either lawe or conscience shall or will permitt the same. **AND** in consideracion of this my guifte and bequeath of the said
25. lastparte as aforesaid I will bequeath and desire that when the said Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominalty of the Citty of Norwich and their Successors shall have, possesse and enjoy the said
26. last parte of the house and growndes aforesaid by vertue of this my last will and testamente which shall be at and from the feast of St Michaell the Archangell full tenn yeares from and
27. after my death that the same and every parte thereof be from that tyme and thencefforth letten to farme unto honest men or artificers that will pay the rente, But I will that the same
28. nor noe parte thereof be lett to farme above the terme and tyme of seaven or tenne yeares at the most upon t[h]e entry to be made for non payment of the rente to the said Maior, Sheriffes,
29. Cittizens and Cominalty or the Citty of Norwich aforesaid. And I and will bequeath that the same houses from tyme to tyme be alwaies kepte and mainteyned in good and sufficiente
30. reparac[i]ons for ever the same and every parte thereof to be paid and allowed out from the rente and profitt that shall growe due, arise and be received for the same without levinge
31. the same reparac[i]ons to be done by any the Ten[a]nt that shall dwell therein untill it shall please God to putt in the heart of some able and godly minded men or by the generall charge of the

32. Citty which hath byn from tyme to tyme for many yeares wished and desired to create, sett upp and found an Hospitall or conveniente place for the keepinge, bringinge up and teachinge of
33. younge and very poore children borne and brought up in this Citty of Norwich and specially such as for want lye in the street[es], vaughtes, doores and windowes whereby many of them
34. fall into greate and greivous diseases and lamenes as that they are fittinge for noe profession ever after whereby in compassion and greate pittie in a good conscience, although I doe
35. acknowledge my selfe the weakest amongg many either in ability in haveing many Children my selfe or in wisdom to directe for the keepinge and bringinge up of poore Children
36. notwithstandinge as a begininge to my small power I have given and bequeathed this said howse and grownd aforesaid to the end and intente aforesaid that if it shalbe thought fittinge and
37. conveniente I wish and desire that the same house and grownd beinge large, spacious and new builte and many roomes therein might after the said tenne yeares nexte after my death be
38. expired and imployed for the placeing of a Master and Dame or other Teachers to bringe up the Children that be very poore and have not freindes to helpe them from the age of five, six or seaven
39. yeares untill they shall attaine to fowerteene or fifteene yeares and soe to be taught in the meane tyme accordinge to their disposic[i]on as they may be fittinge for service or able to

40. maineteyne themselves by their workes. Upon the viewing of which said howses, I doe suppose there may be found convenient chambers in the same house for the placeing and lodgeinge Boyes by
41. themselves and Girles by themselves for fferty Bedd[es] at the least and sufficiente Roomes beside for a Master, Dame and Servant[es] beside lowe Roomes to place them the said Children
42. to worke in which use the said howses and growndes I doe referre the same unto the Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominaltye of the Citty for the tyme beinge to be ordered by them as in their
43. discrec[i]on shalbe thought most fittinge untill a better howse or Roome may be found out and appointed to the or the like use or uses. And if any house more fittinge than the said howses before by me
44. given to this use shalbe bought by the Citty or otherwise given and appointed by any other Godly disposed person or persons to the said or like use or uses before the expiracion of the said terme
45. of tenn yeares which shalbe at the feast of St. Michaell the Archangellfull tenn yeares after my death when as the Maior, Sherifes, Citizens and Cominalty of the said Citty shalbe solely
46. possest thereof by vertue of this my will and testament than then I will and bequeath that all and every parte of the said last parte of the said howses and growndes before by me given as
47. aforesaid to the use aforesaid that the same after the said terme of tenne yeares after the Mich[aelm]as next after my death I will from tyme to tyme shalbe letten to farme for the best Rente as aforesaid

48. and not above seaven yeares or tenn yeares to any one person or persons
whatsoever, and that from tyme to tyme the same howses and every of them be
kept and maineteyned in good and
49. sufficiente reparac[i]ons forever out of the Revenue and proffitt that shalbe from
tyme to tyme received for the same. And from tyme to tyme I will that the
Overplus of the Rente of the said
50. howses and growndes the same beinge from tyme to tyme repaired and kept by
order given unto the Citty Chamberlyn for the tyme beinge or unto any other
Officer appointed for the doeinge
51. thereof and not by the ffarmor at any tyme, that then I will if it shall not be
thought fittinge and found as aforesaid for the dwelling and keepinge therein of a
Master, Dame or Mistres and
52. Servant[es] for the good bringinge up, lodgeinge and well nurturinge of such
Children as shall there be putt to be brought up, taught and learned, that then I will
and bequeath that the Rente
53. thereof groweing and amountinge from tyme to tyme over and above the charges
of reparac[i]ons of the same howses to be deducted, allowed and abated as
aforesaid to be and remaine duely and
54. truely for and toward the better maineten[a]nce of clothing and bedding and
keeping of and for such poore Children as shalbe putt to be brought up in any
other place more conveniente within
55. the Citty after the said tenn yeares aforesaid be expired. And whereas alsoe within
a shorte tyme after the death of the said Thomas Anguishe and longe before the
expirac[i]on of the said

56. tenn yeares the sonnes of the said Thomas Anguishe did in their good and pious disposicion to speede, settle and further the said Godly and charitable guifte and intente of their said father, have
57. given their consente and suffered the Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominaltye of the said Citty freely to enjoye the said premisses soe devised to the uses in the said will menc[i]o[n]ed and as
58. aforesaid devised to the said Maior, Sheriff[es], Cittizens and Cominaltye of our Citty of Norwich, their heires and Successors. **AND WHEREAS** Thomas Tesmond²³⁴ late of our Citty
59. of Norwich, gentleman now deceased, did alsoe since that tyme out of his pious disposic[i]on to the furtherance of the worke soe begune by the said Thomas Anguishe make and declare
60. his last will and testamente in writinge bearing date the seaventh day of July in the yeare of our lord God one thousand, sixe hundred, twenty six [1626], the tenor whereof concerning the releife and
61. sustentac[i]on of poore children in the said Citty followeth in these wordes: Item. I give, devise and bequeath unto the said Mary my wife all my landes and Tenement[es] which I purchased of
62. Charles Rawlinges, gentleman, conteyninge by estimac[i]on threescore and nyne acres lyeinge in Bixley aforesaid nowe in occupac[i]on of Charles Osborne, Gentleman. To hold to her assignes
63. for and duringe the terme of her naturall life, and after her decease I will devise and bequeath the same landes and Tenement[es] which I purchased of the said Charles Rawlinges unto the said

²³⁴ Like the majority of the Hospital's patrons, Tesmond served in local government. He was both a constable and a councillor for Conisford Ward for the latter part of the sixteenth century before his death in 1626: Hawes, *Norwich City Officers*, p. 150.

64. Maiors, Cheriffes, Cittizens and Cominalty of Norwich and there Successors forever. To the intente that after the same shall come to there possession they shall forever yearely paye to the
65. Preachers of God[es] word which shall preach at the co[m]monplace in Norwich on the dayes observed for the memory of Kett[es] Campe, Bowries Conspiracy, the Gunpowder Treason and the coronac[i]on
66. day twenty shillings, that is to say to every of the said Preachers on every [of] the said dayes five shilling[es] i[m]mediately after the end of their Sermon and that all the residues of the issues and
67. proffitt[es] of my landes and Tenement[es] last above menc[i]o[n]ed shall for ever be employed toward[es] the mainten[a]nce of poore Orphan[es] and children whose parent[es] are not able to maineteyne them in the
68. new hospitall or house lately provided within the said Citty of Norwich for the educac[i]on of such poore Children whereby they may be kepte in the same hospitall forever hereafter, soe many
69. poore Children as the said issues and proffitt[es] of the said last menc[i]oned land[es] will maineteyne. **AND WHEREAS** divers other our loveinge subject[es] out of their piety and zeale to workes of
70. Charity, and esp[ec]ially to the Charitable worke aforesaid intended by the said Thomas Anguish, have given and bequeathed and many others doe intend to give and bequeath to the Maior, Sheriff[es]
71. Cittizens and Cominalty of our said Citty of Norwich divers land[es], tenement[es], good[es], chattlles, stock[es] and so[m]mes of money for the charitable purpose aforesaid. And for that the Maior, Sheriff[es],

72. Cittizens and Cominalty of our said Citty have already converted the said howses and premisses soe given and bequeathed, or menc[i]o[n]ed to be given and bequeathed, in and by the said last will
73. and testamente of the said Thomas Anguishe to the lodgeine, harbouringe and feedinge of such poore Children as in the said last will of the said Thomas Anguishe are menc[i]o[n]ed, and doe intend
74. the advancemente of the said pious worke with what speede they can. And soe from tyme to dispose and lay out all such legacie and legacies, so[m]me and so[m]mes of money, as shalbe given and
75. come to their handes for that purpose in purchasing and buying of landes, tenament[es] and herditament[es] and with the yearely revenewes and proffitt[es] of the same to maineteyne and kepe in
76. the said howses soe devised as aforesaid for that purpose by the said Thomas Anguish such and soe many of such poore Children menc[i]o[n]ed in the said will and such and soe many Officers
77. and other persons conveniente to be impoyed in their governemente and making their provision as the same revenewes will from tyme to tyme extend into. **WE THEREFORE**, for the better
78. furtheringe and establishinge of the pious intenc[i]ons aforesaid and for the full effectinge thereof of our esp[ec]iall grace, c[er]ten knowledge and meere moc[i]on, have give, graunted and by these p[re]sent[es]
79. for us, our heires and Successors doe give and graunte to the Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominalty of our said Citty and their Successors; that they the Maior, Sheriff[es], Cittizens and

80. Cominalty of our said Citty and their Successors, the said houses with the appurten[au][nc[es] soe to them given and devised by the said Thomas Anguish for the use and purpose aforesaid may have,
81. receive and enjoye to them and their Succesors forever according to the true intente and meaninge of the said will. The Statute for not putting of land[es] into mortmaine or any other Statue
82. or Provision to the Cont[ra]ry thereof notwithstandinge.²³⁵ And that the said Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominaltye and their Successors, the said mesuages²³⁶, land[es], tenement[es] and hereditament[es] to
83. them as aforesaid devised by the said Thomas Anguish and Thomas Tesmond for the use and purpose in there said will[es] expressed as aforesaid may have, hold, take and enjoye to them and there
84. Successors according to the true intente and meaninge of the last will and testament[es] aforesaid of them the said Thomas Anguish and Thomas Tesmond. The Statute of not putting of land[es]
85. into mortmaine or any other Acte or Statute or P[ro]vision whatsoever to the cont[ra]ry in any wise notwithstandinge. **AND FURTHER**, we of our especiall grace, certaine knowledge and meere moc[i]on doe will
86. and graunte to the Maior, Sherriffes and Cominalty of out said Citty that the said howses with the appurtenances soe given and devised by the said Thomas Anguishe and the yard[es] and growndes thereto

²³⁵ ‘Mortmain: The alienation of land to corporations, whereby the benefit of the incidents of tenure was lost because “a corporation never dies”. Land could not be conveyed to corporations except by statutory authority or by licence of the Crown’: Woodley et. al. (ed.), *Osborn’s Concise Law Dictionary*, p. 269. The Foundation Charter, seven years after the opening of the Hospital doors, prevented the corporation from having to obtain a licence of the crown. See above, pp 34-5.

²³⁶ A house, including gardens, courtyard, orchard and outbuildings: Woodley et. al. (ed.), *Osborn’s Concise Law Dictionary*, p. 264.

87. belonginge shalbe and contynewe for ever an Hospitall and place of sustentac[i]on, releife and maineten[a]nce of poore Children in such sorte as in the will is of the said Thomas Anguise is menc[i]o[n]ed. And
88. that the same beinge thus founded shalbe called by the name of the Childrens Hospitall in the Citty of Norwich of the foundac[i]on of Kinge Charles.²³⁷ **KNOW WE ALSOE** we of our
89. further grace, certaine knowledge and meere moc[i]on doe by these p[re]sent[es] graunte and give lycence, power and authority to all our subject[es] and leige people whatsoever that they and every of them
90. may give, graunte, sell, alien, devise, bequeath and convey for the Maior, Sheriff[es] Cittizens and Cominalty of our said Citty for [the] time beinge and their Successors' Mannors, Rectories, land[es],
91. Tenement[es], Tithes, Rent[es], Revenewes, Servic[es] and other Possessions, Reverc[i]ons, Remainders and Heriditament[es] whatsoever of the yearely value of three hundred pounds or under in our said Citty of Norwich
92. or elsewhere within our Realme of England over and beside the mesuages, howses, land[es] and tenement[es] soe as aforesaid given and devised by the said Thomas Anguish and Thomas Tesmond or either
93. of them although they or either of those howses be holden of us in Capite or otherwise and notwithstandinge there be noe lycence or alienacion for the same and not withstandinge the Statute of
94. puttinge land[es] or tenement[es] into mortmaine or any other Statute, Ordynance or Provision whatsoever. **AND WE** doe further give and graunte to the Maior, Sheriff[es], Cittizens and Co[m]i[n]alty

²³⁷ The Hospital continued to be referred to as Anguish's Hospital or the Boys' Hospital.

95. of our said Citty and their Successors our speciall lycence that they and their Successors may lawfully have, percewe and purchase to the charitable uses, intent and pruposes aforesaid such
96. other mannors, rectories, land[es], Tenement[es], Tythes, Revercions, Remainders, Services, Possessions, Revenewes and Heriditament[es] to the yearely value aforesaid or under, over and above the howses,
97. mesuages, land[es] and tenenement[es] soe as aforesaid given and devised by the said Thomas Anguishe and Thomas Tesmond or either of them as aforesaid of any our Subject[es] of leige people whatsoever
98. soe as alwaies the same be not held of us by Knight Service, in Capite or in otherwise in Capite by Knight Service.²³⁸ The said statute of not puttinge land[es] and Tenement[es] to mortmayne or any other
99. Statute, Acte, Ordynance or Provision or any other matter thinge or cause whatsoever to the cont[ra]ry thereof notwithstandinge. **AND** further of our speciall grace, certen knowledge and meere
100. mocion we have given and graunted and we doe by these present[es] give and graunte to and for us, our heires and Successors soe much as in us is to the Maior, Sheriffes, Cittizens and Cominalty
101. of our said Citty of Norwich that is shalbe lawfull to the Maior and Aldermen of the said Citty from tyme to tyme for the tyme beinge or the greater number of them alwaies and att all tymes
102. from henceforth when and soe often as to them it shall seeme expedient or neede shall require to ordeyne, constitute and make all such fitt, wholsome and honest ordynanc[es], Act[es], Constitucions and

²³⁸ Knight Service was a system by which lands were held of the King in exchange for a bond to perform military service or in some way protect the Crown where necessary: Woodley et. al. (ed.), *Osborn's Concise Law Dictionary*, p. 235

103. rules for the right governing. releivinge and mayneteyninge of the said poore Children to be nourished and kepte in the said howse called the Childrens Hospitall in Norwich as aforesaid as to them
104. or the greater number of them for the tyme being shall seeme meete and conveniente. And that the Maior and Aldermen of our said Citty for the tyme being or the greater number of them shall and
105. may from tyme to tyme at all tymes hereafter have full power and authority to make, create and ordeyne such and soe many Officers, Ministers or Governors of the said house to provide for and
106. governe the said Children as to the shall seeme meete and conveniente without ympeachmente of us, our heires or Succesors, or of our Justices, Escheators, Sheriff[es], Officers or other
107. Subject[es] whatsoever. Any Acte, Statute, Lawe or Ordynance heretofore made or hereafter to be made to the cont[ra]ry notwithstandinge. Soe as alwaies such Ordynanc[es], Act[es], Constitutions, Orders
108. and rules soe to be made by the Maior and Aldermen of our said Citty be not repugnante to the Lawes and Statut[es] of this our Realme of England or to our p[ro]rogative royall or cont[ra]ry to the
109. provision of any [of] the Doners of any mannors, land[es], Tenement[es], hereditamentes or other thing[es] given or to be given to any [of] the charitable uses before mencioned by the Donors thereof; **AND** further of
110. our speciall grace, certen knowledge and meere moc[i]on we doe give and graunte to the Mayor, Sheriff[es], Cittizens and cominalty of our said Citty of Norwich and their Successors that it shalbe

111. lawfull to the Maior and Aldermen of our said Citty from tyme to tyme for the tyme beinge or the greater number of them to admitt and receive into the said house called the Childrens Hospitall any
112. Childe or Children whatsoever borne in the said Citty or in the Suburbes or Hamlett[es] thereof being under the age of tenn yeares. And the same Child of Children or soe many of them as the
113. revenewes of the said howse shall and may extende unto for competente mainetenance shall there in conveniente manner susteyne, mayneteyne, educate, teach and instructe in learning, sett on worke
114. and otherwise dispose as to them shall seeme meete and conveniente. And the same Children and all other Officers of the said Hospitall shall from tyme to tyme, from yeare to yeare, from moneth
115. to moneth, from weeke to weeke or from day to day remove, displace and discharge and others in their places putt at their will and pleasure. Anie thinge herein before men[i]o[n]ed to the con[ra]ry thereof in
116. any wise notwithstandinge. **ALTHOUGH** expresse mencion of the true yearly value or certenty of the p[re]misses or of any of them or of any other guift and graunt by us or any of our Progenitors or
117. Predecessors to the said Maior, Sheriff[es], Cittizens and Cominalty of the said Citty of Norwich heretofore made in these p[re]sent[es] is not made or any Statute, Acte, Ordynance, Provision, Proclamac[i]on or
118. Restrainte heretofore had made ordeyned or p[ro]vided or any other thinge, cause or matter whatsoever to the cont[ra]ry thereof in any wise notwithstandinge. **IN WITNES** whereof we have caused these our

119. letters to be made patent. **WITNES** our self at Westmynster the eight and twentieth day of November in the fowerth yeare of our Raigne

Per bre de privato Sigillo

Wolseley

Primary Sources

R. Bucholz and N. Key, *Sources and Debates in English History, 1485-1715*, (Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004)

‘Robert Crowley on the Causes of Ket’s Rebellion’, 1550 as reproduced in Tawney and Power, *Tudor Economic Documents*

Thomas Dekker, ‘The Belman of London’ (London, 1608), in A. B. Grosart (ed.), *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 5 vols., (vol. 3, New York, 1963)

T. Elyot, *The Boke Named The Governour* (first published 1531, reprint: London, 1970)

R. Frostick, *The Printed Plans of Norwich 1558-1840: A Carto-Bibliography* (Norfolk, 2002)

J. Goeurot, *The Boke of Chyldren* (London, 1546)

W. Hudson and J. Tingey, *The Records of The City of Norwich*, 2 vols. (Norwich, 1906)

John Lydgate, *The Minor Poems: Secular Poems*, ed. H. D. MacCracken, (Early English Text Society, CXCII, 1939)

NRO, ANW22, MF/RO 312, w. 205, The Will of Thomas Anguish

NRO, NCC, will register, Mason, w. 243, The Will of Elizabeth Anguish

NRO, NCR, 20c, Mayor’s Book of the Poor, 1571-9

NRO, NCR 25e, Boys’ Hospital Foundation Charter, 1628

NRO, NCR, 25f, Boys’ Hospital Account Book, 1620/1-1688

NRO, NCR, 16a, Mayor’s Court Book 1603-15

NRO, NCR, 16a, Mayor’s Court Book 1615-24

J. Pound (ed.), *Norwich Census of the Poor 1570*, Norfolk Record Society XL (1971)

W. L. Sachse (ed.), *Minutes of the Norwich Court of Mayoralty 1630-1631*, Norfolk Record Society XV (1942)

W. L. Sachse (ed.), *Minutes of the Norwich Court of Mayoralty 1632-1635*, Norfolk Record Society XXXVI (1967)

R. H. Tawney and E. Power (eds.), *Tudor Economic Documents*, 3 vols (London, 1924), vol. 3

TNA, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, will registers, prob/11/140, The Will of Thomas Anguish Jr., 1622

John Vowell, alias Hooker, *Orders enacted for Orphans and for their portions within the citie of Excester*, (Exeter, 1575)

Secondary Reading

P. Aries, *Centuries of Childhood* (trans. London, 1962)

M. J. Armstrong, *History and Antiquities of the County of Norfolk* (10 vols. Vol. 10, Norwich, 1781)

F. Blomefield, *An Essay Towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk*, 11 vols, (esp. vols. 3, 4 and 5, Norfolk, 1806)

E. Blunden, *Christ's Hospital: a retrospect* (London, 1923)

C. Bonfield, 'The Regimen Sanitatis and its Dissemination in England c. 1348-1550', (Ph. D thesis, University of East Anglia, 2006)

S. Cavallo, 'The Motivations of Benefactors: An overview of approaches to the study of charity', in J. Barry and C. Jones (eds.), *Medicine and Charity Before the Welfare State* (London, 1991)

C. R. Cheney (ed.), *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History* (first published: 1945, reprint: Suffolk, 1991)

R. Cooter (ed.), *In the Name of the Child: Health and Welfare 1880-1940* (London, 1992)

B. Cozens-Hardy and E. A. Kent, *The Mayors of Norwich 1403-1835: Being Biographical Notes on the Mayors of the old Corporation* (Norwich, 1938)

D. Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997)

P. Elmer and O. P. Grell (eds.), *Health, disease and society in Europe 1500-1800: A source book* (Manchester 2004)

I. Fay, 'Health and Disease in Medieval and Tudor Norwich' (Ph. D Thesis, University of East Anglia, 2007)

J. Finch, *Church Monuments in Norfolk before 1850: An archaeology of commemoration* (BAR British Series 317, 2000)

A. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds.), *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Paperback, Cambridge, 1987)

L. Granshaw and R. Porter (eds.), *The Hospital in History* (London, 1989)

- P. Griffiths, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England 1560-1640* (Oxford, 1996)
- T. Hawes (ed.), *An Index to Norwich City Officers 1453-1835*, Norfolk Record Society LII (1986)
- J. Henderson and R. Wall, *Poor Women and Children in the European Past* (London, 1994)
- S. Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke 1996)
- J. Hooper, *Norwich Charities: Short Sketches of their Origin and History* (Norwich, 1898)
- R. Hope-Robbins, 'Medieval Manuscripts in Middle English', *Speculum*, 45 (1970)
- R. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700*, (London, 1984)
- R. Houlbrooke (ed.), *English Family Life 1576-1716: An Anthology from Diaries* (Oxford, 1988)
- B. Jordan, *Birth in Four Cultures* (Eden, 1980)
- W. K. Jordan, *The Charities of London 1480-1660: The Aspirations and the Achievements of the Urban Society* (London, 1960)
- C. Kazmierczak Manzione, *Christ's Hospital of London, 1552-1598: A Passing Deed of Pity* (London, 1995)
- M. C. McClendon, *The Quiet Reformation: Magistrates and the Emergence of Protestantism in Tudor Norwich* (California, 1999)
- M. Pelling, *The Common Lot: Sickness, Medical Occupations and the Urban Poor in Early Modern England*, (London and New York, 1998)
- I. Pinchbeck and M. Hewitt, *Children in English Society: Volume 1: From Tudor Times to the Eighteenth Century* (London and Toronto, 1969)
- J. Pound, *Tudor and Stuart Norwich*, (Surrey, 1988)
- S. Raban, *Mortmain Legislation and the English Church 1279-1500*, (Cambridge, 1982)
- S. X. Radbill, 'Pediatrics', in A. D. Debus (ed.), *Medicine in seventeenth century England : a symposium held at UCLA in honor of C.D. O'Malley* (California University, 1974)

- C. Rawcliffe, *Medicine and Society in Later Medieval England*, (Sutton Publishing, 1995)
- C. Rawcliffe, *Medicine for the Soul: The Life, Death and Resurrection of an English Medieval Hospital* (Sutton Publishing, 1999)
- C. Rawcliffe and R. Wilson (eds.), *Norwich Since 1550* (London, 2004)
- W. Rye, *Norfolk Families* (Norwich, 1913)
- R. Schofield and E. A. Wrigley, 'Infant and child mortality in England in the late Tudor and early Stuart period', in C. Webster (ed.), *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge 1979)
- E. Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (London, 1975)
- P. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1985)
- L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd, 1977)
- A. Wear, *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680*, (Cambridge, 2000)
- A. Wood, *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- M. Woodley et. al. (ed.), *Osborn's Concise Law Dictionary* (tenth edition, London, 2005)