

The Gospel of Poverty:
Poverty, Philanthropy, and Eighteenth-Century
British Literature, 1700- 1759

by

Salita N. Seibert

A dissertation submitted to the Department of English
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Literary and Cultural Studies

Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
USA
January 2016

Committee
Kristina Straub, Carnegie Mellon University, Chair
Richard Purcell, Carnegie Mellon University
Roxann Wheeler, Ohio State University

Abstract

The subject of my dissertation is British philanthropic literature, beginning in 1723 with Bernard Mandeville's controversial criticism of public charity and ending with Jonas Hanway, arguably the most famous figure in the eighteenth-century London charity scene, in the 1750s. Henry Fielding's novel *Tom Jones* (1749) and William Dodd's novels *The Sisters; or the History of Lucy and Caroline Sanson* (1754) and the posthumous *The Magdalen or, History of the First Penitent Prostitute* (1783) round out this project, which also considers sermons, economist treatise, histories, travel writing, reform proposals, and philosophical essays as philanthropic literature. The range of fiction and nonfiction texts, which I categorize as philanthropic literature, help answer crucial questions about how social institutions formed with the goal of assisting the poor actually reinforced social and economic inequality. Those questions include, how was poverty theorized as economic problems, social problems, or class problems? And how was philanthropy represented as an answer to those problems? How were the poor defined, proscribed, and confined by these different concerns? Finally, how were philanthropic institutions shaped by discourses of gender, class, and empire? During this period, the poor were consistently viewed as a threat to the existing social and economic order due to their laziness, ignorance, and criminal nature. The poor laws and workhouses, alongside charitable societies with their associated schools and hospitals, all sought to make the poor more socially useful through discipline, education, or a combination of the two. Over the course of the eighteenth-century, I argue, philanthropic writing expresses several important changes in the institutional mission and strategies of public charities. First, philanthropic literature move from adamantly rejecting any possible link between benevolence and personal gain to promoting charity using a combination of nationalistic, religious, and economic inducements. Second, there is a shift from considering somatic to mental disciplinary methods as a means of control over the poor. Thus, philanthropic writers in the 1750s begin promoting choice and self-surveillance rather than force and public surveillance as elements of charity. After establishing the economic and moral terms, which undergirded charity, this dissertation considers the ways different authors associated with the eighteenth-century London philanthropic community represent the poor, imagine charity, and attempt to shape public

opinion through their writing. Unraveling the logic and practices of the period described by many as the “Age of Philanthropy” helps us to recognize, question, and critique charitable practices and concerns. My examination of the eighteenth-century poor and charity serves as an important reminder that charity is not always synonymous with good; and that philanthropy is not and never has been a benign social institution.

For my brother Ian Daniel Seibert (1/31/85-12/12/07). I see your smile every day.

And to all my other loved ones who believed in me but didn't get to see me make it this far, John Doose, Christopher Patrick, and Ebony Scott, I miss you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	6
Introduction	8
Chapter One: Mandeville versus the Society for the Reformation of Manners: Theories of Economy, Poverty, and Crime	38
Chapter Two: Philanthropists versus Magistrates: Henry Fielding, <i>Tom Jones</i> , and the Poor	86
Chapter Three: Philanthropy and Penitence: William Dodd, <i>The Sisters</i> , and the Magdalen Hospital	139
Chapter Four: Imperial Philanthropy: Jonas Hanway and the Marine Society	192
Conclusion: Philanthropic Exploitation	240

Acknowledgements

I completed this project with the help and support of a number of people and institutions. Carnegie Mellon University's English Department provided financial and intellectual support for the time I was there. I also benefitted from Dissertation Writing Group Grants from the Carnegie Mellon Graduate Student Assembly and dissertation blitzes sponsored by the English doctoral students' GSA funds. For the academic 2011-2012 academic year I received funding from the Schaeffer Fellowship, which allowed me to spend time in the eighteenth-century archives at the Newberry Library.

I owe so much to the people who shaped the direction of my scholarship with their questions and conversation. My advisor, Kristina Straub, has always been willing to look closely at my work in order to give tough and insightful feedback. My other committee members, Rich Purcell and Roxann Wheeler did outstanding work from afar. I appreciate how patient they were as I worked through a number of life changes while juggling this project. Jeffrey J. Williams gave me my first editing job and helped me publish my first piece of academic writing. He has been honest and encouraging since the day I met when we both new to campus in 2004. Thanks as well to my longtime friends, writing group and former officemates, Heather Steffen, and Eric Vazquez. Heather, thanks for deciding we were going to be friends, reading my dissertation, and answering the phone thousands of times. Eric, I admire your courage and intellectual curiosity. You remind me constantly to stand up and speak up for what is right. At Carnegie Mellon I met and worked with many amazing scholars that I consider friends including, Jess Wilton, Dan Markowicz, Bill Blake, Carolyn Commer, Kristin Shimmin, and Thora Brylowe, D.J. Shuldt, Becca May, and Juliann Reineke. Outside of CMU the support of Rachela Permenter, Erica Scott, and Joseph McCarren has been immeasurable.

To my children Allayah and Isaac Seibert thank you for going on this journey with me, I love you so much. Many thanks to my aunt and uncle Tina and George, as well as my grandma Carrie who have served as surrogate parents to me, wonderful babysitters for my children when I needed time to write or rest, and awesome cheerleaders. My cousins, Justin, Joshua, and Jarah, I know that all of you will do your best to change the world. So many other people have been a part of the support system I needed to finish this project, Caprice King, Mike Glenn, Alisha Vereen, Faith Siskind, and my church family at Liberty Baptist, Finally, to the world's best running partner, Kasi, you rock.

Introduction

Henry Fielding's 1749 novel *Tom Jones* concludes with several scenes of penitence, including one between Tom's alleged mother, Jenny Jones, and his benefactor, Squire Allworthy. While the novel's conclusion proves that Jenny is not Tom's mother and hence not guilty of incest, she is guilty of the sins of vanity, disobedience, independent thought, and fornication. In the scene's climax, Allworthy offers Jenny pardon for these sins and the possibility of moral, social, and economic improvement. Falling "upon her knees before him, and, in a flood of tears," she then "made him many most passionate acknowledges to his goodness, which as she truly said, savoured more of the divine than human nature" (Fielding, *Tom* 999). Jenny's story and words highlight several key ideas about poverty, charity, and class that surface in the writing of eighteenth-century British economists, lawmakers, philanthropists, social critics, and novelists. First, her humble position and tearful acceptance of Allworthy's forgiveness suggest that the conditions of poverty and the survival strategies of the poor require both punishment and mercy. Similarly, eighteenth-century philanthropists stressed the need for punishment and mercy when dealing with the poor. Second, the physical contrast between Allworthy standing and Jenny kneeling highlights the social and gender hierarchies that shape their outlook and experiences. Likewise, eighteenth-century philanthropy strove to reinforce, not challenge or erase, class and gender differences. Third, in the novel, Jenny represents a number of positions, both real and perceived: poor servant, criminal, victim, unwed mother, fornicator, and, finally, penitent. During this same period, the number of charities established to assist and discipline these different groups of people increased at a rapid pace. Thus, many eighteenth-century writers, including economists, social theorists, philosophers, and politicians focused on the

different and at times overlapping identities described in *Tom Jones*, and imagined modes of discipline that might discourage problematic thoughts and acts in the poor.

While not usually categorized as philanthropic literature, Fielding's *Tom Jones* contributes to the period's philanthropic discourse through its focus on an abandoned baby, the vulnerability of the poor, and the charitable duties of the upper classes. The novel is just one of several types of texts I identify as philanthropic literature, which I will define shortly. One thing that connects *Tom Jones* to other writings in my project is that it was published at a moment when new forms of public charity challenged long-standing private forms. *Tom Jones* articulates the limitations of both private and public charity in relation to the increased criminalization of the poor. This dissertation explores the struggle between private and public charity considered by Fielding in his novel. One side of the philanthropy debate praised moral values and private charity run by country gentleman, while the other side championed a secular, public charity helmed by philanthro-merchants. Writers on both sides presented their ideas and projects as solutions or supplements to Parliamentary-established poor relief and discipline.

Looking at this struggle, I argue, reveals several important changes that took place in the ways philanthropic writing represented the institutional mission and strategies of public charity between the 1700s and 1750s. First, writers moved from adamantly rejecting any possible link between benevolence and personal gain to promoting charity with a combination of nationalistic, religious, and economic inducements. Second, the literature maps a shift from physical to mental disciplinary controls over the poor. These mental disciplines included education, religious self-surveillance, and structured activities to increase self-restraint. Focusing on the self meant philanthropists invested, to a greater or lesser degree, in the agency of the poor as a means of discipline. While philanthropists like Jonas Hanway viewed their creations with pride,

some public figures viewed this new model with consternation. They worried about how the poor might co-opt something like education for less desirable ends. While the debate between advocates of the two models of philanthropy, country gentleman and philanthro-capitalists, continued very publically throughout the eighteenth century, the latter won when it came to actual philanthropic practice.

The debate over the fundamental characteristics of charity, who it should and should not be used to assist, and how it could be used to reform the poor was explored in a variety of texts. As my observations on *Tom Jones* shows, the novel considered a number of issues that circulated in public conversations about philanthropy. While my dissertation focuses on drawing out themes that connect the essays, novels, sermons, proposals, and travel writing, it is important to note some of the ways the three novels examined in Chapter Two and Three, Fielding's *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling* and Reverend William Dodd's *The Sisters; or the History of Lucy and Caroline Sanson* (1754) and *The Magdalen or, History of the First Penitent Prostitute* (1783), differ from other types of texts in my project. I also explain some of the ways novels differ from each other.

First, Fielding and Dodd speculate on the nature of the poor and philanthropy using contrasts. All three novels are extended considerations of human nature, which use physical and personality contrasts between characters to define good and bad people and charity and noncharity. While the essays and sermons also reflect on human nature; in contrast to the novels, they make direct claims supported by secular or biblical histories. Additionally, the novels are threaded with didactic interjection that tell readers how to feel and what to think. These interjections are necessary because some of the more are problematic narrative details in the novels. For instance, representations of sexual promiscuity, sometimes in great detail, in all

three novels led to charges that the authors encouraged the same in their audiences. Fielding and Dodd clearly recognized the possibility of these types of criticism and attempted to insert narration outside of the plot to mitigate criticism.

The reputation of the novel underlies the representational strategies utilized by Dodd and Fielding and explains the controversy, which followed their novelistic efforts. The novel was a concern for three key reasons, the proliferation of indiscriminate authorship, the production of subliterate amusement with no guiding moral principle, and the corruption of innocent and uneducated readers (Mudge). Efforts to reform the novel and novel readers had to start with the content. Reformers had to “redefine the romance novel to make it once more realistic and more moral” (Mudge 70). Thus, Samuel Richardson wrote *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewards* in 1740 in hopes of reforming a nation of readers. Despite his lofty goal, Richardson’s novel was by no means welcomed with open arms. The story of a servant girl who marries her master did not thrill people who were concerned with the threat of class ambition amongst the lower sorts. Richardson’s novel spawned a debate in which Fielding and Dodd participated (Fielding was an Anti-Pamelist and Dodd a Pamelist), over the novel as a written form of moral and social instruction. While Fielding’s writing condemns Richardson’s representations of relationships between the gentry and the serving class, he, like Dodd, appropriated the novelistic mode for the purposes of moral instruction and social criticism.

In addition to the novels, my project considers sermons, economist treatise, histories, travel writing, reform proposals, and philosophical essays as philanthropic literature. These texts use different types of evidence to support claims about the nature of poverty and charity. For instance, the sermons rely on parables, reform proposals use statistics, and philosophical essays gravitate to hypothetical situation in order to make generalizations. They were also written with

many different goals in mind, to guide social improvement, prove cultural superiority, entertain, inform, or persuade.

It is easier to see what separates, rather than what connects, the writers in each chapter. They worked in different genres, used different representational strategies, wrote with different goals in mind, and addressed different audience. My challenge was to figure out how these disparate texts could be gathered together under the umbrella of philanthropic literature. There are a few important ideas, which link together the different authors and types of writing I explore as philanthropic literature. First, all of the writers in this project identify the poor as a social problem that creates other social problems. Second, they all distinguish between different types of poor. Third, their writing blames the poor for their situation and social problems to some extent, but none of them heap the blame entirely on the poor. Fourth, each worries that improper charity promotes social climbing in the lower classes and proper charity bolsters the proper social order. Finally, as many in the “business” of philanthropy were also in trade, with the exception of Fielding, the merchant plays a critical social role in their writings. Ultimately, what I call philanthropic literature in my dissertation is connected by a set of themes or ideas about the relationship between poverty and charity, which are explicitly stated or assumed by the author.

The Eighteenth-Century Poor

Fielding was just one of many writers concerned with how to deal with the increasing number of poor, especially in London. According to Daniel Defoe, this “crowd of clamouring, unemployed, unprovided for poor...ma[de] the nation uneasy” (235). Historians estimate that by the mid-eighteenth century at least half of England’s population of 6.5 million people qualified as poor (Tomkins 8). In the *Covent Garden Journal* Fielding defines the poor as any person with

“no estate of their own to support them, without industry; nor, any profession or trade by which, with industry, they may be capable of gaining a comfortable subsistence” (Fielding, *Covent* 44-45). This description covered a large percentage of the population, which, starting in the early-eighteenth century, moved in large numbers to urban areas like London in hopes of economic stability—a goal most people never realized. Instead, many hopeful London transplants found themselves living in intermittent or permanent poverty and employing diverse strategies to survive, including formal and informal charity, prostitution, petty theft, and credit (Tompkins 9-13). These London poor, untrained and uneducated, permanently or intermittently unemployed, and the strategies employed to assist and contain them are the subject of my dissertation.

While *Tom Jones* introduces many issues related to poverty, it also glosses over many of the problems experienced by poor at the time. Although the eighteenth-century poor experienced improvements in standards of living, employment, wages, and many other areas over their seventeenth-century predecessors, their situation was still dire. In addition to an overall lack of job security, they were vulnerable to disease and starvation. Frequent grain shortages meant the poor often struggled to buy basic food items like bread. Eighteenth-century London had a number of slums that housed the poor including the notorious St. Giles. The conditions of these homes were deplorable, with no sanitation or fresh water. Families crowded together in single rooms that offered no privacy. Samuel Johnson describes the living conditions of the poor in piteous terms: “wretches...lie crowded together, mad with intemperance, ghastly with famine, nauseous with filth, and noisome with disease” (256). Clothes served as a stark indicator of poverty. The cost of clothing in the first half of the eighteenth century prohibited most poor from owning more than one set of clothes. In fact, the appeal of service work stemmed from the fact that employers provided their servants with a set of clothes each year. In his book, *Down*

and Out in Eighteenth-Century London, Tim Hitchcock notes that the begging poor wore rags, dirty clothes, or so little fabric that they were almost naked. Adding to these pitiable material conditions, the poor existed in a society in which they had few rights and amongst people who frequently viewed them as criminals. Eighteenth-century philanthropists tried to address the lack of adequate food, clothing, and housing in order to mold a more grateful, obedient class of poor.

Women like Fielding's Jenny and their children composed the majority of the poor population. They were beggars, workhouse prisoners, informal laborers, and domestic workers. Eighteenth-century records show that more than half of the poor arrested for begging were women (Hitchcock 6). The means of support available to many women did not pay enough for a "comfortable subsistence" (Cruikshank xii). For instance, the average pay of a housemaid was £5 annually compared to general laborers who earned about £24 pounds or tradesmen with £50 (Cruikshank xii). As Ian Bell notes, "Economically, the creation of a large group of women with no visible means of support encouraged the growth of cheap prostitution" (105). Historians agree that prostitutes constituted a significant portion of London's population, but disagree on exact numbers. Estimates of the number of prostitutes in London between 1720 and 1760 range from a modest 3,000 to 40,000 (Cruikshank 26-30). The numbers depend on the sources examined (pamphlets, court documents, essays, or proposals) and the type of prostitution considered (occasional/casual, streetwalkers, brothel, or private agreements). Importantly, the fate of eighteenth-century poor women reveals the complex relationship between crime, gender, sexuality, commerce, and class, which are explored in this project.

While writers increasingly expressed sympathy for the poor, especially society's weakest and most vulnerable members—the young and women, many observers viewed poverty as a natural and reasonable state. For instance, Bernard Mandeville, author of a number of

inflammatory satirical essays and poems including the *Fable of the Bees* argues that poverty and wealth are necessary products of the economic system. Under the traditional social contract, called the old moral economy by early modern historians, the poor contributed to the greater social good by accepting very low wages for their work, which the rich supplemented by giving alms, protecting the commons, setting fair (just) prices on food, taxes, and other regulations (Thompson “Moral Economy” 79-80). Many of these concessions have a long history. For example, Thomas Aquinas promotes the importance of a just price system because “when the poor were in danger of starvation and had no other means of satisfying their needs they might ‘take what is necessary from another’s goods, either openly or by stealth’” (qtd. in Claeys 7). Despite his warnings, by the mid-eighteenth century, rapid enclosure of common land, high prices for low-quality bread, and staggering unemployment rates led to discontent among the poor. In both urban and rural areas, the poor responded to this breach of the social contract by finding alternative methods of support, including crime. Regardless of the evidence, Mandeville did not see certain groups of poor, like beggars and criminals, as evidence that the system had completely failed. Instead, he and others argued that it was the poor also failed to live up to their part in and undermined the system. He argues that the poor refused to work for the wages offered, looked for easy ways to sustain themselves, and preferred drinking, gambling, and whoring to labor (Mandeville “Of Charity” 275-276). Based on these assumptions, most social reformers’ efforts sought to extract and control the labor of the poor, not to eradicate poverty. This focus on utility and control of the poor connects the different eighteenth-century philanthropic theories and practices explored in my dissertation.

Compounding the negative public opinion of the poor, writers flooded the reading market with an abundance of fictional, sensationalized representations of poor people. Novels, fictional

histories, and confessions revealed social attitudes towards the poor, while merely hinting at the complex circumstances of poverty. For example, we can glean a little of Fielding's ideas about the poor from his fictional representations; however, it is by looking outward to different types of texts written by Fielding and others that the larger conversation about poverty and philanthropy in which he participates becomes clear. Our understanding of what it felt like to be poor in eighteenth-century Britain largely comes from these texts written not by the poor but by people of higher social and economic status. Thus, the writing comes weighted with a variety of motives, assumptions, and prejudices. While the words of the poor are recorded in a sparse number of dry records, largely court and charity documents, a complex body of work exists that offers different class perspectives on who the poor were, what they did, and what defined their relationships to other groups of people. These texts consistently labeled the poor a threat to the existing social and economic order due to their laziness, ignorance, and criminal nature. As I demonstrate in Chapter One, many social critics believed that idleness among the poor culminated in crime. For example, in their journal *Cato's Letters*, Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard complain that many of the serving-class poor "betake themselves to the highway and housebreaking, others to robbing and sharpening, or to the stews" (344). William Hogarth's engraving series *Industry and Idleness* and George Lillo's *The London Merchant* also link together the serving class, idleness, poverty, and criminality. Many of these stories end with confessions and repentance as well as the author's moral injunctions about the benefits of work and obedience.

Writers often resorted to analogies to categorize the poor as subhuman or inhuman. Gordon and Trenchard describe the serving class as "a sort of idle and rioting vermin" (*Cato's Letters*). Fielding complains that "instead of producing servants for the husbandman, or artificer;

instead of providing recruits for the sea or the field,” gin promises “only to fill alms-houses and hospitals, and to infect the streets with stench and diseases” (*Robbers* 20). His description of the poor in terms of sickness resonates with Trenchard’s and Gordon’s metaphoric use of vermin to describe servants. Descriptions of prostitutes employed the same language of infestation and disease. Hanway says London’s streets “swarm with prostitutes” (*Thoughts* 14). Writers also described them as sexual, social, and economic predators, much to the horror and fascination of eighteenth-century audiences. In the first half of the century, prostitutes played a significant role in popular novels and plays such as Daniel Defoe’s *Moll Flanders* (1722) and *Roxana* (1724), John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera* (1728) and *Polly* (1729), William Hogarth’s *Harlot’s Progress* (1731), George Lillo’s *The London Merchant* (1731), Henry Fielding’s *Shamela* (1741), and John Cleland’s *Fanny Hill* (1748). Each of these texts demonstrates that to be a poor and/or criminal woman is decidedly different from that experience as a man. Regardless of differences between different groups of poor—men and women, young and old, urban and rural—these unflattering fictional representations of prostitutes, servants, and apprentices often reinforced public perception of the poor as less than human. My examination of eighteenth-century depictions of poverty shows that philanthropic writers both dehumanized and humanized the poor, often in the same text, in order to show the ways in which charity institutions could facilitate the social rehabilitation of the poor.

From Legal to Philanthropic Discipline of the Poor

Lawmakers responded to the perceived increase in poverty and accompanying crime wave, which Silvia Federici labels the first “capitalist crisis,” by increasing the number of actions criminalized and crimes incurring the death penalty (4). Federici’s description links the period’s increased punitive efforts to the economic interests of property owners. For instance, the 1715 Riot Act made it a felony for a group of twelve or more to “unlawfully, riotously, and tumultuously assemble together” (*old bailey online*). Failure to disperse or property damage in the course of assembly was punishable by death. Additionally, the 1723 Black Act meant that appearing armed in a park, hunting deer, or appearing outside at night with a blackened face all carried the death penalty (*old bailey online*). Between 1688 and 1790, the number of capital offences more than tripled. Capital offenses included theft of domestic animals, burglary, arson, forgery, pickpocketing of goods worth more than one shilling, embezzlement, housebreaking, and robbery (Beattie 1). While the eighteenth century saw an increase in capital offenses, disciplinary institutions still employed a diverse range of strategies, including corporal punishment, labor, isolation, forced prayer, strict diets, uniforms, and controlled daily regimens.

Two major laws broadly affected the poor by organizing them into categories, defining poor support, and identifying proper disciplinary methods. These poor laws, Joseph Persky notes, addressed “a genuine concern and public responsibility for the impoverished, while at the same time attempting to control and if necessary to coerce the behavior of the poor” (179). First, the Elizabethan 1601 Act for the Relief of the Poor outlined outdoor relief as food, wage, or housing subsidies; and employment and indoor relief as housing the needy in workhouses. This Act appointed a parish overseer with the power to force the poor to work and to collect taxes from locals to support the poor. In each parish decisions about poor relief involved local

churchwardens, wealthy householders, and justices of the peace. Due to a lack of standardization, the size of workhouses and the size and number of pensions varied from parish to parish. The second law, the 1662 Act for the Better Relief of the Poor, also called the Settlement Act, bound people to parishes in order to establish where the needy could apply for aid. In addition to identifying who should oversee and relieve the poor and how to get poor relief, this Act outlined proper forms of employment for the poor (workhouses) and punishment (houses of correction). Importantly, the Settlement Act defined four groups of poor and linked them to particular types of assistance or punishment. First were the cunning poor, who were also known as the idle or profligate poor. Legislation criminalized this group for resisting the wage-labor system of early capitalist England. The 1662 Act describes punitive measures, including forced labor in Houses of Correction, as a way to control the idle poor, who ranged from beggars to vagrants and criminals. Second were the impotent poor—people either too young or old to work. Described as a major drain on money and time, many writers lamented that there was no hope of making them profitable. Third, the laboring poor consisted of servants, unskilled workers, and artisans who lived in economic precarity. The final group, the common poor, were people willing and able to work, yet unemployed for long periods. For example, most soldiers and sailors were unemployed during peacetime. Throughout the eighteenth century, the British Parliament introduced several more poor acts, such as the Workhouse Test Act of 1723, in an effort to stop abuse of the system, improve efficiency, and allay public concerns that the poor were not earning their keep (Coats 41).

Of the different types of relief available, by midcentury, workhouses held the most popular appeal because they were, in theory, self-sufficient and self-sustaining entities. According to Hitchcock, parishes established at least 600 hundred workhouses by the mid-

eighteenth century, each with an average of 47 inmates, adding up to almost 30,000 people. By comparison, “forty years earlier there had not been three thousand workhouse inmates” (Hitchcock, “Paupers and Preachers” 160). Writers described workhouses as a convenient means of “cleaning the streets of vagrants, beggars, and other disorderly persons” (MacFarlane 265). Sir William Petty’s *Political Arithmetick* (1690) concurs that the best solutions to the poor problem “provide[ed] for the Impotents, and for Orphans, out of hope to make profit by their Labours” and “punish[ed] the Lazy by Labour,” (9). Workhouses designed so “the labour of the poor could be directly supervised and disciplined work habits more readily imposed” appealed to a society that sought to maximize the profitability of the poor (MacFarlane 263).

Critics leveled charges of corruption and inefficiency at the different forms of parish poor relief, especially workhouses. Some critics expressed concerns that, while workhouses allegedly provided moral improvement and encouraged the proper work ethic, with few exceptions, they actually “terrorize[d] or punish[ed] the poor” (Hitchcock 264). As I show in Chapter Two, Fielding inserted a number of criticisms of workhouses in almost all of his writing. He describes them as spaces that bred disease, crime, and social discontent. He also claims that committing someone to workhouse increases the likelihood of that individual reoffending (“Proposal” 45). Additionally, many small parishes only had enough resources to support small workhouses that were unprofitable because they did not have the means to buy materials to fully employ their poor (Lloyd; Brundage). This led to some workhouse overseers encouraging inmates to beg as a supplement to their parish support (Hitchcock 9). The fact that some parishes encouraged their poor to beg to supplement their support gave Defoe a reason to describe workhouses as “public nuisances, [and] mischiefs to the nation” (235). It is important to note that there is no evidence

that these issues of corruption were pervasive, it was the idea that workhouses and other parish-based poor relief did not work, which was widespread.

Eighteenth-century social critics also expressed resentment for the poll taxes, also called poor rates, implemented to fund workhouses and pensions, viewing them as an economic and social investment with no actual return. In “A Plan and Easie Way to Employ all the Poor and Idle People in England” (1698), G. M. Gent notes that, while “the poor of this nation have the greatest revenue of any body of men, they are so far from being maintained by it” (1). He estimates the poor rate during King Charles II’s reign at £665,000 per year, and at the time of his publication between £800,000 and £1,000,000 per year. To his horror, poor rates have risen at an unreasonable rate of between £135,000 and £335,000 in thirteen years. Unwilling to let go of the workhouse model, Gent’s plan imagines a more efficient workhouse, which he claims can turn a profit, or what he calls a benefit, of two million pounds in just the first year and ten million by the end of the tenth year. He promises that in sixteen years profit will outstrip the initial cash investment and the estimated annual cost needed for upkeep of the poor.

While Gent sought to reform the established parochial system, starting in the late-seventeenth century a number of London merchants focused on charity to solve the “poor problem.” They actively developed a new public model of charity, with more efficient modes of governance, selection, evaluation, discipline, and surveillance. As Tim Hitchcock notes, “the great charitable institutions of the period, the Foundling Hospital, the Magdalen, and the Marine Society, were seen as partial solutions to the ‘problem of begging’” (480). They transformed the philanthropic community from a disorganized system of alms and bequests to churches and hospitals into an organized system of powerful and efficient institutions. These “urban-based ‘associational’ charities pooled supporters’ contributions, asserted the benefits of collective

action and offered an alternative to the statutory relief system” (Lloyd 27). Merchants rather than country gentlemen or churchmen operated the new London charities, so it is unsurprising that eighteenth-century public charities largely resembled trading companies with pools of investors and boards of governors made up of merchants and aristocrats. These merchant-philanthropists also effectively used different methods to generate popular interest and financial support.

Writers from the period expressed both support and disapproval for this new model of philanthropy. For instance, Mandeville, criticized every form of public charity as a self-interested act. He sarcastically establishes the hypocrisy of public charity saying, “If a man builds a fine house, tho he has not one symptom of humility, furnishes it richly, and lays out a good estate in plate and pictures, we ought not to think that he does it out of vanity, but to encourage artists, employ hands, and set the poor to work for the good of his country” (263). As this quote shows, Mandeville clearly believed that genuine charity was more than a performance; it was a fundamental aspect of a person’s character. He also felt that an honest act of giving required total selflessness: no quest for economic or social advancement, no pursuit of publicity, and no acts of duress like deathbed wills. Mandeville directs his ire at specific organizations like the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which established a number of schools for poor children, and the Society for the Reformation of Manners, which punished the poor. More damning than any self-interested agenda, these new charities came under Mandeville’s fire because of charges of corruption. Furthermore, in *The Covent Garden Journal*, Fielding condemns public charities for the “horrid and notorious abuse” committed by managers and governors, bureaucracy, and favoritism (188). While proposed as a solution to the inefficiency

of the parish workhouse, many new London charities faced criticism that they did not properly or sufficiently employ the poor.

While Mandeville objected to the overlap between self-interest and philanthropy, others saw this relationship as a way to revitalize the interest of contributors. Some eighteenth-century writers feared that there was a growing reluctance among the wealthy to give. For example, John Gay's *Trivia* bemoans the fact that it was only during holidays, such as Christmas, that "selfish avarice alone is sad" (Gay 17). In response to inconsistent giving, new and increasingly powerful philanthropic figures like Jonas Hanway promised the contributor that "donations...would not only be pleasant...but would also be profitable to him in his capacity as an economic agent, a citizen, and a soul, both here and hereafter" (Andrew 8). They dangled the lure of earthly and heavenly reward in order to motivate people to give to the poor. The incentivization of charity revitalized the field in terms of production ideas, implementation of ideas, and financial support.

Historiography and Methodology

Eighteenth-century historians and literary scholars have long produced philanthropic biographies and histories. First came a number of impactful philanthropic biographies, including Ruth McClure's *Coram's Children* (1931) and more recently James Stephen Taylor's *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (1985). These two studies canonized Thomas Coram and Jonas Hanway as representative of eighteenth-century philanthropy. Adding to Coram's and Hanway's mythology are a number of narrower studies focused on specific philanthropic organizations, mainly ones in which these two men were intimately involved, such as the Foundling and Magdalen Hospitals. These studies

include R. B. Outhwaite's quantitative contribution, "Objects of Charity: Petitions to the London Foundling Hospital 1758-72" (1999), which attempts to piece together measurable data about charity recipients; and Sarah Lloyd's "'Pleasure's Golden Bait': Prostitution, Poverty and the Magdalen Hospital in Eighteenth Century London" (1996) and Stanley Nash's "Prostitution and Charity: The Magdalen Hospital, a Case Study" (1984) focuses on describing experiences of specific prostitutes to show the different ways in which the poor experienced poverty and charity. Additional work on Coram's and Hanway's charities connects the institutions to emotional or political agendas. For example, two articles by Mary Peace, "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain: 'Well-Grounded' Exemplarity vs. 'Romantic' Exceptionality" (2007) and "Figuring the London Magdalen House: Mercantilist Hospital, Sentimental Asylum or Proto-Evangelical Penitentiary" (2012), consider various eighteenth-century concepts and modes of literary and political representation. This strand of scholarship, which broadly outlines eighteenth-century philanthropy and philanthropists, gives useful insight into the factors that went into making and running a charity, including recipient selection criteria and public fundraising. My work builds on this scholarship by identifying the religious and economic ideologies that undergirded the structural and daily operations of major philanthropic institutions.

Donna Andrew charts a different, more critical, socio-historical course for philanthropic scholarship with her book, *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century* (1989), by considering the different ways that powerful men defined and deployed charity in the period. Thus Andrew's book differentiates between charity as "an inclination to promote the publick good" and the broader and much older definition of charity as "love, kindness, or natural affection" (5). Her groundbreaking study maps broad social agendas onto eighteenth-century

charity strategies. Using a range of previously unstudied texts, including treatises, essays, pamphlets, legal documents, and data generated by charities, Andrew shows connections between the rise and fall of different charity models and public concerns. Her work is the most extensive on eighteenth-century charities to date. In a more recent book, Sarah Lloyd extends Andrew's work on eighteenth-century philanthropy, but shifts focus from real institutions to imagined projects. Like Andrew, Lloyd's *Charity and Poverty in England, c. 1680-1820: Wild and Visionary Schemes* (2009) links general social concerns to philanthropic efforts, albeit ones that never came to fruition. Like Lloyd and Andrew my project tracks patterns of thought and practice in the eighteenth-century philanthropic community. These books focus on standard philanthropic texts, charity histories, reports, court documents, and project proposal. While I do explore these types of texts, they in fact form a critical piece of this project, there are other types of writings, including novels and sermons, which can enhance our understanding of the philanthropic discourse.

In addition to exploring the ideas and concerns embedded in the institutional structure of eighteenth-century philanthropy, a number of social historians examine poverty and charity from the perspective of the poor. In *The Poor in England* (2003), Alannah Thomkins and Stephen King frame thievery, prostitution, requests for charity, and beggary as part of a complex system of survival experienced by the eighteenth-century poor, which they call "the economy of makeshifts." Heather Shore's essay, "Crime, Criminal Networks, and the Survival Strategies of the Poor in Early Eighteenth-Century London," (2003) emphasizes the tenuous economic position of the poor by showing the types of crimes that were short-term solutions to starving, such as stealing bits of cloth to sell or small amounts of food to supplement what they could afford to purchase. Other work, such as King's *Poverty and Welfare in England* (2000), Lynn

Hollen Lees' *The Solidarity of Strangers* (2000), Tim Hitchcock's *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London* (2004), and Tomkins' *The Experience of Urban Poverty: Parish Charity and Credit* (2006), explore different ways the poor survived low wages, criminalization, and indifference. Their work has lent historical depth to my analysis of eighteenth-century economic, poor, and philanthropic literature. Nevertheless, this scholarship too often fails to thoroughly scrutinize the ways in which different institutions, legal, judicial, and philanthropic, struggled over how to define and address those choices.

Missing from both the philanthropic generalists' and socio-historicists' studies are meaningful considerations of the ways in which race, class, and gender intersect with philanthropic concerns and agendas in eighteenth-century Britain. Recent work by Jennie Batchelor, Katherine Binhammer, and Martha Koehler explore gender and class in relation to the women of the Magdalen Hospital. Examining novels, conduct books, and treatises, they show the different ways in which philanthropic literature represented women as victims and objects of sympathy. The shift from social criminal to narrative victim reflects the philanthropic and reading audiences' investment in sentimentality and empathy. Chapter Three is indebted to this scholarship, which tracks the changing social attitudes towards poor women

My dissertation builds on this previous work in four different ways. First, I extend the category of philanthropic literature to include a number of genre including novels, economic treatises, travel journals, and sermons. Second, I chart changes in the way Britain's charitable community discussed public and private interest, charity, and discipline between 1723 and 1758. While these ideas did not always translate into actual practices, they are still a part of the philanthropic discourse. Third, each chapter shows public struggles between types of charity, motivation, and methods. Finally, I explore textual connections between philanthropy and issues

of class, gender, and imperialism in order to link changes in institutional missions and strategies to specific populations of people. To demonstrate these relationships, I identify links between early eighteenth-century disciplinary strategies used on the poor and economic theories.

Mapping this history of social thought is important to show the competing concerns that shaped discussions of poverty and labor. The eighteenth-century texts examined in this dissertation intersected in a shared belief that national, individual, or spiritual wealth depended on control of the labor and non-labor activities of the poor, but diverged significantly in many areas of economic theory and practice. Additionally, my exploration of philanthropic literature shows that whipping, public beatings, and hangings gave way to subtler coercions while engaging with ideas of femininity or cultural differences. All of the charities discussed in this project played an important role in a philanthropic discourse that defined rich and poor, young and old, men and women, and British and non-British in ways that rendered them useful to society.

If the philanthropic text is the site of my investigation, theories of class (its construction and conflicts) provide my analytic framework. A number of “bottom up” or “people’s history” studies of the eighteenth-century establish the criminal poor as an important figure of capitalist resistance, which prefigures lower-class mobilization and resistance in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They read the criminal poor as an example of cooperation, individual identity, democracy, and an alternative to the legitimized economic and social order. In *The Many Headed Hydra* (2000) Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker describe how eighteenth-century sailors, slaves, commoners, and pirates resisted the forces of globalization. Gwenda Morgan and Peter Rushton echo the image of connectivity and resistance in their book, *Eighteenth Century Criminal Transportation* (2004). They speculate that, “perhaps convicts and others joined in a wider culture of the dispossessed and exploited, as they moved across the

Atlantic and back, providing a counter to the dominant forces of order under British rule” (7). Others explore dissent and class resistance but are broader in scope because they consider proto-class formation from the position of those who would benefit and those who would feel threatened by lower-class alliances. For instance, Linebaugh’s *The London Hanged* (2003) and Robert Shoemaker’s *The London Mob* (2004) both see criminal acts as a central node of class conflict. Shoemaker describes the early eighteenth century as a moment when the lower class was “finding a political voice” (18). The criminal body (both individual and collective) becomes a site of class warfare in instances like the Tyburn Riots, where the mob attempted to save the bodies of those hung from the surgeons in direct opposition to the 1752 Murder Act (*Albion* 86). These bottom-up histories forced me to think about who was defining the eighteenth-century poor—men of the middling and upper classes—and influenced my interrogation of concepts such as liberty and choice in chapters three and four.

While I find these contributions useful because they examine a variety of lower-class identities in order to highlight points of connection and continuity, these works do not deeply explore the theories and material conditions of labor to which a proto-working class-consciousness responded. For example, eighteenth-century philanthropy developed language that emphasized liberty, personal choice, and volunteerism alongside narratives of victimization and vulnerability. Novels, instruction manuals, histories, and sermons deployed these concepts in different ways for poor women, boys, and men. This scholarship also minimizes or disregards moments when the poor lack agency, even though these moments play a major role in the narratives philanthropies constructed to garner public interest. Finally, scholars like Rediker and Linebaugh do not examine in depth the assumptions various social observers made about labor and how those assumptions define the poor. In response, my project extends the valuable work

that has been done on the eighteenth-century poor to explore how the many groups of poor people were defined by economic theories, philanthropic logics, and religious, gender, and imperialist assumptions. These concepts are key to understanding the vertical hierarchies defining the poor, the middling sort, the merchant class, and the other strata of eighteenth-century social life.

Overview of Chapters

In order to show the complex relationship between economic and philanthropic discourses, this dissertation is organized into four chapters, each of which explores the relationship between a major figure in eighteenth-century philanthropy and a major philanthropic institution.

The first chapter, “Mandeville versus the Society for the Reformation of Manners: Theories of Economy, Poverty, and Crime,” contextualizes the debate between Bernard Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners (SFRM). I start my project with Mandeville because of his position as bogeyman or devil in moral, philanthropic, and economic thought throughout the eighteenth century. The idea, expressed in *The Fable of the Bees*, that civil society functions because of a balance of vice and virtue did not sit well with most people, who believed that Mandeville was actually promoting vice. “The Grumbling Hive,” which was the first kernel of what would become *The Fable of the Bees*, did not stir much of a response upon its publication in 1705. It was not until 1723, when Mandeville republished *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, which consisted of the original poem, twenty remarks, and three essays, that his ideas (and character) came under vehement attack. In Chapter One I focus mainly on the *Remarks*, which quote earlier economic treatise including Nicholas

Barbon's *A Discourse of Trade*, and is appended to "The Grumbling Hive," rather than the poem itself.

The writings of Mandeville, the SFRM, and earlier writers like Barbon show that there were three economic theories circulating in the early eighteenth century: mercantilist, market, and moral. They each used a different tactic to eliminate problems directly related to poverty, such as crime, social unrest among the lower classes, and parish support of the poor. The concerns of each group of economists differed, but they were united in defining the role of the poor and ensuring their participation in the economy. All parties believed their goals of national, individual, or spiritual wealth depended on control of the labor and non-labor activities of the poor. This chapter demonstrates that the tension between market and moral economic theories influenced public opinion of the poor and inspired the formation of charitable societies and institutions. It also shows the rising influence of the merchant in eighteenth-century politics and international affairs. Subsequently, chapters three and four come back to the merchant to show how he becomes deeply associated with philanthropy.

In Chapter 2, "Philanthropists versus Magistrates: Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones*, and the Poor," I consider Fielding's novel in relation to another Mandeville debate over education of the poor. Mandeville's essay *Of Charity and Charity Schools* garnered the ire of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK), which focused on education of the poor in charity schools, which Mandeville disparaged. I argue that the tension between Mandeville and the SPCK is also apparent in Henry Fielding's *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*, which evidences a genuine appreciation for both charity and the law. Fielding believed, with the SPCK, that moral corruption was at the center of the ills plaguing society, but he put his faith in magisterial power, not religious charities, to solve the problem. I identify a split in Fielding's

writing that reflects his belief that reform and philanthropic organizations were not sufficient to counter crime and could only be used to guide individuals in their private actions. Charity should be limited to private individuals or groups with discernment that can recognize worthy recipients, who include, according to Fielding, the hardworking poor, helpless babies, and those with genuine physical ailments that limit their ability to work. For Fielding, the law is the appropriate means to counteract idleness and crime, flawed as it might sometimes be in scope or execution. Ultimately, I demonstrate that similar to the economists explored in Chapter One, Fielding's main goal was to make institutions that forced labor from the poor more effective and efficient.

In the many plans written and implemented to address the poor "problem," criminal women repeatedly come under special consideration. Chapter Three, "Philanthropy and Penitence: William Dodd, *The Sisters*, and the Magdalen Hospital" scrutinizes the most ambitious and famous charity plan from the period: Hanway's Magdalen Hospital for former prostitutes. Opened in 1758, the Magdalen Hospital was the first public charity in England with the goal of assisting prostitutes. William Dodd, the Hospital's high-profile minister, published sermons and pseudo-histories of former prostitutes both before and after the institution's founding. Dodd also wrote a novel entitled *The Sisters; or the History of Lucy and Caroline Sanson*, which, although rarely considered by scholars, adds to our understanding of eighteenth-century discussions of poverty, sexuality, and charity. In this chapter, I prove that despite what initially seems like an ideological contradiction, Dodd's fictional efforts should be understood as consistent with the Magdalen Hospital's theological, economic, and social vision. My close examination of Dodd's novels and sermons shows that he and the founders of the Magdalen Hospital believed a lack of charity and understanding for the circumstances of poor women

caused prostitution. Furthermore, Dodd's writing suggests a good charity promotes discipline, penance, forgiveness, and self-surveillance.

Chapter Four, "Imperial Philanthropy: Jonas Hanway and the Marine Society," explores the connection between imperialism and philanthropy. Before founding the Magdalen Hospital, Hanway established the Marine Society in 1756. He aimed to create the perfect sailor through a combination of religious, civic, and general education. Hanway worked to reclaim the sailor, a major concern for social planners, as a symbol of British freedom, secured through adherence to the social order. This new breed of sailors, under the tutelage of English merchants, was to be properly equipped to represent the British Empire. I argue that reading Hanway's travel writing alongside his much more numerous and obviously philanthropic texts allows for a clearer understanding of the ideological complexity of a simple operation like the Marine Society. My reading of Hanway identifies connections between his experiences in Persia and Russia and the institutional imperative of the Marine Society to inculcate England's poor. These efforts to shape the minds and actions of the British poor form what I call an "imperial philanthropy."

Given the continuous and expanding importance of philanthropy from the eighteenth century to the present, the questions explored in this project remain relevant. What is the role of philanthropy in a society of deep economic inequalities? How can we ensure that care of those in need does not devolve into a coercive act? Can we separate philanthropy from the deeply racialized, gendered, and classed system in which it was conceived? These are important ethical questions, which we must ask even if there are no easy or clear answers. Unraveling the logic and practices of the period described by many as the "Age of Philanthropy" helps us to recognize, question, and critique charitable practices and concerns. My examination of the eighteenth-century poor and charity serves as an important reminder that while we define charity

as a social good, charitable practices are not always synonymous with the interests of the common good.

Works Cited

- Andrew, Donna. *Philanthropy and the Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989. Print.
- Batchelor, Jennie. "'Industry in Distress': Reconfiguring Femininity and Labor in the Magdalen House." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28.1 (2004): 1-20. *Project Muse*. Web. 10 May 2011.
- Binhammer, Katherine. *The Seduction Narrative in Britain, 1747-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- Brundage, Anthony. *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.
- Claeys, Gregory. *Machinery, Money and the Millennium: From Moral Economy to Socialism, 1815-1860*. Oxford: Polity, 1987. Print.
- Cleland, John. *Fanny Hill: Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure*. 1749. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 2000. Print.
- Coats, A. W. "Economic Thought and Poor Law Policy in the Eighteenth Century." *The Economic History Review, New Series* 13.1 (1960): 39-51. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May 2011.
- Cruikshank, Dan. *London's Sinful Secret: The Bawdy History and Very Public Passions of London's Georgian Age*. New York: St. Martin's, 2009.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Giving Alms No Charity and Employing the Poor a Grievance to the Nation*. London, 1704. *The Making Of The Modern World*. Web. 5 May 2015.
- . *Moll Flanders*. 1722. New York: Barnes and Nobles, 2005. Print.
- . *Roxana*. 1724. Ed. Melissa Mowry. New York: Broadview, 2009. Print.
- Elliott, Dorice Williams. "Sarah Scott's Millennium Hall and Female Philanthropy." *Studies in English Literature* 7.1 (1995): 535-553. *Project Muse*. Web. 3 April 2013.
- Federici, Silvia. "The Great Caliban: The Struggle Against the Rebel Body." *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 58.15.2 (Jun 2004): 7-16. *Proquest*. Web. 12 Dec 2013.
- Fielding, Henry. "Covent Garden Journal." *The Works of Henry Fielding*. Ed. William Henley. Vol 14. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967. 71-242. Print.
- . "A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor." *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber and Related Writing*. Ed. Malvin Zirker. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988. 219-280. Print.
- . *Shamela*. 1741. *Anti-Pamela and Shamela*. Ed. Catherine Ingrassia. New York: Broadview, 2004. Print.
- . *Tom Jones*. 1749. New York: Bantam, 1997. Print.

- . *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber and Related Writing*. Ed. Malvin Zirker. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988. 31-60. Print.
- Gent, G.M. *A Plain and Easie Way to Employ All the Poor and Idle People in England and Thereby to Enrich the Nation*. London, 1698. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 7 Jul 2009.
- Gay, John. *The Beggar's Opera*. 1728. *The Beggars Opera and Other Eighteenth-Century Plays*. Ed. David W. Lindsay. North Clarendon: Tuttle, 1995. Print.
- . *Polly*. 1729. LeVergne: Kessinger, 2009. Print.
- . *Trivia; or the Art of Walking the London Streets*. London, 1716. *Walking the Streets of Eighteenth Century London: John Gay's Trivia (1716)*. Ed. Clare Brant and Susan E. Whyman. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. 169-218. Print.
- Hanway, Jonas. "Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen-House for Repentant Prostitutes." London, 1758. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 12 Jul 2013
- Hay, Douglas, et al. *Albion's Fatal Tree*. New York: Pantheon, 1975. Print.
- Hitchcock, Tim. *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*. London: Hambledon and London, 2004. Print.
- . "Paupers and Preachers: the SPCK and the Parochial Workhouse Movement." *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: Response to Social and Economic Problems in England 1689-1750*. Eds. Lee Davison, Tim Hitchcock, and Tim Keirn. New York: Palgrave, 1992. 99-120. Print.
- Hogarth, William. *A Harlot's Progress*. 1732. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. 18-23. Print.
- . *Industry and Idleness*. 1732. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. 60-71. Print.
- Johnson, Samuel. *The Rambler, No. 171*. 1752. *Samuel Johnson: The Major Works*. Ed. Donald Greene. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 253-257. Print.
- Jordan, Sarah. *The Anxiety of Idleness*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003. Print.
- Keohane, Catherine. "'Spare from Your Luxuries': Women, Charity, and Spending in the Eighteenth Century." *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 31 (2002): 41-59. *Project Muse*. Web. 11 Jun 2012.
- King, Steven. *Poverty and Welfare in England: 1700-1850*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000. Print.
- King, Steven and Alannah Tomkins, eds. *The Poor in England 1700-1850: an Economy of Makeshifts*. New York: Manchester UP, 2003. Print.
- Koehler, Martha. "Redemptive Spaces: Magdalen House and Prostitution in the Novels and Letters of Richardson." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*. 22.2 (Winter 2009-10): 249-278.

- Project Muse*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Lees, Lynn Hollen. *The Solidarity of Strangers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- Lillo, George. *The London Merchant*. 1731. Omaha: U of Nebraska, 1965. Print.
- Linebaugh, Peter. *The London Hanged*. New York: Verso, 2003. Print.
- Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. *The Many-Headed Hydra*. Boston: Beacon, 2000. Print.
- Lloyd, Sarah. *Charity and Poverty in England, c. 1680-1820*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- . "‘Pleasure’s Golden Bait’: Prostitution, Poverty and the Magdalen Hospital in Eighteenth Century London." *History Workshop Journal* 41 (Spring 1996): 50-70. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Nov. 2011.
- McClure, Ruth. *Coram’s Children*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981. Print.
- Macfarlane, Stephen. "Social Policy and the Poor in the Later Seventeenth Century." *The Making of the Metropolis: London 1500-1700*. Ed. A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay. New York: Longman, 1986. 252- 277. Print.
- Mandeville, Bernard. *An Essay on Charity and Charity Schools. Fable of the Bees*. Ed. Phillip Harth. New York: Penguin, 1970. 261-325. Print.
- Morgan, Gwenda, and Peter Rushton. *Eighteenth-Century Criminal Transportation: The Formation of the Criminal Atlantic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- Nash, Stanley. "Prostitution and Charity: The Magdalen Hospital, a Case Study." *Journal of Social History* 17.4 (1984): 617-628. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2011.
- Outhwaite, R.B. "Objects of Charity: Petitions to the London Foundling Hospital 1758-72." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*. 32.4 (1999): 497-510. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 May 2015.
- Peace, Mary. "Figuring the London Magdalen House: Mercantilist Hospital, Sentimental Asylum or Proto-Evangelical Penitentiary." *Prostitution and Eighteenth-Century Culture: Sex, Commerce and Morality*. Eds. Ellis, Ann and Markahm Lewis. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012. 141-155. Print.
- . "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain: ‘Well-Grounded’ Exemplarity vs. ‘Romantic’ Exceptionality." *The Eighteenth Century* 48.2 (Summer 2007): 125-148. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Persky, Joseph. "Classical Family Values: Ending the Poor Laws as They Knew Them." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11.1 (Winter 1997): 179-189. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Dec 2014.
- Petty, William, Sir. *Five Essays in Political Arithmetick*. London, 1687. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 Jan 2008.

- Shoemaker, Robert. *London Mob: Violence and Disorder in Eighteenth-Century England*. New York: Continuum, 2004. Print.
- Shore, Heather. "Crime, Criminal Networks, and the Survival Strategies of the Poor in Early Eighteenth-Century London." *The Poor in England 1700-1850: an Economy of Makeshifts*. Ed. Steven King and Alannah Tomkins. New York: Manchester UP, 2003. 137-165. Print.
- Taylor, James Stephen. *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Berkeley: Scholar, 1985. Print.
- Tomkins, Alannah. *The Experience of Urban Poverty: Parish Charity and Credit*. New York: Manchester UP, 2006. Print.
- Thompson, E.P. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." *Past & Present* 50 (1971): 76-136. *JSTOR*. Web. 7 April 2009.
- Trenchard, John and Thomas Gordon. "Of Charity and Charity Schools." *Cato's Letters: or, Essay on Liberty, Civil, and Religious and Other Important Subjects in Four Volumes*. London, 1723. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 9 June 2011.

Chapter 1

Mandeville versus the Society for the Reformation of Manners: Theories of Economy, Poverty, and Philanthropy

In 1723, a battle of words broke out over Bernard Mandeville's *The Fable of the Bees*, a multi-genre attack on the Society for the Reformation of Manners (SFRM). The Society, a Protestant organization created in 1690, aimed to root out all forms of moral corruption in English society.¹ The SFRM waged a battle of epic proportions against "the champions and advocates of debauchery [who] put themselves in array to defend their wretched and infamous liberties" (Woodward 5). Its members actively focused on solving religious, political, and economic issues, in an effort to bolster the English nation against moral corruption. No one was safe from the diligent surveillance of the Society for the Reformation Manners and its network of informants, judges, justices of the peace, and constables. The Society raided molly houses to root out the vice of effeminacy and pursued the prosecution of prostitutes and their clients to banish lust. They also zealously pursued any sort of general impiety, such as swearing or not attending church on Sunday. The Society often directed their efforts to stem vice at the poor, and their strategies included fines, pillorying, and whipping. According to SFRM member Josiah Woodward's 1700 testimony, vice still abounded in England, but the group had cleansed the country to an astonishing degree.² While the Society congratulated its members on a job

¹ The Society spread relatively quickly. By 1701 more than a dozen organizations operated in London and the countryside (Hurl-Eamon 1020). In fact, "at one point there were about twenty reformation of manners societies active in the metropolis [London]" (Hitchcock 100). These estimates do not include the numerous Scottish and Irish Societies. Scholarship shows that the efforts of the SFRM garnered significant public support.

² In this chapter I largely use Josiah Woodward's history of the SFRM, which is a propaganda piece, to explain their goals, objectives, and actions, because he was the most prolific writer on the organization's behalf. Woodward was a Church of England clergyman and a member of the SFRM. He published numerous sermons and tracts: *A Disswasive from the Sin of Drunkenness*; *A Kind Caution to Profane*

well done, Mandeville took potshots at their ideals, social reform efforts, and philanthropic projects.³ He objected to the tactics the Society for the Reformation of Manners used in its zealous pursuit of vice. Mandeville believed the views of the Society were naïve and that those views encouraged actions harmful to the commonwealth. In response to the Society's call for moral purity, Mandeville claimed that private vices, including self-love, increased the health and wealth of England. The Society hit back at Mandeville's claim and reasserted their fundamental belief that "it is God himself, who first declared the Excellence of human Nature" (Law 10).⁴ The debate between Mandeville and the Society, I will show, reflected an ideological divide that extended across early eighteenth-century social criticism and reform texts.

The roots of the socioeconomic disagreement between Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners lie in the treatises of seventeenth-century economists such as Nicholas Barbon, Thomas Mun, Josiah Childs, and Sir William Petty. Using different strategies: historical, mathematical, and classificatory they addressed a number of questions including what roles do, or should, the poor have in the economic system, and how do we ensure the cooperation of the poor in this system? Their economic writing reflects a community divided on issues of

Swearers, and *Fair Warnings to a Careless World*; *The Seamen's Monitor*; *The Soldier's Monitor*; and *The Young Man's Monitor Shewing the Great Happiness of Early Piety and the Dreadful Consequences of Indulging Youthful Lusts*. As a member of the Society, he wrote two essays laying out the history, mission, and growth of the organization: *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London, &c.* and *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in England and Ireland* (1700).

³ Mandeville's pointed jabs at the Society for the Reformation of Manners were not limited to *The Fable of the Bees*. From 1714 to 1732, shortly before his death, Mandeville's writing focused on the nature of humankind, economic principles, crime, religion, and governance, and contained explicit or veiled insults aimed at the Society and their ilk. His works on the subject include: *The Mischiefs that Ought Justly to be Apprehended from a Whig-Government* (1714); *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness* (1720); *A Modest Defence of Publick Stews* (1724); *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn* (1725); and *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honour, and the Usefulness of Christianity in War* (1732).

⁴ Others who have explored the idea of natural benevolence include the 3rd Lord Shaftesbury in *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1708) and Francis Hutcheson in *System of Moral Philosophy* (1755), and a few years earlier, Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651).

luxuries, profits, wages, and morality. A division also articulated in the print battle between Mandeville and the SFRM. Despite their differences, each of these economists identified the poor as a threat to both the existing social and economic order due to their laziness, ignorance, and criminal nature. As Nicholas Rogers observes in his study of eighteenth-century crime, “The question of crime became umbilically linked to the question of regulating the poor, to monitoring their manners, morals, and pauperdom” (84). Writers shared a collective goal of eliminating problems directly related to poverty, including crime, social unrest among the lower classes, and parish support of the poor. They also established the poor as an essential component of national and imperial wealth and strength. Thus, the economic texts examined here intersect in a shared belief that national, individual, or spiritual wealth depended on exploitation of the waged labor and control of the unpaid reproductive labor of the poor.⁵

In this chapter, I argue that the textual squabble between Mandeville and the Society represents a critical link between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century economic theories that established the role of the poor and eighteenth-century social reform efforts aimed at directing the activities of the poor. This debate gives insight into the economic and religious motivations that permeated all areas of eighteenth-century social reform from poor laws to institutions of public philanthropy. For example, in his writing, Mandeville willingly articulates the moral grey areas of British charity, including economic profit and vice. In contrast, many of Mandeville’s contemporaries in the 1710s and 20s, including the SFRM, struggled to reconcile or outright rejected the possibility that a self-interested element existed in charity work. Additionally, in

⁵ I use the phrase “unpaid reproductive labor” in the Marxist sense of not producing surplus value. Unpaid reproductive labor is more fitting than “idle time” or “leisure activities” because the poor were not supposed to have either of the latter. Unpaid reproductive labor emphasizes the fact that the poor were defined through the act of their bodies doing work. Therefore, while not every activity had to produce a financial profit all of their actions needed to be productive.

pursuit of profanity and prostitution, the Society persecuted the poor, not the rich. Responding to this lopsided focus, Mandeville vehemently insists that corruption exists at every level of society, making the Society's actions at the very least misguided and ineffectual.⁶ This early-eighteenth-century disagreement represents the clash of what I call market and moral theories, concepts explored in detail later. Importantly, the tension between market and moral economies reflected and influenced public opinion, social reform projects (including public charities), and official policies about the poor.

The goal of this chapter is two-fold: First, I contribute to scholarship, which considers Mandeville a key contributor to early-eighteenth-century economic theory as I will explain shortly. Second, I demonstrate the ways in which his notions about poverty, labor, and public assistance were part of a range of positions that impacted the material conditions of the poor; and, in the process, I broaden the scope of Mandeville scholarship. The essays, sermons, treatise, proposals, and royal proclamations that I bring together in this chapter helps us better understand connections between class, labor, physical exploitation, and ideological coercion in the eighteenth-century. They also serve as the theoretical framework for the following chapters by mapping the concerns about the poor that influenced changes in the institutional missions and strategies of public charities over the course of the eighteenth century.

In the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, according to Salim Rashid, religious scholars and political theorists generally relegated Mandeville to a secondary position in eighteenth-century thought, viewing him as a mere foil to major thinkers like Francis Hutcheson,

⁶ Mandeville repeatedly notes that the Society's attempts to eliminate vice disrupted the social and economic order. Among his many dire predictions, Mandeville argues that a society sans prostitution will degenerate into one in which virtuous women are raped. He also believed that the Society's tactics did not resolve the reasons why poor young women resorted to prostitution.

Lord Shaftesbury, and Adam Smith. The tide turned with F. B. Kaye's 1924 introduction to *The Fable of the Bees*, which established Mandeville's importance in eighteenth-century studies. Since Kaye, political theorists and economic historians have traced the cultural influences that contributed to Mandeville's economic thought. A significant amount of this scholarship explores the relationship between Mandeville and the emergence of modernity—Anne Mette Hjort's "Mandeville's Ambivalent Modernity" and E. J. Hundert's "Bernard Mandeville and the Enlightenment's Maxims of Modernity," for instance. Other scholarly works establish a relationship between Mandeville and capitalism, as do M. M. Goldsmith's "Mandeville and the Spirit of Capitalism" and Jimena Hurtado Prieto's *Mandeville's Heir: Adam Smith or Jean Jacques Rousseau on the Possibility of Economic Analysis*. Each of these studies situates Mandeville's writing within a constellation of contemporaneous ideas, including continental philosophy and science. For example, Hjort's essay considers sociological meanings of autonomy in relationship to Mandeville's writing, while Prieto analyzes the ways in which Mandeville's thinking positively and negatively influenced writers in the 1760s and 70s. While important, these efforts to show the complexity of Mandeville's writing are limited to articulating connections between social and economic theories, and they miss the material practices and effects of those theories.

This chapter establishes the importance of examining the struggle between Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners as a moment when economic theory and practice intersect. Section one, "A Moral Tale," gets to the heart of the debate between Mandeville and the SFRM. In it, I define moral economy; lay out the exigencies and mission of the SFRM as they are described in Woodward's *An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London* and *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners*

in England and Ireland; and then explain Mandeville's main objections to the organization's work. Section two, "Rationalizing Poverty," examines the threads of economic thought that influenced the debate between Mandeville and the Society of the Reformation of Manners. I map the central ideas of mercantile and market economics which point toward the competing and complimentary concerns that shaped the relationship between poverty and labor throughout the eighteenth century. On the surface, the SFRM's philosophy stands in stark contrast to Mandeville's controversial suggestions for more efficient management of the poor. However, I argue that all groups overlap in their focus on somatic disciplinary methods to control and exploit the poor. Understanding the similarities and differences between these groups clarifies what stays the same (control and exploitation) and what changes (philanthropic motivations and methods of control) over the course of the eighteenth century, which is the focus of my subsequent chapters.

A Moral Tale

Historians use the term moral economy to explain dissenting actions amongst the poor living in an eighteenth-century protocapitalist or nineteenth and twentieth century capitalist economy. Contemporary scholarship on moral economy, including mine, is indebted to E. P. Thompson's "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century."⁷

⁷ One book that uses the term moral economy before Thompson's 1971 essay is Ralph Barton Perry's *Moral Economy* (1909), which is heavy on the religious analysis and light on real economic consideration. There is of course a long history of moral philosophy that informs the language of moral economy, but the latter phrase, as Thompson used it, brought a distinctly Marxist set of questions to the understanding of eighteenth-century mobs and riots. Thompson was not sure whether he coined the term or read it some long lost book. Regardless of the originality of the term, it is clear that Thompson revitalized discussion in the fields of cultural studies, history, ethics, economics, and philosophy with his writing. Scholars of contemporary economics have used the term moral economy more broadly to consider whether or not ethics come into play in the decision-making process of a transnational corporation or in the power of popular protest, among other topics. See William James Booth, "On the Idea of the Moral Economy" (1994); James C. Scott, *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia* (1976); Thomas Heilke, "Locating a Moral/Political Economy: Lessons

Thompson first used the term moral economy to explain the food-based riots, both peaceful and violent, of the poor in the eighteenth century.⁸ Thompson's project, a bottom-up history of poor relief, mapped the ways that the poor brought the wealthy to task to do what was right, instead of following the logic of profit. Magistrates labeled the actions of the rioters and poachers "mob" behavior.⁹ Nevertheless, Thompson says, "it is possible to detect in almost every eighteenth-century crowd's action some form of legitimizing notion," generally a defense of "traditional right or customs" (Thompson 78). The poor acted "upon a consistent traditional view of social norms and obligations, of the proper economic functions of several parties within the community, which taken together, can be said to constitute the moral economy of the poor" (Thompson 79). The economic and social contract between the rich and the poor meant that the poor did their duty, laboring for less than subsistence wages for the greater good, and the rich took care of the latter for the same reason. Care came in the form of charity efforts, setting fair (just) prices on food, taxes, and other regulations. The poor saw greedy businessmen and traders as the root of their problems and responded with demands for fair prices on goods.

Thompson's bottom-up history is important, but it has three limitations that my use of moral economy challenges. First, when looking at eighteenth-century policies and plans, it is the moral economy of the upper class that competes head-on with other economic theories and practices, not that of the poor. Many people from the ranks of the middling class and landed

from Sixteenth-Century Anabaptism" (1997); John Bohstedt, "The Moral Economy and the Discipline of Historical Context" (1992); John Powelson, *The Moral Economy* (2000); William Andrew Munro, *The Moral Economy of the State* (1998); David Cheal, *Moral Economy: Gift Giving in an Urban Society* (1985); Charles Tripp, *Islam and the Moral Economy: The Challenge of Capitalism* (2006); and Adrian Randall, *Moral Economy and Popular Protest: Crowds, Conflict and Authority* (2000).

⁸See also J. M. Neeson, *Commoners: Common Rights, Enclosures, and Social Change in England, 1700-1820* (1993); and Bob Bushaway, *By Rite: Custom, Ceremony, and Community in England, 1700-1880* (1982).

⁹The poor believed that the rich had an obligation to help the poor by paying poor taxes, supporting reasonable plans for the improvement of the children of the lower ranks, and maintaining the care of the crippled and elderly (Birtles 77-79).

gentry attempted to rewrite the terms of moral economy to balance the rights of property with duty to the poor. Furthermore, Thompson describes “an old moral economy of provisions,” which was fading away, yet concern for the poor and efforts to help them did not stop in the eighteenth century; in fact, they increased. The increased efforts to “assist” the poor stemmed from the perceived increase in crime among the poor. All strands of eighteenth-century economy, including the moral economy, framed punishment as a component of poor assistance. The logic justifying acts of violence against the poor range from the moral economy’s religious explanations to the market economy’s socioeconomic claims.

Finally, Thompson rejects religion as a factor in the conflict between the rich and the poor, but the early-eighteenth-century moral economy was a stridently Protestant (and anti-Catholic) set of beliefs about stewardship, punishment, zeal, Christian charity, and rewards. The moral economists believed they were competing with secularized strands of economic practice in shaping the lives and conditions of the poor for the livelihood of the nation. Thus the term moral economy, more accurately than the more commonly used term moral philosophy, articulates the material impact of moral beliefs in the financial realm.¹⁰ Here my analysis aligns with scholars from different fields, including theology and history, that come to the same conclusion about the importance of religion in early moral economy. Moral economy in its different early forms was above all a set of religious concerns and practices that informed public and private economic attitudes and practices until the nineteenth century, which saw the consolidation of capitalism and secular ethics (Lind 17; Claeys 3). The royals, in particular King William, Queen Mary, and

¹⁰ Contributions to an eighteenth-century moral philosophy include Francis Hutcheson’s *A System of Moral Philosophy in Three Books* (1755); Edward Bentham’s *An Introduction to Moral Philosophy* (1746); David Hume’s *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739) and *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751); Henry Homes, Lord Kames’ *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion* (1751); and Adam Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759).

Queen Anne, were the most powerful public figures shaping the discourse of moral economy in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, but many others participated in the conversation, and what they had in common was their Protestant faith.

While eighteenth-century moral economy was deeply grounded in religious faith, no one denomination represented its ideas or the SFRM. M. M. Goldsmith, in “Public Virtue and Private Vices: Bernard Mandeville and English Political Ideology in the Early Eighteenth Century,” says that neighborhood branches or versions of the Society were “composed of Anglicans and Dissenters both, often mixed” (491). The wide range of people I have uncovered who supported the Society in particular or a reformation of manners in general supports Goldsmith’s claim. For instance, Daniel Defoe was a member for at least a short time, and he was from a dissenter family (Burch 307). His membership was brief because he agreed with the Society’s aims, but not so much with their methods (Anderson 30). George Stanhope was a prominent member and a moderate high church Dean of Canterbury. Many other members, such as John Ellis, Joseph Norton, William Hendley (1691-1721), and Thomas Mangey (1688-1755), were minor clergymen from conforming and nonconforming backgrounds.

I believe that two sets of related concepts, vice and poverty on one hand, and sin and punishment on the other, grounded in the political and social turmoil of the seventeenth century, defined the early-eighteenth-century moral economy; and connected people across the political and religious spectrum. Moral economists, concerned with finding the root of the poor “problem,” found it in the swearing, gin swilling, and irreligion prevalent among the poor. Moral economists argued that while sin tempted all women and men, the poor were especially vulnerable. There was broad public support for the organization’s methods “of clearing the streets of prostitutes, beggars, street merchants, and other ‘loose idle and disorderly people’”

(Hitchcock 100). This eighteenth-century moral economy operated on the belief that forcing the poor into moral compliance would bring “advantages to us and others, while the consequences of not doing so would be personal and painful quite apart from the law” (Powelson 1). Ultimately, the new moral economy of provisions established by organizations such as the SFRM looked very different from what Thompson describes, because these organizations focused on addressing the spiritual needs of the poor over their physical ones.

The religious and moral quagmire of King Charles I’s, Charles II’s, and James II’s reigns, which led people to believe that they were being punished for leaving the path of righteousness, shaped the early-eighteenth-century moral economy.¹¹ Woodward and other SFRM members criticized Charles II and James II because under their leadership vicious acts gained a degree of social respectability. In Woodward’s view, it was now “breeding to swear, gallantry to be lewd, good humour to be drunk, and wit to despise sacred things” (Woodward 3). Even worse, vice was “practiced in the streets and labeled as wit and entertainment in theatres and sincere religion became the jest and scorn of our courts in the late reigns” (Woodward 3). Several clergymen, tract writers, and social critics identify this historical juncture (with the exception of the Commonwealth period) as the point at which England lost faith and God’s favor (Shoemaker, “Reforming” 99).

Woodward’s SFRM propaganda, a combination of operational report, institutional history, and philanthropic guide, frames the 1688 Glorious Revolution as both a political and

¹¹ The rule of these three kings was marred by concerns about their Catholic leanings. Of the kings, Charles II was the ruler most frequently named by early-eighteenth-century moral economists. Charles II flirted with popery throughout his reign, indicated by his marriage to the Roman Catholic Catherine of Braganza; his issuance of the Royal Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which stopped punishment of recusants; his support of Roman Catholic France in the third Anglo-Dutch war; and his lack of legitimate issue, which ensured the throne went to his Roman Catholic brother James II. Charles II’s religious ambivalence, as well as the excesses of his court, shaped subsequent generations’ concerns about the monarchy, vice, and virtue.

moral revolution, shaking off the threat of a Roman Catholic ruler and the inherent vices of such a reign (Woodward; Wells and Wills 418).¹² Unfortunately, according to Woodward, the damage of Catholic excesses lingered. While the ascension of William and Mary vanquished popery, it did not mean the end of immorality and profanity. William and Mary, influenced by the clergy, led the charge against vice. They published proclamations and statements declaring England's exceptionalism (England was exceptional because it had personally experienced the grace of God) and expressing the worry that they risked losing God's favor through their actions. King William's 1697 proclamation "For Preventing and Punishing Immorality and Prophaness" starts with a dire warning: God is good for ending the long and bloody war, but despite this blessing the people are not showing their gratitude through suitable actions, since "Impiety, Prophaness [sic], and Immorality do still abound" (Woodward A). A later proclamation by Queen Anne, "For the Encouragement of Piety and Virtue and for the Preventing and Punishing of Vice, Prophaness, and Immorality" (1702), begins with warnings that the people are not following God's will. Because of their disobedience, the English run the risk of God's wrath falling on the country to punish their wicked ways. Thus, eighteenth-century moral economy contained within it the tendency to tally vice and virtue as profits and losses to be met with the wrath or goodwill of God.

Against this historical background, the Society for the Reformation of Manners attempted to establish "moral uniformity" across England by punishing the bad behavior of the poor (Hunt 102). SFRM literature emphasized the historical pattern of sin and punishment to justify the organization's restrictive and violent actions towards the poor. Popular and powerful

¹² Despite this resounding strike against the popish threat, eighteenth-century England never felt completely safe due to real and imagined threats to the throne in the form of Jacobite Risings trying to restore James II and then his Stuart descendants.

participants in the early-eighteenth-century moral economy discourse, SFRM members and supporters came from every rank, from royalty to tradesmen.¹³ The SFRM made a concerted effort to enforce secular and moral laws, do the work of parish officers and ministers, and inform on and prosecute offenders (Shoemaker 239). As such, they decried and punished prostitution and buggery, as well as more mundane (and pervasive) sins such as cursing, drinking, and fornicating.¹⁴ As Tim Hitchcock notes, the general belief was that “all forms of vice were connected—if one was so immoral as to swear or drink too much one was also likely to fornicate or gamble” (Hitchcock, “Reforming” 101). The perceived relationship between different types of vices and an incipient connection to crime led Woodward to argue that “laws against

¹³ A number of powerful men publically supported the SFRM. Even the Crown advocated the organization’s goal, doing its part to fight moral corruption by submitting proclamations denouncing vices to be read in the public square of every town. Thus, King William, in support of the reformers’ goal, wishes “to discountenance and punish all manner of vice, immorality and prophaness in all persons, from the highest to the lowest degree within our realm” (A2). The makeup of the SFRM reflected the larger social composition in terms of duties and influence. Parliament members, justices of the peace, and high-ranking citizens were the nucleus of the Society. The brains of the operation, these top-ranking members came up with ways to effect reform and served as a sort of advisory board. The second branch of the Society consisted of approximately fifty tradesmen, according to Woodward. This branch pursued the prosecution of offenders. The third group consisted of the constables in charge of inspections and street patrols, among other things. The final group, informants, were used to entrap offenders and supply testimony for the prosecution; they were foot soldiers in what was seen as a just, godly war. While not members of the Society, these men and women, according to Woodward, were the institution’s “corner-stone” (Woodward 10).

The Society for the Reformation of Manners has been singled out by eighteenth-century scholars as unique because of the range of people involved, the combination of tactics members employed, and its influence on policy and discussions of eighteenth-century male sexuality. See Josiah Woodward, “An Account of the Progress of the Reformation of Manners in England, Scotland, and Ireland” (1707) and “An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in England and Ireland” (1700); Robert Shoemaker, “Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690-1738” (1992); Margaret Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England* (1996); and Stephen H. Gregg, “A Truly Christian Hero: Religion, Effeminacy, and Nation in the Writings of the Societies for Reformation of Manners” (2001).

¹⁴ For studies on the subjects of prosecution see Shoemaker, *Prosecution and the Police: Petty Crime and the Law in London and Rural Middlesex, c. 1660-1725* (1992) and “Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690-1738” (1992); T. C. Curtis and W. A. Speck, “The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform” (1976); Stephen H. Gregg, “A Truly Christian Hero: Religion, Effeminacy, and Nation in the Writing of the Society for the Reformation of Manners” (2001); Edward Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain Since 1700* (1977); and Margaret Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England, 1680-1780* (1996).

prophaness [sic] and debauchery are necessary for the preservation of communities, as that piety and virtue are requisite to their well-being; and that unrestrained vices and prophaness are as fatal to publick societies, as they are destructive to private persons” (2). Woodward’s observations about the health of a morally cohesive society contributed to a persistent slippery slope argument that criminalized the poor by eliding sin and crime.

Woodward’s institutional propaganda further forges a connection between vice and poverty when grappling with the concept of wealth. While the SFRM connected luxuries to vanity, self-love, greed, effeminacy, theft, and murder (Gregg 18), they did not believe that material wealth was inherently sinful. Nevertheless, moral economists grappled with what they thought was a total and inadvisable “separation of trade from religion [which] was transmuted into a separation of economics from ethics” (Lind 18). They worried about the long-term effects England faced when financial decisions were being made based solely on man’s will, not God’s law. For instance, Woodward acknowledges the period’s focus on money, wealth, and colonial expansion, but raises no objection to wealth.¹⁵ Instead of directly criticizing market economists for their material aims, Woodward suggests that their methods and primary aims were wrong. He and other members of the SFRM feared what would become of a nation that believes “the chief end of [the] business of trade is to make a profitable bargain” (Barbon 3). Thus, moral economists believed that individual profit was an acceptable by-product, but not the central focus of trade. Instead, they championed trade as an effective vehicle for transmitting the gospel at home and abroad.

¹⁵ This is an important shift, because moral economic theory and practice had been—since at least the Middle Ages—driven by the “perceived threat which commerce posed to the successful pursuit of Christian virtue” (Claeys 3). For instance, Thomas Aquinas focused on the image of the greedy merchant who would buy cheap and sell at exorbitant prices because they “not only violated the Christian tradition of moral restraint” but also threatened “the full employment of the nation’s labor” (Claeys 16).

Preachers like George Stanhope, Richard Smalbroke, Thomas Mangey, and William Norton used parables and metaphors to comment on the duty of the rich and the poor, earthly possessions, and God's wrath. Many used the "trope of the nation as a fortress-isle, hedged around by God's special care but under the threat of immoral invasion often figured in metaphors of the plague" (Greggs 17). Reverend John Ellis was among the many early-eighteenth-century clergy with a dire warning for his congregation. In his sermon "Reformation of Manners," he says that "there has been, I fear, but too much occasion given for the general complaint of the great degeneration and corruption of manners, which of late seems to have spread it self thro' almost the whole body of the nation." This disease can only be struck down if people become "a terror to evil doers" and "revengers to execute wrath upon him that doth evil" (Ellis, "Preface"). The sins of man are "a devouring plague," continuing the imagery of violence and epidemic (Ellis, "Preface"). In the Bible, whole groups frequently suffer due to the wrongs of a few. For this reason, it is incumbent on each person to stand up to sin, as Ellis explains to his congregation: "we have no reason to expect but that, if we sin, as others have done, God will deal with us, as we read he hath dealt with others" (6). Ellis' words make even more sense when considering that many believed a 1665 outbreak of the plague and the Great Fire of London in 1666 were just two moments when the people of England were punished for turning away from God.¹⁶

The emphasis on punishment meant that moral economists had to be active in reforming English society and molding it to God's will. In every way possible, SFRM sermons promoted a

¹⁶ Puritan preacher Thomas Vincent describes the Great Fire of London as the cleansing hand of God in his book *God's Terrible Voice in the City* (1667). He quotes from Psalm 11:6, "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest, this shall be the portion of their cup." Vincent's argument is comparable to Pat Robertson's and Jerry Falwell's claims that various natural disasters and the September 11 terrorist attacks are the result of God's anger over homosexuality, abortion, and feminists.

“logic of reform” that “demanded strict and consistent punishment of deviations from virtue” (Hunt 110). Even discussion of God’s reward inevitably circled back to fear of punishment and the actions necessary to prevent God’s chastisement. For instance, after talking about the reward due to the faithful, George Stanhope reminds his congregation that “Our Lord hath next recourse to Terrors and Punishments” (3). According to Justice Hugh Hare, the goal of reformers should be to strike down all “dangerous domestic enemies,” who were “all prophane, lewd, debauched, traitorous, seditious, lawless, and disorderly persons who blaspheme God, and dishonour themselves; who conspire the ruin of the government under whose protection they live” (Hare 3). Failure to strike out in punishment logically leads to the destruction of civil society. Therefore the SFRM had to act in order to prevent God’s punishment (poor crops, fire, and war), and as an added bonus those that worked towards ridding the world of vice did not have to wait to be rewarded since their works would “bring down the riches of heaven” (Woodward 11).

Belief in the immediacy of God’s anger and favor led to the Society’s focus on acts of zealotry. Zeal reflected their belief that each person must uncompromisingly follow the will of God and ensure that others also comply. Zeal was public and violent, unyielding and consistent. In a “Reformation Necessary to Prevent Our Ruine,” Richard Smalbroke begins his sermon with the story of Phinehas, a Jewish high priest, punishing the Israelites in Psalms 106:30-31. The Israelites “joined themselves also unto Baalpeor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead. Thus, they provoked him to anger with their inventions: and the plague brake in upon them. Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgment: and so the plague was stayed and that was counted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for evermore” (Smalbroke 29-31). Smalbroke explains that Phinehas’ execution of the two offenders is not murder because he was “transported by fervent zeal”; it is “an act of zeal for the honour of God” (9). In the same

sermon, Smalbroke describes Society for the Reformation of Manners as a group “capable of imitating the zeal of Phinehas” (6). Furthermore, he claims that Phinehas’ slaying of the two offenders when others balked is a righteous example that should be imitated by magistrates in order to ensure the righteousness of this generation and those to follow (Smalbroke 5). Efforts to control and punish the poor were compared to the swift and mighty hand of the Lord and the terror of sinners and saints in his presence.

Zeal was ultimately a justification within moral economy for violent control of the idle and criminal elements among the poor. To the charges of fanaticism leveled against the reformers, Ellis retorts that when Jesus came to earth, he corrected others loudly and fearlessly. Since efforts to purify the nation follow in the footsteps of God, any negative criticism of the Society is a rejection of God and the tenets of Christian faith (Ellis, “Preface”). Smalbroke’s sermon shows that for moral sermonizers the world was black and white: there was virtue, and everything else was a vice. There was no difference between a sin and a crime, and virtue was the natural state of man, God’s greatest creation. Vice was to be discouraged at all costs, and the most effective method was criminal prosecution. Zeal was about striking terror in the hearts of men so they did not turn from God, and moral economists took the work of zeal very seriously.

The content of Smalbroke’s and other SFRM members’ sermons seems removed from the economic discourse, compared to sermons that commented directly on contemporary financial matters, but cumulatively they had an effect on the existence of the laboring poor and inspired the activities of groups like the Society for the Reformation of Manners. For example, each time the Society threatened prostitutes’ clients and punished justices who were willing to turn a blind eye for a small fee, the SFRM affected the lives of poor women who used prostitution as a survival tool. In 1700, Woodward claimed that the society of tradesmen “suppressed and rooted

out about five hundred disorderly houses, and caused to be punished some thousands of lewd persons” (Woodward 9).¹⁷ Others are “transported to our plantations” to avoid “shame and punishment...poverty and disease...and the danger of the gallows” (Woodward 18).

Woodward’s writing shows that, while some women voluntarily chose to start new lives, for many the result of the Society’s work was punishment, which usually consisted of imprisonment and hard labor.

Mandeville’s Attack

The reformers’ zealous pursuit of vice and their hidden economic motives sparked the debate between Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners.¹⁸ Mandeville makes his displeasure clear in the poem *Typhon, or the War between the Gods and Giants* (1724), which he dedicates to the Society by referring to “The numerous Societies of Fools in London and Westminster” (A2). Ensuring the insult hits its mark, Mandeville explains that his dedication is comparable to Scarron’s decision to dedicate *Typhon* to “his sister’s bitch” (A2). All of these explicit insults stemmed from Mandeville’s beliefs that the Society’s convictions and practices were shortsighted and hypocritical. Furthermore, while the moral economists framed public charity as the will of God and therefore not selfishly motivated, Mandeville pointed out the self-interested nature of any public act. In the essay, *Free Thoughts on Religion*,

¹⁷ Those convicted of “lewd and disorderly practices” averaged 1,330 a year, according to the Societies’ records from 1708 to 1724 (Shoemaker 103). By 1735 “the London and Westminster societies could boast a forty-year record of no fewer than 99,380 prosecutions for debauchery and profane behavior” (97).

¹⁸ According to Robert Shoemaker, “offenses directly insulting God...were given first priority” (“Reforming” 102). In just one year, “563 persons were convicted for permitting tippling on the Sabbath, working on the Sabbath, drunkenness, and swearing and cursing” (Shoemaker, “Reforming” 103). Tellingly, “the only legislation passed in support of the reformation of manners campaign concerned profane swearing and cursing and blasphemy” (Shoemaker, “Reforming” 102). While a number of lawmakers and in related professions mouthed support of the SFRM’s goals, they realized the economic impracticality of making or enforcing laws against things such as prostitution or working on the Sabbath.

the Church, and National Happiness, he says that sinners rid themselves of fear of God's punishments for their acts by observing "some of the branches of outward piety and devotion...[which are] altogether foreign to real virtue" (v). The hypocrisy of moral economists and others of their ilk leads Mandeville to write his satirical expose of the seedy underbelly of society and reforming organizations like the SFRM.

Mandeville uses economic logic throughout his writing to cement his criticism of the SFRM. To demonstrate the hypocritical elements of the reformers' position, Mandeville refers to what he calls "true" Christianity and the language of religion. He also uses the language of economy and utility to prove the shortsighted, harmful nature of the Society. Thus, Mandeville says the reformers' attempts to squash private vices might harm England's economic wealth in the long term because "vices are inseparable from great and potent Societies, and... it is impossible their Wealth and Grandeur should subsist without" (Mandeville, *Fable* 57). In the *Remarks* section of *The Fable of the Bees*, he warns that if everyone becomes virtuous, the wealth and strength of the nation will dwindle. The SFRM'S actions could produce a dystopia in which "Pride and Luxury decrease, so by degrees they leave the seas. Not merchants now; but companies remove whole manufacturies. All art and crafts neglected lie; content the bane of industry, makes 'em admire their homely store, and neither seek, nor covet more" (Mandeville, *Fable* 75). Of course, he then shows that this genuinely virtuous society is no more than a pipe dream for the SFRM, who is crippled by thinly-veiled greed, hypocritically punishing the very poor who make them rich.

Of all the shortsighted actions of the SFRM, Mandeville expresses the most disgust for the fact that in a city full of thieves and robbers the Society targeted prostitutes and their clients, drunkards, and Sabbath breakers. He notes that, conveniently for the successful merchants and

businessmen who make up a large portion of the Society, the focus on Sabbath breaking nets “low-status shopkeepers who [sell] food, such as bakers, chandlers, butchers, and fruiterers” (Hitchcock, “Reforming” 111). The Society argues that their focus “on such low-status offenders” is appropriate because the lower class is “most vulnerable to corruption” (Hitchcock, “Reforming” 111). However, Mandeville suggests that the true motivation of the Society’s members is self-interest. He chooses not to name concrete ways the Society benefits, but makes it clear that the private interests of powerful men define what is vice and virtue. Thus virtue and vice are socially, not divinely, inspired (*Fable* 81). He firmly believed the interest of these men was wealth, generally at the expense of poor—a fact concealed by their religious language.

In the *Remarks* section of *The Fable of the Bees* and *A Modest Defense of Public Stews*, Mandeville chooses prostitution as a central point of contention with the Society for the Reformation of Manners. His *Remarks* warns, “if Courtezans and Strumpets were to be prosecuted with as much Rigour as some silly people would have it, what Locks or Bars would be sufficient to preserve the Honour of our Wives and Daughters” (Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees* 127). The dangerous outcome of moral reform is that “men would grow outrageous and ravishing would become a common Crime” (Mandeville, *Fable* 127). Mandeville delivers a double insult: first, the explicit name-calling, and second, the implied insult that the organization fails in its duty to ensure the safekeeping of wives and virtuous young women. He reiterates the Society’s failures by dedicating his outrageous proposal for government-managed prostitution, *A Modest Defense of Public Stews*, to the Society whose “endeavours to suppress lewdness, have only served to promote it” (ii). His hyperbolic language when describing the effects of the Society’s actions reinforces the wrongness of their actions.

Unlike the moral economists, Mandeville explicitly acknowledges the energy and resources that go into and are the product of activities that others do not consider labor. Mandeville's argument for public stews acknowledges the role economics plays in shaping moral standards and social responses to the poor. He proposes a more effectual plan to protect virtuous women and employ the poor: state-owned bordellos. Mandeville reminds his readers of his overall goal to find ways to contribute to the wealth of state when he describes the plan as having a "great deal of Prudence" and "Oeconomy" (*Public Stews*). His language emphasizes the market economists' bottom line of fiscal gain whatever the cost. Mandeville proposes public stews as a means of helping the poor because managing vice is a better deterrent to lawlessness than the zealous punishments pursued by the Society. In the case of prostitution, the problem is not the act itself, according to Mandeville; the problem is the lack of government regulation and control to ensure safety and profitability. He implies that if the government establishes an efficient plan to manage prostitution and make it profitable, the tide of public opinion will turn. Mandeville's overall message supports Defoe's claim that "the nation's prosperity is built on the ruins of the nation's morals" (qtd. in Anderson 27). In Mandeville's writing, the prostitute serves as a concrete example of the positive social value of vice.

The flurry of published denouncements shows that many people were disgusted by Mandeville's claim that avarice, vanity, and intemperance are a necessary part of civil societies. George Blewitt's "Enquiry...in which the Plea Offered by the Author of the Fable of the Bees...are Considered" (1725) combines anecdote and history to disprove the key points in Mandeville's argument. He claims that Mandeville's writing urges "against the practice of virtue," which is more damaging to the health and wealth of England than any other idea (A2). William Law's outrage with Mandeville leads him to proclaim in his essay "Remarks upon a

Late Book Entitled, the Fable of the Bees” (1724) that “the nature and divine Origin of moral Virtue, is founded in...the Perfections and Attributions of God, and not in the Pride of Man, or the Craft or Cunning of Politicians” (Law 29).¹⁹ As late as 1872, Leslie Stephens describes

Mandeville as a “coarse and crude interpreter” who gloats over the idea of evil (65, 70).

Cementing his place as eighteenth-century villain, Mandeville’s observations on prostitutes and male impulses were at the center of objections when he was brought before the Grand Jury of Middlesex in 1723 as a public nuisance.

The defensiveness of the SFRM and other moral economists stemmed in part from the fact that Mandeville’s observations articulated the material concerns that underlay spiritual anxieties. For instance, Woodward’s SFRM propaganda promotes a moral agenda that masks the economic motivations behind their attempts to exert control over the thoughts and actions of the poor. The Society’s informers covered the streets, inns, bawdy houses, and molly houses because they believed that nonlabor or “leisure time, the time when one was not working...was the most dangerous” (Hunt108). The danger Woodward and other SFRM members confronted was a society weakened by a reduced number of the laboring population due to physical and moral weakness. Thus, Woodward claims that drinking and promiscuity reduce the productive labor force by weakening the body, producing vulnerability to disease and then death. Similarly, he argues that gambling leads to debts, which lead to robbery, which lead to hanging at Tyburn—another loss of productive labor. Woodward’s causal links reveal the economic concerns that underlay the eighteenth-century reforming spirit.

Mandeville’s clash with the reformers, beyond his crass examples, was sparked by his articulation of the moral quagmire that contributed to England’s economic success. Mandeville

¹⁹ See Russell Nieli, “Commercial Society and Christian Virtue: The Mandeville-Law Dispute” (1989).

was not the atheist that his detractors made him out to be, but from a practical standpoint, he believed it was impossible to banish most vices. He says, “the passions of some people are too violent to be curbed by any law or precept: and it is wisdom in all governments to bear with lesser inconveniences to prevent greater” (Mandeville, *Fable* 127). Mandeville makes it clear that while vice is tolerable, crime is not. On the surface, the squabble between Mandeville and the SFRM looks to be a small skirmish about vice and virtue, private actions and public accountability, but in reality, it was an important battle for control over the poor. Importantly, the shock value of using controversial examples such as prostitutes highlights Mandeville’s moral compromises and obscures the fact that his proposal does not benefit or extend greater social freedoms to the poor. For example, his proposal for state-regulated public stews would ensure the safety of virtuous gentlewomen by exerting total control over the labor, health, and finances of poor women. As I show in the following section, Mandeville’s proposal reflected the larger objective of all strands of eighteenth-century economic theory by highlighting the physical and ideological control of the poor.

Rationalizing Poverty

Classic mercantilist and market economist ideas about trade, luxury, population, and poverty undergirded both the new market economy and the 1723 Mandeville controversy.²⁰ The

²⁰ Late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century economists bounced between the mercantilist system, the emergent capitalist system, and a moral system incompatible with both. Yves Charbit, M. N. Rothbard, and Lars Magnusson all agree on problems that surface when using the term mercantilism, but each continues to use the term in his work. In recent years, eighteenth-century economists have been called late mercantilist, proto-capitalist, early capitalist, or pre-capitalist in an attempt to show development or instability. All of these terms define the eighteenth century according to what it was not: it was no longer a purely mercantilist society and not yet quite a capitalist one. Market economics is a better description for a discourse that shared some similarities with classic mercantilism (and has been grouped under the same heading) but was moving toward a newer model of economy. As Joyce Oldham Appleby explains in *Economic Thought and Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*, mercantilists “saw England, not as a giant workhouse but rather as a giant market whose individual members had differing needs” (168).

market economists disagreed with the classic mercantilists in fundamental ways regarding moral arguments about trade and luxury.²¹ They “took one discourse element, namely ‘the economy,’ emphasized and elaborated it until it became the predominant element in a new discursive formation that was no longer organized around morals, but around economics” (Hunt 367). Nevertheless, this was not a complete break in economic theory and policy because classic mercantilist beliefs about population and poverty persisted throughout the eighteenth century. The social ramifications of the market economic theory become clear when examining the East India Trading Company and the men who made the Company a powerful policymaker. Bernard Mandeville and Nicolas Barbon adapted the arguments merchants made in the interest of the Company to explain the social and economic relationships between the rich and poor. In response to the privileging of profit, groups like the SFRM imagined their work as public assistance, moving society back onto the proper moral path by disciplining the poor. Despite major points of disagreement between the moral, classic mercantilist, and market economists on various points of economic policy, they cohere, as I will show, around the idea of keeping the poor docile and productive.²²

²¹ Karl Polanyi considers market economy in his book *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Times* (1944). When Polanyi discusses market economy, he is referring to market liberalism—a theory of self-regulating markets in which “an economy [is] directed by market prices and nothing but market prices” (43), which as an economic policy failed dismally in the early-twentieth century. Polanyi’s argument focuses on a variety of cultural developments and crises, starting with the industrial revolution and ending with World Wars I and II. He says, “from the sixteenth century onwards markets were both numerous and important. Under the mercantile system, they became, in effect, a main concern of government; yet there was still no sign of the coming control of markets over human society. On the contrary, regulation and regimentation were stricter than ever; the very idea of a self-regulating market was absent” (Polanyi 55). I would argue that, while the men I discuss in this section were not market liberals when compared to the period Polanyi discusses, the term market economy accurately reflects their belief in the overwhelming power of the market. They gave credit to merchants that in the past was reserved for kings and queens and warriors.

²² As I explain earlier in the chapter, moral economists came from different denominational and political positions, high church and dissenting, Whig and Tory. The same is true of the broader conversation about economic policy. Paul Sack notes that “We can no longer so readily map binary alignments onto

Two major concerns in classic mercantile theory and policies informed Mandeville's writing: finding a favorable balance of trade and increasing the native population (populationism).²³ Classic mercantilists believed that establishing a positive balance of trade ensured the state's wealth.²⁴ This balance of trade depended on exporting more than the nation imported. The classic mercantilists assumed that the "goods of a country [were] its natural wealth [which could] only create money when sold abroad" (Van Ruymbeke 28). However, their concept of trade was not a reciprocal one. High tariffs on foreign manufactures would restrict domestic consumption of foreign goods and ensure the state lost very little bullion (at least in theory). As one author warned in 1549, "we must always take heed that we buy no more

the several contending economic interests of post-Restoration England: clothiers and merchants, defenders of corporations and companies and early advocates of some forms of economic freedom" (610).

²³ In his book *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), Adam Smith popularized the term mercantilist to describe the economic theories and practices of the sixteenth through the mid-eighteenth centuries. The real subject of Smith's critique was the classic mercantilist period, which ended in the early-seventeenth century. There were certainly classic mercantilists well into the eighteenth century—James Steuart's *Principles of Political Economy* was published in 1767—but the theory's high point occurred before 1620, and the major mercantilist policies were instituted between 1620 and 1660. Mercantilism was a protectionist economy that assumed "the wealth of the world was a zero-sum pie. National enrichment came from getting a larger slice of the pie" (Appleby, *The Relentless Revolution* 97). Merchants and policymakers championed extensive government intervention, such as restrictions or prohibition of exports, wage controls, and compulsory employment, to protect the interests (profits) of the state (Herkscher 26). Many classic mercantilists believed that the nation was self-sufficient and opposed debasement of the coinage and monopolies. Smith was critical of mercantilism as a system that restrained foreign imports in favor of "home industry" because he believed it actually ended up retarding a country's natural economic development and growth (192). Instead of strict regulation, Smith says that economic prosperity is the product of self-interest and competition. For a society to progress towards real wealth and greatness, "every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice" should be "left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men" (Smith 300). Smith's advocacy of each man's "free" pursuit shows the absorption and evolution of Mandeville's pro self-love position. For more on various mercantilists objectives, see Eli Heckscher, *Mercantilism* (1931); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy 1600-1730* (1981) and *The Modern World-System III: The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy, 1730-1840s* (1989); Lars Magnusson, "Eli Heckscher and His Mercantilism Today" (2006); Joyce Appleby, *The Relentless Revolution* (2010); and P. J. Thomas, "Mercantilism and the East India Trade" (1926).

²⁴ For close analysis of the balance of trade theory, see D. A. Irwin, "Mercantilism as Strategic Trade Policy" (1992); Robert Ekelund and Robert Tollison, *Mercantilism as a Rent-Seeking Society: Economic Regulation in Historical Perspective* (1981) and *Politicized Economies, Monarchy, Monopoly, and Mercantilism* (1997); and Jacob Viner, "Mercantilism" (1935).

from strangers than we sell them, for so should we impoverish ourselves and enrich them” (qtd. in Braudel 204). The worry about impoverishment referred to the common wealth, not to individual people. Classic mercantilists believed the lopsided balance of trade supported the working poor by ensuring they had enough work and thus did not become an unreasonable financial burden on anyone, especially the propertied. The classic mercantilists agreed that poverty was not a problem that needed solved. In fact, arguments about the necessity of poverty underlay the logic of the mercantile system. A number of social plans, including charities, sprang from a need to balance the dependency of the poor with a degree of self-sufficiency, or at least social utility.

The classic mercantilists claimed that the public’s demand for foreign luxury items harmed England’s moral fiber and native industry. To discourage consumers from spending their money on foreign luxuries, the popular belief spread that luxuries drained wealth and caused corruption, crime, poverty, and effeminacy.²⁵ A tract entitled *The Ten Plagues of England* (1757) says that luxuries, effeminacy, idleness, and disregard for domestic products are crimes “more injurious to a Nation than bodily Plagues.” The anonymous critic claims that England’s “correspondence with foreign nations only serves to increase our love for exotics, and to expend our wealth for what is not half so efficacious to the support of the subject as what the fertility and nature of the English soil afford for our use” (*Ten Plagues* 2). The idea of a positive balance of trade hinged on the belief of people, like this unknown critic, in the limitless “stock”—natural resources—of England. What depletes the “common weal,” in the classic

²⁵ Ordinances and taxes stemmed the tide of foreign textiles such as calico and silk and drinks like French brandy. While the last English sumptuary law was repealed in 1604, there was demand in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries “for outright sumptuary laws to prevent the outflow of money for luxuries” (Freudenberger 43). In 1606, legislation was passed requiring everyone buried on English soil to be wrapped in a shroud of English wool (Hunt 366). In 1700, legislators prohibited the importation and wearing of Indian colored calico and silk.

mercantilist view, is indiscriminate spending that supports another country's industry.

Additionally, "luxury came to be conceived as both cause and symptom of an evil that was both personal and social" (Hunt 355). Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, writers like Daniel Defoe identified the poor as the group most vulnerable to the corrupting forces of luxury.²⁶ *The Ten Plagues* identifies the laboring poor, particularly male servants, as susceptible to the negative results of luxury. In his study of servants, Leonard Schwarz says that eighteenth-century commentators believed that "manservants were a flagrant example of degeneracy, which in turn was a product of the love of luxury that was lamentably but relentlessly spreading throughout the population" (237). In essence, "the pursuit of luxury...was viewed as a fundamental and general vice, from which other, subordinate vices would ensue" (Sekora 48). The author of *Ten Plagues* says that in order to keep up appearances of social superiority, male servants resort to stealing from or indulging in sexual relationships with their masters. Similar to the moral economists, the mercantilists used this altruistic rationale—protecting the poor from morally corrupting influence—to direct attention away from their less-than-selfless pursuit of profit.

²⁶ Defoe insists that the "crimes of our people and from whence their poverty derives...are "luxury, sloth, and pride" (*Giving Alms No Charity* 250). In general, arguments against luxury were directed against both the rich and the poor but in different ways. Arguments about luxuries directed at the rich were about where they spent their money as opposed to what they spent it on. Fancy clothes, horses, and food, when purchased by the rich, were a "natural expression of position and status" (Hunt 361) that conveniently helped native industry through increased demand for goods and employment. On the other hand, the lives of the poor were incompatible with luxuries. The desire for better things in life encouraged discontent amongst the poor, which might result in surly employees demanding higher wages, thieving servants, and incorrigible poor who refuse to work (Fielding).

On luxuries and consumption, see David Clarke, Marcus Doel, and Kate Housiaux, eds., *The Consumption Reader* (1973); Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth Century England* (1983); Maxine Berg and Helen Clifford, *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe, 1650-1850* (1995); Maxine Berg and Elizabeth Eger, *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century* (2003); Alan Hunt, *Governance of the Consuming Passions: A History of Sumptuary Law* (1996); Christopher Berry, *The Idea of Luxury* (1994); John Sekora, *Luxury: the Concept in Western Thought, Eden to Smollet* (1977); and Alan Hunt, "Moralizing Luxury: The Discourses of the Governance of Consumption" (1995).

Population was equally important to classic mercantilists, because they related the number of inhabitants to England's status as a trading nation. Throughout the period, many assumed that the "strength of a society consist[ed] in the number of the people" (Fielding 5). Consequently, classic mercantilism encouraged people to reproduce in an effort to keep up the strength of the nation. In *The Classic Foundation of Population Thought*, Yves Charbit explains that "mercantilists were populationists for two major reasons—one economic and the other political. A large population was needed to provide the labour force for agricultural and industrial productions, to pay taxes, and to strengthen the country's military power" (6). For classic mercantilism, it was not just any group that needed constant replenishment; it was the poor, because the labor force came from the ranks of the poor. Thus, the laboring poor played a central role in classic mercantilist debates about luxury, wages, and population (Appleby, *Economic Thought* 136). The classic mercantilists championed "the doctrine of the utility of the poor" (Middendorf 70). In short, the low wages of common laborers ensured the overall profitability of native industry. They masked the exploitative and profit-motivated nature of their arguments with claims that naturalized poverty.²⁷ In the words of William Petty, poverty was beyond anyone's control because "that some are poorer than others, ever was and ever will be" (3). Shop owners, merchants, and landowners quickly squashed many attempts by workers and their advocates to raise wages.²⁸

²⁷ Both the classic mercantilists and the moral economists naturalized poverty using religion. Saying things like, God made both rich and poor. It has always been that way and always will be. Attempts to subvert that order go against God's will. Later in this section, I explain how market economists secularized this rationale for poverty.

²⁸ The ruling class did not succeed in silencing the laboring poor. There were many riots and clashes between landowners or government officials and workers throughout the eighteenth century. The conflict was often motivated by a combination of issues, including religion, labor, food, and legislation. For instance, one riot in 1736 involved English building workers who were fired and replaced with Irish workers who were paid significantly less (Rudé, "The London Mob" 50). See George Rudé, "The London 'Mob' of the Eighteenth Century" (1959); Rudé, *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular*

The creation of The East India Trading Company marked a decline in the power of classic mercantilism's central tenets and a rise in the sorts of self-interested motivations that stimulated the conflict between the SFRM and Mandeville. Queen Elizabeth I gave the East India Trading Company a royal charter in 1600 to trade mainly with India and China. The company traded its investors' gold and silver for cotton, silk, indigo dye, tea, and opium.²⁹ After enduring several structural changes, competition, and a merger, by the early eighteenth century, the Company had emerged as the most politically influential nongovernmental organization (Sherman 332-335).³⁰ The royal charter and subsequent provisions show the extent of the Company's power. It gained the rights to acquire territory in the name of the Crown, mint money, command fortresses and troops, form alliances, make war and peace, and exercise both civil and criminal jurisdiction over acquired areas. While not the only institution that influenced government policy in order to expand trade, the Company was the most powerful (Mokyr 27).

There was also a governmental equivalent to the East India Company: The Lords Commissioners

Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848 (1981); E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (1966); Philip D. Jones, "The Bristol Riots and Its Antecedents: Eighteenth-Century Perception of the Crowd" (1980); and Herbert Atherton, "The 'Mob' in Eighteenth-Century English Caricature" (1978).

²⁹ See P. J. Thomas, *Mercantilism and the East India Trade* (1926); Bal Krishna, *Commercial Relations Between India and England, 1601-1757*; Shafa'at Ahmad Khan, *The East India Trade in the XVIIIth Century* (1923); Chaudhuri, *The English East India Trading Company, The Study of an Early Joint Stock Company, 1600-1640* (1965); Chaudhuri, *The Trading World of Asia and the English East India Company* (1978); and Miles Ogburn, "Writing Travels: Power, Knowledge and Ritual on the English East India Company's Early Voyages" (2002).

³⁰ To consolidate the Company's power, Company officers and supporters obtained seats in Parliament and on government councils, which made and implemented commercial policy and by loaning and gifting large amounts of money to the Crown (Sherman 335). Several valuable studies of the East India Company show how powerful the East India Company was, including Philip Lawson's *The East India Company: A History* (1993), which is an informative and concise history charting the highs and lows of the Company from its beginning in 1600 to its end in 1857. Arnold Sherman's "Pressure from Ledenhall: The East India Company Lobby, 1660-1678" (1976) shows the role the company played in relationship to Parliament and the Crown. Betty Joseph's *Reading the East India Company* (2004) brings the stories of colonial and Indian women to bear on the history of the Company. H. V. Bowen's *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain* provides a compiles data-driven picture. Finally, Nick Robin's *The Corporation that Changed the World: How the East India Company Shaped the Modern Multinational* (2004) is a great popular history.

of Trade and Foreign Plantations. The Commission, formed in 1696, consisted of eight advisors paid to “promote trade in the American plantations and elsewhere” (Inglis 158). The advisors examined colonial legislation to safeguard the state’s financial interests. They nominated colonial governors, recommended laws affecting the colonies to Parliament, and heard complaints from the colonies about their administrators. The Company lobbied the Commission for favorable trade policies, and since many of the Commissioners were also merchants with interest in the East India Trading Company, there was very little disagreement (Fulcher 2; Sherman 340-41). The agendas of both groups show how the market beliefs espoused by Mandeville (that private gain equals public good) and the mercantilists’ idea of private sacrifice for the public good advocated similar methods to control and exploit the poor.³¹

Two of the most important economic writers of the seventeenth century— Thomas Mun (1571-1641) and Josiah Child (1630-1699)—worked for the East India Company. These powerful and rich Company men argued successfully for exceptions to official policy to accommodate the Company’s interests, because they believed that what was good for the Company was good for the nation.³² Mun’s *England’s Treasure by Forraign Trade, or the*

³¹ This is part of a gradual social shift over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that recognized the important role trade played in all areas of social advancement. Defoe reflects the period’s growing confidence in and concerns about trade in *The Complete English Tradesman*. He says, “as to the wealth of the nation, that undoubtedly lies chiefly in the trading part of the people” (Defoe, *Complete* 289), an idea that was repeated throughout the eighteenth century by a number of writers. However, there were cautions that those who wished to “undersell” must be punished because underselling would lead to the ruin of others (Claeys 16). While Mandeville was quick to claim that private vice, including greed, benefitted society, many still believed that “the wish to buy cheap and sell dear was a vice” because “human need,” especially that of the important pool of working poor, should “take a high priority in setting a just price” (Claeys 3).

³² Among the concessions for which the East India Company successfully lobbied was the right to export up to 50,000 pounds in bullion. This was an immense amount of stock flowing out of a country with a protectionist agenda (Sherman 347). To those who worried about the immense amount of money the East India Company used in trade, Mun argued that English policy should not focus on the actions of one company but on the overall balance of trade. Additionally, Mun and Child represented a shift in seventeenth-century economic theory and politics: all luxuries were considered social and economic

Balance of Forraign Trade is the Rule of our Treasure (written in 1630, published 1664) and Child's *A New Discourse of Trade* (1668) were part of a fundamental shift in which "economists began to think that to act in self-interest was rational, not sinful" (Hill 133). Mun and Child were powerful forces allied against the unyielding protectionist position of the mercantilists due to their belief in the compatibility of individual merchants' ambitions, the Company's interests, and the needs of the nation.³³ Unlike the classic mercantilists, who believed that limiting imported luxury goods was laudable and possible, Mun's and Child's treatises acknowledge that the resources of each nation are geographically limited, and thus England, like every other country, is dependent on merchants and foreign trade for goods such as sugar, tea, coffee. As Joseph Addison succinctly explains, "nature indeed furnishes us with the bare necessities of life, but traffick gives us a great variety of what is useful" (205). Foreign trade brings diamonds, fruit, spices, wines, medicine, and an opportunity to convert England's tin into gold (206).³⁴ The

villains for many mercantilists until these two Company men persistently and successfully petitioned Parliament on the East India Company's behalf (Rothbard 290). To those who objected to unbalanced trade relations, Child says that there is "freight, custom, and charges paid to the King and our own countrymen and consequently [coin is] not lost to England" (preface). Therefore, importation of foreign goods should not be dismissed as complete loss. Ultimately, both Child and Mun conceded that the Company operates on a trade deficit, which actually supports the country's greater trade balance by encouraging diplomatic ties that translate into foreign markets for English goods. The massive amount of profits the Company made for investors also helped their case. Between 1609 and 1613, the Company's investors enjoyed 234 percent profits (Walker 101).

³³ Mun and Child argue (and Barbon and Mandeville concur) that merchants encourage peace and goodwill between nations, an image Joseph Addison's persona Mr. Spectator describes in an issue of the *Spectator*, in which he says, "there is no more useful member in a commonwealth than merchants" (206). According to Mr. Spectator, merchants "knit together in a mutual intercourse of good offices, distribute the gifts of nature, find work for the poor, add wealth to the rich, and magnificence to the great" (206). The merchant operates as an ambassador, representing England to the world. See also Dalby Thomas, *A Historical Account of the West India Colonies* (1690); Henry Martyn, *Considerations Upon the East-India Trade* (1701); Dudley North, *Discourse Upon Trade* (1691); and John Houghton, *A Collection of Letter for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* (1681-1683).

³⁴ While Mandeville argued that private vice can benefit the public, Addison made it clear that this idea is wrong and that only private virtue benefits the public. Addison praised the objects and products of trade. However, in another issue of the *Spectator* he criticized luxury, which would include many of the goods listed in his praise of the Royal Exchange. The difference between good and bad riches (for lack of a better word) is the impulse behind its acquisition. Addison says that the "pleasures of luxury" are

market economists listed among the positive aspects of foreign trade: supplying natural but nonnative resources, establishing positive foreign diplomatic relations, offering a market to sell the excess of the state's manufactures to help native industry, and providing employment.

Significant to this chapter are the ways in which Mun's and Child's economic theories about the balance of trade and luxury incorporated the poor. Mun's and Child's writing veered from the classic mercantilist position and opened the door for a market position of relatively freer trade, and this shift depended heavily on growing and sustaining a reliable pool of poor laborers. According to Silvia Federici, these seventeenth-century economists acknowledged the poor as "the container of labor power, a means of production, the primary work-machine" (Federici 5).³⁵ As part of their economic agenda, Child and Mun argued that some limitations must be placed on foreign luxuries to ensure the wellbeing of the poor. A number of writers expressed this decidedly class-centered argument against luxury. For instance, Dudley North, in *Discourses Upon Trade* (1669), argued that it was important for the economy that noblemen spend large sums of money. In addition, Francis Brewster said, "that it would be far better for them [nobles]" to "continue to spend their money in consumption," as extravagance is "preferable to hoarding" (Appleby, *Economic Thought* 135). Ultimately, economic theorists "saved their reforming interests for the poor whose labor they were compelled to organize and whose subsistence they underwrote through the poor rates" (Appleby, *Economic Thought* 135). Child also objected to the importation of finished goods, because he believes that the poor could

expensive and puts in danger "those who are addicted to them upon raising fresh supplies of money, by all the methods of rapaciousness and corruption" (201). Luxuries are the product of a selfish and "immoderate pursuit after wealth and riches" (Addison 201). On the other hand, Addison weeps tears of joy when he sees men at the Royal Exchange "thriving in their own fortunes, and at the same time promoting the publick stock" (204). In the first example, Addison describes the overwhelming selfishness of individual pursuit, and in the second, he promotes a balance of personal and public pursuit of wealth.

³⁵ Federici goes on to quote Mun's writings to show how his descriptions of industry are recognizable as what Marx calls "labor value."

find suitable employment making products from raw goods (either native or imported). Additionally, Child and Mun argue that an increase in employment opportunities mitigated against unbalanced trade relations. Thus, Child's essay identifies a complex web of economic relations between the Navigation Act, woolen manufacturing, the balance of trade, plantations, and "methods for the employment and maintenance of the poor" (1). Both Child and Mun contend that any trade the Company participated in had the added benefit of employing seamen and requiring ships. Cutting down trees, building ships, making nets, and knitting stockings for the seamen are just a few ways, according to Child and Mun, that the Company indirectly employed the poor³⁶.

As important as Mun and Child were to the development of market economy, Sir William Petty's (1623-1687) numerical study of the British population established a crucial distance between moral and economic concerns, a split that played a key part in the conflict between Mandeville and the Society. In *Political Arithmetick* (1690), Petty shows that luxuries are an important and necessary means of circulating wealth between merchants, the crown, and, at times, individuals. He ignores moral objections to luxury in favor of economic concerns about native trade and employment of the poor. Economic treatises such as Gregory King's "The Naval Trade of England" (1688), which claims almost three-quarters of England's superlucration "derived from foreign trade, and only just over a quarter from inland trade and labour" (Davies 285), affirm Petty's focus on labor, trade, and profit. Petty's conclusions about the importance of trade and trading companies influenced King Charles II's government to jettison many duties on trade and monopolies (Rothbard 300). More importantly, Petty brought empiricism to

³⁶ It is important to note that this project deals with ideas and perception. While Mun and Child enthusiastically promoted the East India Company as an advocate of the poor there were others who saw the corporation as something other than a advocate of the poor . Ultimately, there was a difference between what Mun and Child believed the Company was doing and the actual outcomes of their agendas.

economics with the idea that men's and institutions' value ought to be measured by their economic utility (Rothbard 296-7). This logic led to the abstraction of groups of people, in particular the poor, into populations defined by the relationship between their labor and others' profit.

Nicholas Barbon and Bernard Mandeville represented the next steps in the evolution of a market economy agenda concerned with growing a market for a larger variety of luxury goods, reducing government regulation, increasing non-agricultural investment and speculation, broadening the social role of the merchant class, and fine-tuning the ideological coercion and physical exploitation of the poor.³⁷ In his most important publication, *A Discourse of Trade*, Barbon sums up the dialectical relationship between rich and poor: "the chief causes that Promote Trade (not to mention good government, Peace, and Scituation,[sic?] with other Advantages) are Industry in the Poor and Liberality in the Rich: Liberality is the free Usage of all those things that are made by the Industry of the Poor" (Barbon 19). Barbon and Mandeville challenged the logic of moralists who claimed that luxuries were a "debilitating and corrosive social evil" (Berg 2). Instead, Barbon was convinced that luxury is a "positive force," and

³⁷ Nicholas If-Jesus-Christ-Had-Not-Died-For-Thee-Thou-Hadst-Been-Damned Barbon (1640-1698) was a doctor, economist, and financial speculator. He had a checkered career even by eighteenth-century standards, which involved him in a number of schemes and businesses considered financially suspect by his contemporaries. Jonathan Swift's poem, "On the South Sea Bubble," summarizes early-eighteenth-century mistrust of speculation and those who dabble in it: "One fool may from another win, And then get off with money stored; But, if a sharper once comes in, He throws it all, and sweeps the board." The description of speculators like Barbon sounds much like a card cheat. After the Great Fire of London burned down large parts of the city in 1666, Barbon proposed fire insurance. Barbon responded to the needs of individual buyers, not companies, in the development of his insurance scheme. In addition to different forms of insurance and building speculation, he helped found the National Land Bank (1690), the first to issue loans in the form of mortgages against real estate. The point here is that Barbon represented what many viewed as a new economic man, and he operated in moral grey areas.

Mandeville linked luxury (and vice) to the “progress of civilization” (Berg 2).³⁸ The conclusion of all these texts (either implicit or explicit) was that shutting out foreign commodities is naïve and downright bad business; it is not a crime deterrent or a way to stimulate the national economy. Nonetheless, while Barbon and Mandeville encouraged luxury purchases among the titled, landed gentry, and even the middling sorts, they articulated a persistent worry that luxuries might encourage the poor to pursue something other than hard labor. Despite concerns about the relationship between luxury, poverty, and crime, their enthusiastic praise of luxury put them in direct conflict with moral economists.

Market economists cohered with classic mercantilists in their certainty that the wealth of the nation was built on the backs of the poor and the wallets of the rich. As a titan of industry and one of the wealthiest countries in the world, England should have no poor when “no man needs to want that will take moderate pains” (Petty 3). While these early economists were anxious to prove England’s wealth by describing a country bursting with natural resources and plentiful jobs for all, cracks existed in their well-rehearsed arguments. For example, the Charter of Georgia contradicts the widely-held belief that there was work for everyone: “we are credibly informed, that many of our poor subjects are, through misfortune and want of employment, reduced to great necessity, insomuch as by their labor they are not able to provide a maintenance for themselves and family” (*Charters* 66). Mandeville acknowledges the existence of people who are “Desp’rate and Poor...urged by mere Necessity,” not mere laziness, to commit crimes (*Fable* 67). So how could poverty exist in a nation that “had more Work than Labourers” (Petty

³⁸ Both Mandeville and Barbon play devil’s advocate by claiming that anything that goes beyond that which is “absolutely necessary to keep men alive” are luxuries, including homes and clothing (Mandeville 137). Mandeville’s language echoes Barbon’s almost word for word.

64)? How did market economists explain the existence of the poor—a group of people that were not thriving economically and were in fact struggling to survive?

Both classic mercantilists and market economists firmly backed two explanations for the poor problem: the poor were themselves to blame for their condition; or the market, not people, created social inequality (Appleby, *Economic Thought* 145-147). Most market economists resorted to passing the blame for the poor “problem” onto the poor. For example, in *Giving Alms No Charity*, Defoe insists that it is “the men that won’t work, not the men that can work, which makes the numbers of our poor” (252). Adam Smith argues, “A beggar chooses to depend chiefly on the benevolence of his fellow-citizens” (16). Both Defoe and Smith imply that the poor choose their poverty. From Petty to Barbon, market economists refused to consider the possibility that the large population of poor proved that there was anything wrong with the economic system. Blaming the poor’s circumstances on the poor was the logic policymakers used to justify criminalizing and punishing them. The market economists believed that “out of hope to make profit by their Labours: [we] must punish the Lazy by Labour, and not by crippling them” (Petty 9). The group most in need of punishment was what the classic mercantilists called the profligate poor. These were “persons who live by begging, cheating, stealing, gaming, borrowing without intention of restoring” (Petty 1). The categorization of the profligate poor demonstrates a refusal to consider the fact that the poor dealt with an ever-shifting boundary between legitimate and criminal actions. For instance, the rural poor once had the use of common lands for hunting until enclosures in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries made this subsistence strategy illegal (Birtles). When the poor chose to disregard the new restrictions, they were labeled criminals, unwilling to do an honest day’s work.

Increasingly, economists turned to the nature of markets and trade to explain poverty. Despite the fact that some writers, including Barbon and Child, encouraged higher wages for the working poor because “the more every man earns, the more he consumes (Finkelstein 96), this was not a popular position.³⁹ Petty was among those who “sought to maintain a subsistence wage to keep unit profits up” (Finklestein 94). Mandeville says that the “poor should be kept strictly to work”...with “cheap labour” (*Fable* 256). The bottom line for Petty and Mandeville was that some people (the poor) have to sacrifice a living wage to ensure the economic health of the state. They also believed that keeping the poor’s wages low kept them sober and productive.

Mandeville reveals the calculated logic, usually cloaked in language invoking religion or the greater public good, behind poverty. He bluntly confronts the idea that “pure economic expediency—not God’s mysterious plan—justifies keeping the lower order in a perpetual state of poverty and ignorance” (Cooke 127). At one point, he writes a long description of the life of the laboring poor, which is important enough to quote at length. He says that

The plenty and cheapness of provisions depends in a great measure on the price and value that is set upon this labour, consequently the welfare of all societies...require that it should be performed by such members as in the first place are sturdy and robust and never used to Ease or Idleness, and in the second, soon contented as to the necessities of life; such as are glad to take up with the coarsest manufacture in everything they wear, and in their diet have no other aim than to feed their bodies when

³⁹ Defoe has a convoluted explanation of how markets, not men, regulate wages in *Giving Alms no Charity*. Additionally, he argues that servants detrimentally inflated wages in *The Behavior of Servants in England Inquired Into* (1725). For more on wage regulations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Elizabeth W. Gilboy, “The Cost of Living and Real Wages in Eighteenth Century England” (1936); Douglas Hay, “England, 1562-1875: The Law and Its Uses” in *Masters, Servants, and Magistrates in Britain and the Empire, 1562-1955* (2004); T. S. Ashton, *An Economic History of England: The Eighteenth-Century* (2013); Dorothy Marshall, *The English Poor in the Eighteenth Century* (1926); and Perry Gauci *Regulating the British Economy* (2011).

their stomachs prompt them to eat, and with little regard to taste and relish...As the greatest part of the drudgery is to be done by daylight, so it is by this only that they actually measure the time of their labour, without any thought of the hours they are employ'd, or the weariness they feel. (Mandeville 293)

Mandeville describes a sad existence with no moments of leisure, good food, or comfortable clothes. This extended quote demonstrates a “cool scientific detachment in which people in general and the laboring poor in particular became mere commodities to be dealt with as unsentimentally as any other economic resource” (Cook 100). Nevertheless, the lack of sentimentality amongst market economists did not stop them from valorizing the laboring poor and viewing their poverty as a worthy sacrifice, not a problem.

In place of a real living wage, market economists upheld the system of poor relief and alms-giving established by the classic mercantilists. Ultimately, classic mercantilists consistently tried to find ways to make the poor more profitable. Many times, efforts to make the poor lucrative meant dividing them into abstract categories, which justified forced labor and punishment. As my overview of the history of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poor laws in the introduction explains, early-seventeenth-century laws organized the poor into the categories—laboring, common, impotent, and cunning—that defined their support and discipline for two centuries. The job of the parish, as defined in the 1601 and 1662 Acts, was to ensure that they worked, either through the apprenticeship system or in workhouses and poor houses, which eighteenth-century planners called “Houses of Industry.” The statute describes punitive measures, including forced labor in Houses of Correction, as a way to control the idle poor, from beggars to vagrants and criminals. Both Acts show that classic mercantilism impacted a large

percentage of the eighteenth-century English population—it was not just a theory that existed in a vacuum or on paper.⁴⁰

A variety of work-based charity plans written by self-proclaimed projectors proposed ways to improve on the established model of physical discipline and control of the poor. For instance, Petty's goal of economic utility led him to write proposals that mirrored the mercantile poor laws' attempts to maximize the profitability of the poor's labor.⁴¹ Among Petty's schemes was a "serious proposal...to cure Ireland's alleged cause of poverty, underpopulation, by urging government subsidies for births among unmarried Irish women" (Rothbard 303).⁴² Petty's proposals reflect his "zeal for increasing the labouring population of England" (Rothbard 303). Petty was not the only one drafting profit-driven plans concerned with wringing money from the poor. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts raised concerns over the activities and non-activities of the poor and proposed ways to coerce or force them into the profit-driven mode of the market economy. G. M. Gent and John Beller number among of the many profit-driven planners of the early-eighteenth century. Gent promises the government a profit of ten million pounds over five years in his tract *A Plan and Easie Way to Employ All the Poor and Idle People in England* (1698).⁴³ In a *College of Industry* (1696), Beller's motto is "industry brings plenty."

⁴⁰ See Anthony Brundage, *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930* (2002); Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *English Poor Law Policy* (1910); Mark Blaug, "The Myth of the Old Poor Law and the Making of the New" (1963); A. W. Coats, "Economic Thought and Poor Law Policy in the Eighteenth Century" (1958); Martin Daunton, *Progress and Poverty, an Economic and Social History of England, 1700-1850* (1995); and Paul Slack, *The English Poor Laws, 1531-1782* (1990).

⁴¹ Petty adhered to Sir Francis Bacon's rational science and was a member of the Royal Society (Rothbard 296). For more on Bacon's influence, see Paul Slack, "Government and Information in Seventeenth-Century England" (2004); Walter E. Houghton Jr., "The History of Trades: Its Relation to Seventeenth-Century Thought as Seen in Bacon, Petty, Evelyn, and Boyle" (1941); and Harold B. Ehrlich, "British Mercantilist Theories of Profit" (1955).

⁴² In *A Modest Proposal* (1729), Jonathan Swift satirizes "Petty's claim that the more people the better" and "every aspect of Petty's style from the solemnly avowed absurd policy proposal to fake precision of the numerological style" (Rothbard 303).

⁴³ He says that "the poor of this nation have the greatest revenue of any body of men, yet they are so far from being maintained by it, that they rather daily increase in their number and miseries, to the great

Like Gent, he wants to put every able-bodied person to work. Beller is confident that “the present idle hands of the poor of this nation are able to raise provision and manufacture that would bring England as much treasure as the mines do Spain” (10). He expresses two goals in his proposal: make the rich even richer, and ensure a satisfactory living for the poor. Unlike Gent, Beller makes no grand promises, but he seems confident that his scheme will succeed. Importantly, both Gent’s and Beller’s plans are similar to the workhouse model, which provided housing for the poor with a highly structured system of regulation that was supposed to maximize their profitability by coercing or forcing them to work and controlling their every moment.

Mandeville’s proposal for a state-run system of prostitution mirrors many of the agendas in Gent’s and Beller’s proposals. First, he focuses on ways to make poor women profitable. While he does not cite specific numbers in the way the other projectors do, he does state that the nation is losing money in a variety of ways due to unsanctioned prostitution and that his system is a way to recoup financial losses. Secondly, the tone of his writing makes the proposal seem both logical and humane: prostitutes will be healthier and no longer a nuisance, young men will no longer be vulnerable to diseases, and married men will not destroy their families with a fleeting encounter in a back alley. Finally, Mandeville’s proposal would effectively control a significant portion of what was viewed as a problem population. The root of the conflict

nuisance and danger of the public” (Gent 1). Here Gent refers to the poor rates (taxes on property to help with poor relief), which he says have increased from 665,000 pounds to 800,000 pounds a year from the 1630s to the 1690s. He wants to ensure the old, sick, and children are “serviceable to the kingdom in their generation; whereas they are now only bred up to vice, or at best idleness” (Gent 3). In their ignorant and lazy state, they “will certainly be the ruin of the whole kingdom” (Gent 3). According to Gent’s plan, the poor are best employed making goods needed for different industries especially shipping. To that end, they can make twine, nets, and canvas. He boasts that in sixteen years profits will far offset the substantial initial outlay of cash.

between Mandeville and the SFRM regarding his proposal stemmed from his certainty that the ends justify the means, an idea that moral economists could never support

In addition to focusing on the potential profit of the labor of the poor, projectors, including Mandeville, considered ways to improve legal punishment of the unemployed poor. Mandeville's writing, particularly his essay *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn* (1725), reflects the belief that the law should be responsible for punishment of the poor and the criminal, not private men with their own personal agendas. This is why he says, "whoever justly prosecuted, and convicts a person of a capital crime, has nothing to answer for to his conscience, but on the contrary, has done a service to his country, without offence to God, or at least breach of charity to his neighbor" (Mandeville, *Tyburn* 2). The people who responded to Mandeville's outrageous examples and summed up his writing as "praise of immorality" (Law 7) missed or ignored his suggestions for stricter criminal judgments and other ways to exert greater control over the poor. He argues, "The greatest charity, therefore, and compassion we can shew to our fellow-creatures, is an extraordinary severity, and never-ceasing watchfulness in a government against the first approaches of dishonesty" (Mandeville, *Tyburn* 36). Mandeville complains about light sentences, pardons, and a lack of proper oversight in prisons.

Interestingly, despite his efforts to map out an alternate system of discipline for the poor, Mandeville's emphasis on the spectacle and fear of capital punishment inadvertently resembled the zealous punishments of moral economists. For instance, he proposed the government give several hanged bodies each year to doctors, since the horror of this desecration of the body might deter some crime. George Olyffe, in his 1731 tract, *An Essay to Prevent Capital Crime*, concurs

with Mandeville's assessment of the criminal punishment system.⁴⁴ Olyffe says that the problem is that criminals disregard the example of those who have been executed, so hangings are not an effective preventative measure. According to Olyffe, the leniency of the courts, which only takes extreme action in extreme cases, compounds the problem. Therefore, his "reasonable" solutions are using the wheel, cutting off blood to the extremities, and burning at the stake. This, for Olyffe, serves an admirable end since the horrifying death of a few will save thousands, just as Mandeville views the dissection of the criminal body as a preemptive strike. Mandeville also advocated for the separation of different types of criminals, an idea that gained in popularity throughout the period. The SFRM also recommended this separation and organization as a means to curb vice. Mandeville also suggests that criminals be isolated, starved, then quickly and publicly hanged. All of Mandeville's ideas to solve the "poor" problem focused on physical punishment and control, which did not stray from the model proposed by the SFRM and established by the mercantilist government.

The story of early-eighteenth-century economy consisted of conflicts between men who increasingly used utilitarian logic and those propagating moral arguments to control the poor. Where classic mercantilists and market economists debated the degree to which they should acknowledge the poor's demand for what they felt were their traditional rights—the use of common lands and price setting—the moral economists countered with a zealous pursuit of sin. While the classic mercantilists and market economists tried to ensure financial advantages for merchants, the Crown, or the middling rank down through the poor, the Society for the Reformation worked on spiritual strength. Underlying all their claims and counter-claims about

⁴⁴ Based on my research, it seems safe to conclude that the George Olyffe who wrote this essay on crime also preached *A Christian Alarm to the Enemies of Charity and Moderation* for the SFRM. Both texts are attributed to George Olyffe M.A. and were published in London by J. Downing.

vice and virtue, profit and duty, was a concerted effort to keep the poor under control—obedient, hardworking, and content with their poverty—through a variety of physical disciplines.

Conclusion

The print battle between Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners demonstrates an important shift in English economic thought. The classic mercantilists used a combination of economic and religious language in their arguments, but, starting with the market economists, most “economic writers continued to present their arguments in terms of right and wrong [but] the affirmation of a moral order where economic activity were the means to social ends—God’s and man’s—fell from public view” (Appleby 70). Instead, authors as diverse as Petty, Mandeville, and Smith developed arguments around the ideas of economic freedom and social expediency. Of course, this freedom only applied to those with wealth, and the poor were excluded from this pseudo-secular, proto free-market world. The Society and other moral economists believed they were standing on the frontline, fighting for the souls and labor power of the poor against the corrupting forces of Catholicism, luxuries, and other vices, encouraged by foreign trade. In the end, despite their differences, all of the parties considered in this chapter believed their goals of national, individual, or spiritual wealth depended on control of the labor and nonlabor activities of the poor. Mercantilists, moral economists, and market economists alike vilified and punished the poor, who did not comply with socially and religiously circumscribed expectations for their labor.

A moral economy did not prevail, but it did not disappear completely in the second half of the eighteenth century. While many of the authors I have examined in this chapter (except for Mandeville) have faded into obscurity over time, their opinions influenced important social

projects aimed at the poor throughout the eighteenth century. As the remainder of this dissertation demonstrates, philanthropic literature, both fiction and nonfiction, replays the struggle between Mandeville and the Society for the Reformation of Manners by moving from adamantly rejecting any possible link between benevolence and personal gain to promoting charity using a combination of nationalistic, religious, and economic inducements. Mid-century philanthropists such as Jonas Hanway and William Dodd combined what the early-eighteenth-century writers felt were incompatible: the pragmatic, economic bottom line of the market economists and the spiritual considerations of the moral economists. They established institutions like the Magdalen Hospital and the Marine Society, which reflected the values of both moral and market economists. Additionally, their writing shows a shift from considering somatic to mental disciplinary methods as a means of control over the poor. The move from a focus on bodies to minds in social plans and philanthropic texts uses much of the zealous language espoused by the Society for the Reformation of Manners. In the end, both the market and moral economies played a pivotal role in the construction of social welfare and debates over the efficacy of public charity throughout the eighteenth century. They did so by defining the poor as a coherent group; by articulating the importance of the poor to the economy; and by proposing theories about how best to control this group.

Works Cited

- Addison, Joseph. "Spectator No. 69." *The Commerce of Everyday Life: Selections from the Tatler and the Spectator*. Ed. Erin Mackie. Boston: Bedford, 1998. 203-206. Print.
- Alsop, Vincent and Henry Hurst. "The Humble Address of the Presbyterians Presented to the King by Mr. Hurst, Mr. Chester, Mr. Slater, Mr. Cox, Mr. Roswell, Mr. Turner, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Deal, and Mr. Reynolds." London, 1689. Print.
- Appleby, Joyce Oldham. *Economic Thought and Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton U, 1978. Print.
- Barbon, Nicholas. *A Discourse of Trade*. London, 1690. Print.
- Bentham, Edward. *An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. Oxford, 1745. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 June 2011.
- Bellers, John. *Proposal for Raising a College of Industry of All Useful Trades and Husbandry*. 1696. London. Print.
- Berg, Maxine. *Luxury and Pleasure in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.
- The Bill, Intituled, An Act for the Relief, Employment, and Settlement of the Poor, Which Came from the House of Commons; and also the Bill Intituled, An Act for the Further and Better Relief, Employment, and Maintenance of the Poor*. London, 1705. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 June 2011.
- Birtles, Sara. "Common Land, Poor Relief, and Enclosure." *Past & Present* 165 (Nov 1995): 74-106. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Nov 2011.
- Blaugh, Mark. "The Myth of the Old Poor Law and the Making of the New." *Journal of Economic History* 23.2 (Jun 1963). 151-184. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Aug 2012.
- Brundage, Anthony. *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.
- Braudel, Ferdinand. *The Wheels of Commerce: Civilization and Capitalism: 15th-18th Century*. Vol. 2. Berkeley, U California P, 1992. Print.
- The Charters of the Following Provinces of North America: viz., Virginia, Maryland, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts's Bay*. London, 1766. *Sabin Americana*. Web. 15 June 2015.
- Charbit, Yves. *The Classical Foundations of Population Thought: From Plato to Quesnay*. New York: Springer, 2010. Print.
- Chaudhury, Sushil and Michel Morineau, eds. *Merchants, Companies and Trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

- Claeys, Gregory. *Machinery, Money and the Millenium: From Moral Economy to Socialism*. Princeton; Princeton UP, 1987. Print.
- Coats, A. W. "Economic Thought and Poor Law Policy in the Eighteenth Century." *The Economic History Review, New Series* 13.1 (1960): 39-51. JSTOR. Web. 11 May 2011.
- Cook, Richard I. *Bernard Mandeville*. New York: Twayne, 1974. Print.
- Daunton, Martin. *Progress and Poverty, an Economic and Social History of England, 1700 1850*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.
- Davies, K.G. "Joint-Stock Investment in the Later Seventeenth Century." *The Economic History Review, New Series* 4.3 (1952): 283-301. JSTOR. Web. 12 May 2011.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Complete English Tradesman in Familiar Letter*. Dublin, 1726. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 15 Jun 2013.
- . *An Essay on Projects*. London, 1697. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 5 Nov 2014.
- . *Giving Alms No Charity, and Employing the Poor a Grievance to the Nation*. London, 1704. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 14 Jun 2014.
- Ellis, John. "A Reformation of Manners." London, 1701. Print.
- Fielding, Henry. "A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor." *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber and Related Writing*. Ed. Malvin Zirker. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988. 219-280. Print.
- Finklestein, Andrea. "Nicholas Barbon and the Quality of Infinity." *History of Political Economy* 32.1 (2000): 83-102. Project Muse. Web. 29 Aug 2011.
- Freudenberger, Herman. "Fashion, Sumptuary Laws, and Business." *The Business History Review* 37.1/2 (Spring 1963): 37-48. JSTOR. Web. 11 May 2011.
- Fulcher, James. *Capitalism: A Very Short Intro*. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.
- Gent, G.M. *A New Method, Wherein a Plain and Easie Way is Set Forth, to Employ All the Poor and Idle People in England and Thereby to Enrich the Nation*. London, 1698. Print.
- Goldsmith, M.M. "Public Virtue and Private Vices: Bernard Mandeville and English Political Ideologies in the Early Eighteenth Century." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 9.4 (Summer 1976): 477-510. JSTOR. Web. 12 Mar 2011.
- Hare, Hugh. "A Charge Given at the General Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the County of Surrey." London, 1692. Print.
- Hay, Douglas. "England, 1562-1875: The Law and Its Uses." *Masters, Servants, and Magistrates in Britain and the Empire, 1562-1955*. Ed. Douglas Hay and Paul Craven. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, 2004. 59-116. Print.

- Heckscher, Eli F. *Mercantilism*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. "Sin and Society." *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill*. Vol. 2. Amherst: U of Massachusetts, 1986. 117-140. Print.
- Kames, Henry Homes, Lord. *Essays on the Principles of Morality and Natural Religion*. London, 1751. Print.
- Hume, David. *An Enquiry Concerning the Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals*. Westport: Greenwood, 1980. Print.
- . *A Treatise of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. Print.
- Hunt, Alan. "Moralizing Luxury: The Discourses of Governance of Consumption." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 8.4 (Dec. 1995): 352- 374. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May 2011.
- Hutcheson, Francis. *Thoughts on Laughter and Observations on the Fable of the Bees*. London, 1758. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 13 Mar 2012.
- . *A System of Moral Philosophy in Three Books*. London, 1755. Print.
- Hutchison, T.W. *Before Adam Smith: The Emergence of Political Economy, 1662-1776*. New York: Blackwell, 1988. Print.
- Inglis, Robert, ed. *Dictionary of Political Economy*. Vol. 1. New York: Palgrave, 1894. Print.
- Johns, A.H. "Insurance Investment and the London Money Market of the 18th Century." *Economica, New Series* 20.78 (May 1953): 137-158. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Apr 2013.
- Law, William. *Remark Upon a Book Intitled The Fable of the Bees*. London, 1723. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 29 Apr 2010.
- Leng, John. "A Sermon Preached to the Societies for Reformation of Manners at St. Mary-le Bow." London, 1719. Print.
- Lind, Christopher. *Rumors of a Moral Economy*. Halifax: Fernwood, 2010. Print.
- Magnusson, Lars. *Mercantilism: Critical Concepts in the History of Economics*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Mandeville, Bernard. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn*. London, 1725. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 13 Mar 2012.
- . *Fable of the Bees*. Ed. Phillip Harth. New York: Penguin, 1970. Print.
- Mokyr, Joel. *The Enlightened Economy: An Economic History of Britain 1700-1850*. New Haven: Yale U, 2009. Print.
- Mun, Thomas. *England's Treasure by Forraign Trade*. London, 1664. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 11 May 2010.

- Norton, Joseph. *Publick Charity, A Sermon*. London, 1705. Print.
- Ollyffe, George. *An Essay Humbly Offer's, for An Act of Parliament to Prevent Capital Crimes and the Loss of Many Lives; and to Promote a Desirable Improvement and Blessing in the Nation*. London, 1731. Print.
- Petty, William. *Political Arithmetick, or A Dscourse Concerning, the Extent and Value of Lands, People, Buildings; Husbandry, Manufacture, Commerce, Fishery, Artizans, Seamen, Soldiers; Publick Revenues, Interest, Taxes, Superlucration, Registries, Banks; Valuation of Men, Increasing of Seamen, of Militia's, Harbours, Situation, Shipping, Power at Sea*. London, 1691. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 June 2014.
- Powelson, John P. *The Moral Economy*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1998. Print.
- Rothbard, M.N. *An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Press, 1995. Print.
- Sherman, Arnold. "Pressure from Ledenhall: The East India Company Lobby, 1660-1678." *The Business History Review* 50.3 (1976): 329-355. JSTOR. Web. 13 Oct 2011.
- Skousen, Mark. *The Big Three in Economics: Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and John Maynard Keynes*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2007. Print.
- Smalbroke, Richard. "Reformation Necessary to Prevent Our Ruine." London, 1727. Print.
- Smith, Adam. *An Enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York: R.R. Smith, 1948. Print.
- . *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.
- Stanhope, George. *The Danger of Hard-heartedness to the Poor, a Sermon*. London, 1705. Print.
- . *Dr. Stanhope's Advice to the Religious Societies in a Postscript to a Sermon*. London 1702. Print.
- Swift, Jonathan. *A Modest Proposal. A Modest Proposal and Other Satirical Works*. Ed. Candace Ward. Mineola: Dover, 1996. Print.
- . "The Bubble." *Swift Poetical Works*. Ed. Herbert Davis. New York: Oxford UP, 1967. Print.
- The Ten Plagues of England, of Worse Consequence than Those of Egypt*. London. 1757. Print.
- Thomas, P.J. *Mercantilism and the East India Trade*. New York: P.S. King, 1926. Print.
- Vaggi, Gianni and Peter Groenewegan. *A Concise History of Economic Thought*. New York: Palgrave, 2006. Print.
- Van Ruymbeke, Bertrand. *From New Babylon to Eden: the Huguenots and Their Migration to Colonial South Carolina*. U of South Carolina P; Columbia, 2006. Print.

- Vincent, Thomas. *God's Terrible Voice in the City*. London, 1667. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 15 Jun 2012.
- Walker, C.E. "The History of the Joint Stock Company." *The Accounting Review* 6.2 (June 1931): 97-105. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Feb 2012.
- Webb, Sidney and Beatrice Webb. *English Poor Law Policy*. New York: Longman, 1910. Print.
- Woodward, Josiah. *An Account of the Progress of the Reformation of Manners in England, Scotland, and Ireland*. London, 1707. Print.
- . *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in England and Ireland*. London, 1700. Print.
- . *A Disswasive from the Sin of Drunkenness*. London, 1711. Web. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. 11 Mar 2012.
- . *Fair Warnings to a Careless World*. London, 1707. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 Mar 2012.
- . *A Kind Caution to Profane Swearers*. London, 1704. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 Mar 2012.
- . *The Seamen's Monitor*. London, 1705. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 Mar 2012.
- . *The Soldier's Monitor*. London, 1715. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 Mar 2012.
- . *The Young Man's Monitor Shewing the Great Happiness of Early Piety; and the Dreadful Consequences of Indulging Youthful Lusts*. London, 1718. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 11 Mar 2012.

Chapter 2

Philanthropists versus Magistrates: Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones*, and the Poor

After a moderately successful career as a playwright, barrister, political pamphleteer, and journalist, Henry Fielding was appointed Justice of the Peace of Westminster and Middlesex in 1748. In 1749, Fielding used his power as magistrate to establish the Bow Street Runners, the first professional police force, charged with enforcing the judgments of the Bow Street magistrate. The magisterial appointment and his law-enforcement venture prompted Fielding to turn his pen from politics to policy.⁴⁵ Two texts, *Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers* (1751) and *A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor* (1753), which consider crime and propose workhouses, were the most obvious outgrowths of Fielding's new position. One unsigned review in the *Monthly Review* (1751) praises Fielding for *Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers*: "The public has been hitherto not a little obliged to Mr. Fielding for the entertainment his gayer performances have afforded it; but now this gentleman hath a different claim to our thanks, for the services of a more substantial nature" (Paulson 239). On the surface, *The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling* (1749) seems very different from Fielding's policy writing and work. *Tom Jones* was a popular novel, but its low humor and matter of fact representations of sex, bastards, and prostitution were controversial. Fielding started writing *Tom Jones*—his first post-appointment publication—well before his appointment, but the novel represents an important fictional foray into the concerns of poverty, crime, and policy reform that are fleshed out in *Enquiry into the Increase of Robbers* and *A Proposal for Provision for the Poor*.

⁴⁵ For more on the connection between Fielding's writing and his work as magistrate, see Hugh Amory, "Magistrate or Censor?: The Problem of Authority in Fielding's Later Writing" (1972); Malinda Snow's, "The Judgment of Evidence in *Tom Jones*" (1983); Malvin Zirker, "Fielding and Reform in the 1750's" (1967); and Lance Bertelsen's *Henry Fielding at Work* (2000).

Four major strands of criticism have emerged in Fielding scholarship: biographical, genre, and cultural historicist. The importance of *Tom Jones* as popular fiction has never been in doubt, but the biographical strand calls into question its place as a literary work. As Ian Watt explains, criticism of Fielding's writing has been deeply influenced by criticism of Fielding's character (282). Even those who admire his literary greatness confuse Fielding's personal life with the lives of his literary characters. In their 1989 biography of Fielding, Martin and Ruth Battestin claim, "Fielding's own character and the course of his life...are shadowed in the progress of his bumptious hero [Tom], who learns to discipline his passions in order to marry the girl he loves" (454). Watt's *The Rise of the Novel* (1957) raises questions about the development of the novel as a genre. His contribution shifted the field of criticism from reductionist conclusions about the novel's relationship to Fielding's biography to a deeper understanding of the literary context in which Fielding wrote.⁴⁶ A third strand of criticism, the moralist perspective, has a longer history. Moralism criticism censures Fielding for his representations of vice. Catherine Talbot says, "The more I read *Tom Jones*, the more I detest him, and admire Clarissa Harlowe" (qtd. in Paulson 166). Samuel Richardson and Samuel Johnson, two of the eighteenth century's most admired writers, also took issue with Fielding and *Tom Jones*. The moralist strand of criticism has largely faded from view, but its elision of fiction and reality is also present in biographical criticism.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ My introduction includes a brief explanation of this context as it relates to Fielding, William Dodd and development of the novel.

⁴⁷ On form and influence, see J. Paul Hunter, *Occasional Form: Henry Fielding and the Chains of Circumstance* (1975), and Nancy A. Mace, *Henry Fielding's Novels and the Classical Tradition* (1996). On literary devices like narrative and irony, see Richard Rosengarten, *Henry Fielding and the Narration of Providence* (2000); James Smith, *An Inquiry Into Narrative Deception and its Uses In Fielding's Tom Jones* (1993); Henry Power, "Henry Fielding, Richard Bentley, and the 'Sagacious Reader' of *Tom Jones*" (2010); Glenn W. Hatfield, *Henry Fielding and the Language of Irony* (1968); and Robert Alter, "Fielding and the Uses of Style" (1967). This list is only a sampling of available sources, which shows the enduring popularity of Fielding and *Tom Jones* as a topic of literary and cultural analysis. For a

The final group of scholars, the cultural historicists, has examined the cultural, political, and professional context of Fielding's writing and raised questions of gender identity and discourse.⁴⁸ These works contribute to our understanding of Fielding's importance in the development of the novel and prove that an amusing tale can do serious work. Two recent books, Lisa Zunshine's *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century England* (2005) and John Allen Stevenson's *The Real History of Tom Jones* (2005), focus on marginalized figures represented in Fielding's work. Zunshine shows that in *Tom Jones* Fielding creates a world of multiple "unremarkable" bastards to entertain a society that was still trying to hide its dirty little secrets (86). Zunshine's work helps us think about how socially marginalized groups are represented in the novel and how those representations connect to policies and institutions. Stevenson's and Zunshine's focus on ordinary characters and incidental conversations lay the foundation for this chapter's consideration of how *Tom Jones* dramatizes the eighteenth century's problems with and solutions to poverty. Their work, which broadens the historical contexts through which we might understand Fielding's writing, guides my efforts to place Fielding's writings on poverty, charity, education, and reform within the public debate about poor education.

In this chapter, I scrutinize Fielding's fictional and nonfictional representations of charitable responses to foundlings, beggars, and thieves. Charity plays a major role in all of

compilation of popular and critical responses to *Tom Jones* see Ronald Paulson and Thomas Lockwood, eds., *Henry Fielding, The Critical Heritage*. Paulson also has a great essay, "Fielding at 300" (2010), which analyzes Fielding studies.

⁴⁸ For the cultural context of Fielding's works dealing with political or moral concerns, see Brian McCrea's *Henry Fielding and the Politics of Mid-Eighteenth-Century England* (1981); Thomas Cleary's *Henry Fielding, Political Writer* (1984); Bernard Harrison, *Henry Fielding's Tom Jones: The Novelist as Moral Philosopher* (1975); and Andrew Wright, "Tom Jones: Life as Art" (1965). On gender, see Jill Campbell, *Natural Masques: Gender and Identity in Fielding's Plays and Novels* (1995); Angela Smallwood, *Fielding and the Woman Question: The Novels of Henry Fielding and Feminist Debate, 1700-1750* (1989); and Tiffany Potter, *Honest Sins: Georgian Libertinism and the Plays and Novels of Henry Fielding* (1999).

Fielding's writing, which reflects the immense amount of energy eighteenth-century Britons expended on non-legislative forms of poor relief. While philanthropists viewed their charities as viable substitutes for or supplements to government-sponsored poor programs, I demonstrate how charity serves an indispensable but limited social role in *Tom Jones*, mirroring Fielding's own views of its utility. Charity, according to Fielding, is a Christian duty that can help relieve individual instances of suffering and is a reliable indication of one's essential nature. But, as I will argue, Fielding believed that rigorous legislative reform and application of the law—not charity—were the best solutions to the constellation of social problems related to the poor, including issues of unemployment, crime, and immorality. Fielding was certain that public effort directed at workhouse reform would solve poor problems. With the notable exception of the Foundling Hospital, Fielding wanted to restrict charity to the private realm and direct public energy to poverty legislation that would give magistrates more power over the poor and establish a more efficient workhouse system. The larger goal of this chapter is to broaden our understanding of philanthropic literature by showing the ways in which a wide range of Fielding's writings participate in debates about private versus public charity, education, idleness, and penitence that divided the philanthropic community.

Fielding's novel and other writing relate to an ongoing eighteenth-century debate about educating the poor, which was spurred by Bernard Mandeville's critical comments about the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. The SPCK, a Protestant charitable organization established in 1699 was concerned with molding poor children into socially acceptable and useful servants through education. Members expressed their certainty that the correct education would produce meek, obedient poor. While he disliked charity schools' instruction in "manners and civility," Mandeville was more concerned that the SPCK stirred

lower-class dissent (Mandeville, “Charity Schools” 277). He feared that the project of educating the poor could lead to informed resistance to low wages, encourage unscrupulous lower-class traders, and spur other economic and social problems. His fears are echoed in Alannah Tomkins’ summation that charity schools “highlighted the gulf that could exist between the uneducated poor and their employers and apparently threaten[ed] to narrow the gap” (165). Fielding’s writing also expresses concerns related to the idea of educating the poor. The education of Jenny Jones, as I show later in the chapter, suggests that the educated poor are a danger to themselves and others.

Additionally, the argument between Mandeville and the SPCK relates to a shift in eighteenth-century philanthropy from private to public charity, a change that Fielding also considers. Mandeville relates this split in charitable forms to the bigger issue of vice and virtue explored in Chapter One. The SPCK preached prudence, justice, temperance, faith, and charity, but Mandeville argued that private vices like greed, envy, and pride might actually benefit the public financially. Mandeville was confident that corruption and vice would continue to thrive because the motives of philanthropists were less than pure. He believed the true goal of the rich men directing the reforming societies was to garner public praise. While Fielding’s essays certainly did not promote Mandeville’s perspective on the social function of vice, he did echo Mandeville’s criticism of public charity, leveling charges of inefficiency and corruption. In privileging private charity in his novel, Fielding agrees, to some degree, with Mandeville, whom he called ‘Man-devil’” (Nieli 596). Fielding’s novels, essays, and proposals, demonstrate a continued social engagement with ideas fomenting thirty years before.

The 1723 debate between Mandeville and the SPCK can further develop our understanding of Fielding’s fiction and nonfiction ruminations on poverty, crime, and the nature

of philanthropy. The assumptions, social prejudices, and fears about poor people and charity, which divided Mandeville and the SPCK are also apparent in *Tom Jones*, *Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers*, and *A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor*. The SPCK, Mandeville, and Fielding all addressed two crucial questions: What is the proper roles of charity? How do we control both the bodies and the minds of the poor? To examine how eighteenth-century philanthropists and social reformers, including Fielding, answered these questions, the first section of this chapter, “Mandeville versus the SPCK,” contextualizes Fielding’s work by examining the goals and assumptions of the two sides in the 1723 debate over private versus public charity and charity schools. Section two, “Fielding’s Charity,” looks at Fielding’s novel *Tom Jones* (1749), and his periodical *Covent Garden Journal* (1752) to understand his position on public and private charity and education of the poor. Fielding vacillates between criticizing the types of public charity that the SPCK advocated and worrying about the lack of charity Mandeville’s logic would produce. Section three, “Workhouse Reform,” uses two of Fielding’s proposals, *Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers* and *A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor*, to show how the claims he makes in the two proposals echo his fictionalized world of charity, discipline, and rehabilitation of the poor in *Tom Jones*. In the end, Fielding’s fiction and nonfiction writing shows the various choices that confronted mid-century social critics and planners concerned with poverty including whether or not to educate the poor and the effectiveness of forcing or luring the poor into social compliance.

Mandeville versus the SPCK

In his 1705 sermon on *Publick Charity*, Reverend Joseph Norton explains the difference between two types of philanthropic pursuits: private and public charity. Private charity, according to Norton, happens when a person prays or gives alms, clothing, food, or medicine to a needy (and, Mandeville would add, deserving) individual or family. Public charity means giving money to churches or founding and endowing schools, colleges, and hospitals. The SPCK represented a newer form of public charity that derived its funding and support from multiple subscribers instead of a single endowment. In the eighteenth century, both private and public charities were important in Christian theology, but public charity dominated sermons because many ministers were trying to drum up interest in their projects.⁴⁹ Hundreds of sermons on charity were published in the early-eighteenth century.⁵⁰ They appealed to parishioners by showing that “the duty to give charity was the compromise between the divine injunction to live in a perfect condition of community of property and the conventionally recognized desire for private possessions” (Claeys 7).⁵¹ In *The Danger of Hard-Heartedness to the Poor* (1705), George Stanhope uses the parable of the rich man and Lazarus to illustrate the spiritual necessity of charity. The rich man in the parable is unwilling to give “one morsel of his broken meat...to support the drooping spirits of a hunger-starved wretch” named Lazarus (Stanhope 4-5). When

⁴⁹ For analysis of the strategies in charity sermons, see Donna T. Andrew, “On Reading Charity Sermons: Eighteenth-Century Anglican Solicitation and Exhortation”; and Jeremy Schmidt, “Charity and Government of the Poor in the English Charity School Movement” (2010).

⁵⁰ Fielding gives a fictional representation of the flooded sermon market in *Joseph Andrews* (1742). In the novel, Parson Adams is on his way to London to try to sell his multi-volume sermon into a market already oversaturated with sermons. An insightful analysis, Jennifer Farooq’s *Preaching in Eighteenth-Century London* (2013), looks at everything from what types of sermons were printed to how the reading public responded and the relationship between preaching, social criticism, and politics.

⁵¹ The lure of personal reward for eighteenth-century philanthropists brings to mind the oft-quoted observation of Adam Smith that “It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer and the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity, but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our necessities but of their advantages” (qtd. in Dore 459).

the two men die, the rich man is punished with hell, and Lazarus is reward with heaven. While this story might seem like a condemnation of wealth, Stanhope assures his parishioners that “riches ought not be blamed for the abuses of them; for they are capable of being turned to good or evil purposes, just as the owners please” (10). While sumptuous dress and fine food are forgivable, the role the rich man plays in the suffering and death of another human being is not. Members of the SPCK were secure in the knowledge that they were nothing like the biblical rich man.

Protestant ministers had to convince parishioners to give to the poor while steering clear of the Catholic belief that “their works would assist them in their passage to heaven” (Archer 229). Instead of arguing that good works paved the path to salvation, they claimed that good works reflected one’s salvation.⁵² Reverend Norton explains that when Jesus walked the Earth he did things to show he was the son of God and in the process proved his love for man. Jesus’s life on Earth was about love, which he showed when he fed the hungry, clothed the needy, admonished the greedy, raised the dead, and died for the sins of mankind. Unlike Jesus, the common man “cannot indeed work miracles,” but he can “imitate the charity and goodness that appeared in all his miracles” (Norton 3). Congregants, in Norton’s view, should follow Jesus’s example by giving happily and viewing their duty to the poor not “as a burden, but...as a privilege” (Stanhope 23). In sum, Protestant ministers taught that charity was an important expression of obedience, love, and gratitude that distinguished the faithful from the unfaithful.

⁵² In her excellent study of eighteenth-century charity, *Philanthropy and the Police*, Donna Andrews says that English men and women “were convinced that a new phase in England’s care of the poor had been initiated, vindicating for all time the superiority of the Protestant faith, which, while not making good works the method of salvation, showed its true Christianity by its overflowing benevolence” (11). The theme of cultural superiority and benevolence ties together all of the writers I examine, but the most explicit and insistent articulation is in Hanway’s writing, the focus of Chapter Four,

Organizations such as the SPCK were convenient venues for men and women to prove they were good, virtuous people, certain of God's salvation.⁵³

In addition to being a public demonstration of their benefactors' good character, organized charities promised to make the poor into good people, subservient to God and their betters. The Reverend Isaac Watts appeals to potential charity school contributors who expect their recipients to become servants and laborers in "An Essay towards the Encouragement of Charity Schools" (1728). He promises that the children will "not be generally educated in such a manner as may raise them above the services of a lower station" (Watts 14); and directs his plea for financial support at anyone who has "any value for the preservation of property" (Watts 14, 47).⁵⁴ The money will rescue children "from the vile company of those that curse and swear, rob and steal, that they may be kept from fatal temptation to drunkenness, lewdness, and vile intemperance and be preserved from sin and ruin" (Watts 47). Watts paints a dismal, frightening picture, in which every law-abiding citizen is in danger as long as idle children roam the streets without the discipline and subordination inculcated by charity schools. Reverend William Hendley's *A Defense of the Charity Schools* (1728) identifies condemned criminal James White as one of those children tempted into sin and ruin. In Hendley's account, White joins the ranks

⁵³ A small sample of sermons on charity from the first quarter of the century include: Robert Lumley Lloyd, *Christian Charity* (1705); Samuel Clarke, *The Great Duty of Universal Love and Charity* (1706); Robert Clavery, *The Excellency of Charity* (1708); Robert Moss, *The Providential Division of Men into Rich and Poor and the Respective Duties Thence Arise* (1708); Samuel Bradford, *Unanimity and Charity the Characters of Christians* (1709); George Ollyffe, *A Christian Alarm, to the Enemies of Charity and Moderation* (1710); John Killingbeck, *The Blessedness and Reward of Charity* (1710); White Kennett, *The Works of Charity* (1710); Moss Lowman, *The Character of a Christian a Motive to Charity* (1718); John Gale, *Universal Charity, the Bond of Christian Unity* (1718); Joseph Dodson, *Moderation and Charity* (1720); John Barker, *The Nature and Excellency of the Heavenly Treasure and the Way to Obtain It* (1721); John Peters, *The Universal Obligation to Christian Charity* (1724); and William Berriman, *The Excellency and Reward of Charity* (1725). Three-fourths of the texts on this list are charity school sermons.

⁵⁴ Ministers repeatedly reassured their sponsors and their students that their job was to "promote the security and happiness of the nation" by teaching "children to order themselves lowly and reverently to all their betters" (Hendley 88).

of the London hanged who “in the bitterness of their souls, charg’d their misfortune upon their ignorance, upon a cruel neglect of their parents in not having given them a good and a religious education” (10).⁵⁵ All Watts and Hendley request is a little financial support to mold children who will have “the eighth commandment strongly impress’d” on them (Hendley 17). In return, the word of God and duty to man will be so deeply ingrained in charity school children that they will be unable to steal because their hands “would tremble and betray ” them (17).

The SPCK believed that their rigorous selection process and rules helped them find lower-class children who could be easily molded into adults with the correct religious and social beliefs. Like many eighteenth-century philanthropists, they assumed they were in a better position than parish officials to discern “real cases of distress and the appropriate care of the needy” (Andrew 27). Charity school promoters offered to fill a large gap in the eighteenth-century education system and teach children whose parents could not afford to pay for school.⁵⁶ Depending on the charity school, there were two ways to gain admittance: the family of the child had to prove financial need in a letter or interview, or one of the governors could sponsor a child (Jones 45). Once accepted, students had to follow a strict set of guidelines, including proper conduct inside and outside of the school, uniform maintenance (they usually had to work off the cost of the clothing), and lessons (Lloyd, “Agents” 112). The children learned to read by memorizing Bible verses and writing by transcribing the same verses (Jones 79). Very few texts

⁵⁵ The beggar in *Tom Jones* articulates the issues in this sort of education when Tom discovers the bank note in Sophia’s book. He says, “for had they...sent me to charity-school to learn to write and read and cast account, I should have known the value of these matters as well as other people” (Fielding 658). In short, he would have known to steal the bank note if he had learned to read and write at a charity school. This, of course, is the opposite of the what the SFRM claims their educational efforts will do.

⁵⁶ M.G. Jones says that, by the late-seventeenth century, the number of free, endowed, and low cost private schools increased but the majority of the lower order were “unable to share in the advancement of learning” (18). Despite the grand vision of charity school promoters, “no more than 20-30 percent of enrollment was found in schools paid for and consequently controlled by a public body, religious or secular (Laqueuer 192).

other than the Bible were used in an effort to discourage the development of worldly desires. The SPCK believed that the number of religious-minded and respectful poor would increase exponentially as former charity school children raised their own children with the same values they learned.

Despite (or maybe because of) the SPCK's promotional campaign, Mandeville did not believe that charity schools could produce good people because they encouraged idleness. Mandeville's objections drew on three ideas of idleness circulating in debates over the poor, which Sarah Jordan outlines in *The Anxiety of Idleness*. First, Mandeville felt that luxury and idleness were acceptable in the upper class but not in the poor, because wealthy people's leisure activities were considered idle when undertaken by the poor (Jordan 39). Second, Mandeville worried that six hours of daily schooling destroyed industry, because "every hour those poor people spend at their book is so much time lost to the society" (Mandeville, "Charity Schools" 295). Third, Mandeville's objections to charity schools reflect the fact that most people in the eighteenth century believed the poor had an economic obligation to their social superiors to "do work that will profit the middle and upper classes," and thus any sort of activity that "brings rewards only to himself...is idleness" (Jordan 39). Mandeville was also not convinced that mental labor, at least when performed by the poor, had any social value. He says, "Going to school in comparison to working is idleness" (Mandeville, "Charity Schools" 295). Hendley, in contrast, defends the mental labor that children do in charity schools: "to make any progress at school, a child must not be idle; there must be study and application. And a close application of the mind is as fatiguing and tiresome as any labour of the body" (Hendley 22). Hendley's mental labor argument was a marginal position; most people believed with Mandeville that the poor should be limited to physical labor and that "mental labor, when engaged in by the poor" was

idleness (Jordan 39). Hendley was fighting an uphill battle against “the conviction that the education of the poor was economically unsound and socially destructive” (Jones 13).

Mandeville, John Trenchard, and Thomas Gordon also attacked charity schools for fomenting political and religious dissent by harboring Jacobites and encouraging Catholic sympathies, the very things they were supposed to prevent.⁵⁷ According to Craig Rose in “Seminarys of Faction and Rebellion: Whigs and the London Charity Schools, 1716-1724,” charity schools initially enjoyed interdenominational support and crossed party lines, but they quickly became fodder for dissension. In an alarmist tone, Trenchard and Gordon claim that the “the vilest tenets” of popery are “openly asserted and maintained...The principles of...our common people debauched in our charity schools” (133). The children “are taught as soon as they can speak, to blabber out High Church and Ormond; and so are bred up to be traitors, before they know what treason signifies” (133). Trenchard and Gordon say that many hanged at Tyburn are literate poor who “die for high church, and for the right line” (133). In sum, critics believed that a charity school education produced children disloyal to church and state to their dying breaths. The proper solution to Jacobitism, their writing implies, is the dismantling of charity schools. This controversy did serious damage to the appeal of charity schools and contributed to a decline in subscribers in the 1740s (Lawson 135).

In response to Mandeville, Trenchard, and Gordon’s jibes, charity school supporters published denouncements of Mandeville’s arguments, and *The Fable of the Bees* was presented to the Middlesex Grand Jury as a public nuisance (Speck 362). In addition to charges of

⁵⁷ In *Cato’s Letters*, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon joined with Mandeville to argue that charity school projects were ineffective in halting crime and that they harmed the economic and social order of eighteenth-century society by encouraging idleness among the poor. The concerns about idle and the poor crossed party lines, but the idea that education contributed to the problem was definitely a Whig criticism.

blasphemy, Mandeville was accused of decrying “all instructions of youth in the principles of the Christian religion...with the greatest malice and falsity” in order to establish “a general libertinism” (Mandeville, “Vindication” 388). Mandeville reprinted a letter signed Theophilus Philo-Britannus and addressed to the grand jury, which claims that he and other charity school detractors are full of lies and that “nothing ought to be regarded, by wise and serious men as a weighty or just argument, if it is not a true one” (qtd. in Mandeville 393). Philo-Britannus also compares Mandeville to the devil, calls him profane, and says his writing is an attempt to “extirpate the religion which the sacred offices were appointed to preserve” (400). Mandeville’s writing touched a nerve, because eighteenth-century commentators took “pride in identifying philanthropy as one of the defining hallmarks of Englishness” (Solkin 467). When Mandeville condemned popular charity practices, in the minds of many people, he criticized the essence of English identity.

Mandeville was neither indifferent nor hostile to religion despite his detractors’ accusations and the grand jury presentment. In *Free Thoughts on Religion, the Church, and National Happiness* (1720), Mandeville makes it clear that “our religion requires of us faith and good works” (2). Charity must be given happily, and the recipient must “not be tyed [sic] to us by the bonds of friendship or consanguinity because true charity is given to deserving “meer [sic] strangers, whom we have no obligation to, nor hope to expect anything from” (Mandeville, “Charity School” 263). In short, for Mandeville, charity is about giving to others what we take for granted—clothing, food, or shelter—with no expectation of personal gain. Benevolent giving is only one part of Christian charity, which is a limitless self-sacrificing love for God and man or, as Mandeville explains, it is “that virtue by which part of that sincere love we have for our selves is transferred pure and unmixed to others” (Charity School” 263). Genuine charity is a

virtue defined by selflessness and which is consequently incompatible with any form of selfishness.

Mandeville believed that private charity played an important religious and social role, which the directors of charity schools and other philanthropic organizations were redirecting to their own selfish purposes. The financial scandals of popular public charities throughout the eighteenth century, discussed by historian Slack in *From Reformation to Improvement*, provided fodder for detractors. Slack says that eighteenth-century public charities were too easily “misdirected, corrupted, by motives of personal pride or profit” (120). According to Slack, “promoters of charities borrowed the methods of joint-stock companies and found themselves in the new world of stock-jobbery and speculation” (120). Sermons from the period reminded supporters, “where ever the motive is worldly and temporal, we must not expect the reward should be heavenly and eternal” (Leng 17), but many charitable organizations were destroyed by mismanagement and embezzlement. Philanthropic scandals cemented Mandeville’s scorn of public charity.

Between 1700 and 1720, an average of forty new subscription-based charity schools were founded yearly, but by 1723, enthusiasm for the SPCK’s charity schools was waning, thanks to the volley of literary ire published by Mandeville and scandals involving other public charities(Andrew 50). Only five new schools were established between 1730 and 1740 (Andrew 50). Charity schools felt the criticism that they encouraged the poor to idleness in their pocketbooks, as other charitable endeavors received the money that was once theirs; and, the charity school model shifted to include labor elements in response to public concerns about educating the poor. By the 1720s, charity school proponents suggested that “every charity school [be] so constituted, that the children of the poor both in city and country, might be

employed in some work and labour, generally one half of the day; that it might have partly the nature of a work-house, as well as of a school” (Watts 15). But even the combination of catechism and labor failed to revive flagging interest in charity schools (Jones 95). Nevertheless, while the number of charity schools waned after the first quarter of the century, worries about defining the nature of charity, identifying worthy objects of charity, and applying charity continued and are taken up by Fielding in his novel *Tom Jones*.

Fielding’s Charity

In *Tom Jones*, Fielding explores the nature of virtue, vice, and charity in terms that echo those of the Mandeville-SPCK debate. Characters like Squire Allworthy prove that benevolence, a charitable impulse, is the foundation of Christian virtue because it is pure love, without which “all his other good deeds cannot render him acceptable in the sight of his creator and redeemer” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 184). Fielding also shows the different ways selfishness destroys relationships and lives and charity redeem lost souls. Importantly, Fielding’s novel serves as a guide, aiding readers in detecting the difference between benevolence, “true good nature,” and hypocrisy, which can masquerade as “good humor” (Shesgreen 772). At the heart of Fielding’s fictional exploration of charity lie concerns about the role charity plays in the coercion and control of the poor and the maintenance of class boundaries, which were also at the heart of the Mandeville-SPCK debate. In contrast to the earlier debate, which sticks to direct arguments about real world philanthropic practices, Fielding uses the novel to explore the drawbacks of poor education and the benefits of private charity.

Fielding’s Squire Allworthy demonstrates that genuine practitioners of charity are good people. In “The Moral Function of Thwackum, Square, and Allworthy,” Sean Shesgreen argues that “the single most important moral concept in Henry Fielding’s ethical thought is the idea of

benevolence or good nature” (772). Squire Allworthy embodies the important Christian virtues of prudence, justice, temperance, faith, and charity as a generous patron, fair magistrate, and kind brother.⁵⁸ The narrator in *Tom Jones* is effusive in his praise of Allworthy, who from nature “derived an agreeable person, a sound constitution, a solid understanding, and a benevolent heart” and from fortune inherited “one of the largest estates in the country” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 28). In the novel, Allworthy lays out his definition of charity to his future brother-in-law, Captain Blifil, who tries to prove “that the word charity in the scripture, nowhere meant beneficence or generosity” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 88). Instead of material assistance, Blifil believes that charity is “candour, or the forming of a benevolent opinion of our brethren” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 89). He praises social criticism as having “a virtue much higher and more extensive in its nature than a pitiful distribution of alms” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 89). In sum, Captain Blifil thinks that an abstract discussion of humanity’s flaws is charity. Allworthy is not satisfied with the captain’s definition and counters that charity is when “we bestow on another what we really want ourselves; where in order to lessen the distresses of another, we condescend to share some part of them by giving what even our own necessities cannot well spare” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 90). Furthermore, the act of charity comes “from a principle of benevolence and Christian love” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 90). Allworthy’s definition of charity, like Mandeville’s, emphasizes love and sacrifice. Allworthy feels that nothing can “justify a man hardening his heart against the distresses of his fellow creatures” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 91). Atheism is the worst appellation that Allworthy can come up with to explain uncharitableness,

⁵⁸ I do not agree with E. Taiwo Palmer and Bernard Harrison that Allworthy fails dismally as a magistrate or a patron (Harrison 107). Allworthy was supposed to be a literary representation of George Lyttleton, to whom Fielding dedicated the book and expressed the highest regard. Squire Allworthy is meant to stand out from the rest for his moral rectitude (Rosengarten 75).

because he cannot understand how someone can claim to love God and not assist his creation—man.

In the novel, Fielding stresses that charity consists of both belief and action. Thus, Allworthy does more than talk about charity; his actions are consistently benevolent. Allworthy practices what he preaches about charity not only by opening his purse and home but also by encouraging superior habits in his inferiors. His generosity extends to a wide range of people who fit Fielding's definition of the poor. Fielding says the poor are all those people who have "no estate of their own to support them, without industry; nor any profession or trade by which, with industry, they may be capable of gaining a comfortable subsistence" (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 44-45).⁵⁹ Among the poor characters in *Tom Jones* are Black George's wife and children, who live "in all the misery with which cold, hunger, and nakedness, can affect human creatures" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 144). Allworthy offers money to the gameskeeper's family, which is the image of abject poverty. He also gives a yearly anonymous gift to Mr. Partridge; welcomes Thwackum and Square into his home and gives them employment; and arranges a respectable marriage for Jenny Jones, along with a financial settlement. However, the greatest recommendation of Allworthy's goodness comes when readers learn that "in conferring all his numberless benefits on others, [he] act[s] in a rule diametrically opposed to what is practiced [sic] by most generous people. He contrived, on all occasions, to hide his beneficence not only from the world, but even from the object of it" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 859). In emphasizing the anonymous nature of the Squire's gifts, Fielding eschews the self-promoting nature of public charity, which Mandeville also criticizes. Allworthy requires neither thanks nor recognition to give; he has what Fielding calls a good mind, because his greatest happiness is "the reflection on

⁵⁹ Stephen King's historical study of poverty and welfare in the eighteenth century estimates that as much one-third of England's population could be categorized as poor at some point in their lives (79).

having relieved the misery, or contributed to the well-being of his fellow creature” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 185). Fielding leaves no doubt that Allworthy is a good man, and his private charity is an outward (but not public) demonstration of his inner goodness.

In *Tom Jones* Fielding uses the contrast between Allworthy and Miss Bridget to reinforce the parallel between charity and inner goodness.⁶⁰ Fielding based Miss Bridget on “Morning” which was the first in a series of paintings entitled “Four Times of Day” (1738) by William Hogarth.⁶¹ Hogarth, a close professional and personal friend of Fielding, inspired various characters in all of his novels.⁶² According to the narrator of *Tom Jones*, Miss Bridget sat for Hogarth and “was exhibited by that gentleman in his print of a *Winter’s Morning*...and can be seen walking...to Covent-Garden church, with a starved foot-boy behind her carrying her prayer-book” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 61). In addition to ignoring the conditions of her page, who is visibly cold, Hogarth’s lady “also evades the glance and outstretched hand of the beggar” (Hogarth 42). Her selfish nature is clear for all to see despite her pious demeanor. Similar to the woman in Hogarth’s painting, Miss Bridget is considered an old maid at a bit past thirty. She is no beauty, and in fact “she never mentioned that perfection [beauty] without contempt; and would often thank God she was not as handsome as Miss such a one, whom perhaps beauty had led into errors” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 29). Hogarth’s and Fielding’s spinsters are both well-dressed, although Miss Bridget is quick to declare her disdain for fashion due to her piety. She says it is only her love for her brother that compels her to accept his fine gifts, including

⁶⁰ Fielding uses this sort of contrast in all of his novels, with the exception of *Shamela*, “to discriminate the true meaning of words like ‘charity’ and ‘prudence’” (McCrea 122).

⁶¹ *Tom Jones* was not the first time Fielding had used this series of prints as inspiration in his work. Robert Etheridge Moore says that Fanny’s “would be suitor, Beau Didapper” in *Joseph Andrews* is “remarkably similar to the beau in “Noon,” the second plate of Hogarth’s *Four Times of the Day*” (124).

⁶² For more on the connection between Fielding and Hogarth, see Robert Moore, *Hogarth’s Literary Relationships* (1948); F. Antal, “The Moral Purpose of Hogarth’s Art” (1952); and Richard Baum, “Hogarth and Fielding as Social Critics” (1934).

beautiful clothing (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 36). Hogarth's "lady" performs her virtue by looking away in horror from the effusive young lovers in the street, while Miss Bridget declares her virtue and her disdain for strumpets at every opportunity. Miss Bridget has a number of strong words for loose women despite the fact she has birthed and abandoned one child out of wedlock, and Master Blifil's "premature" birth proves that she anticipated her wedding night with Captain Blifil.⁶³ The pairing of Miss Bridget and Hogarth's lady is an early clue to the former's hypocritical and uncharitable nature. Fielding uses every opportunity to show that parallels exist between vice and uncharitableness, virtue and charitableness, through his characterization of Miss Bridget and Squire Allworthy.

In contrast to the Squire, who combines charitable thoughts and practices with sincerity, Miss Bridget is a model of hypocrisy and selfishness. For example, when Allworthy informs his sister about the foundling he wishes to raise as his own, she "intimated compassion for the helpless little creature, and commended her brother's charity in what he had done" rather than ordering "the child; as a kind of noxious animal, immediately out of the house" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 36). The servants, aware of her selfish nature, expect her to reject the child; instead Miss Bridget cannot "forbear giving it a hearty kiss, at the same time declaring herself wonderfully pleased with its beauty and innocence" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 38). In the case of the foundling, it seems that Miss Bridget is the female compliment to her brother in kindness and understanding.

However, the servants are aware that the lady of the house does not always say what she really thinks. Before much time has passed, Miss Bridget is back to form, mean-spirited and self-centered. In a sarcastic tone, the narrator assures readers who "may condemn her for shewing too great regard to a base-born infant, to which all charity is condemned by law as

⁶³ See E. Taiwo Jones for a reading of Fielding's use of irony in this scene.

irreligious...that she concluded the whole with saying ‘Since it was her brother’s whim to adopt the little brat, she supposed little master must be treated with tenderness’” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 38). Her kindly façade wears away quickly, and she is frequently found verbally abusing Tom. In addition, “she had more than once sily [sic] caused him [Thwackum] to whip Tom Jones, when Mr. Allworthy, who was an enemy to this exercise, was abroad” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 137). It is not until Tom grows older and skilled at flattery that the “disinclination which she [Miss Bridget] had discovered to him a child, by degrees abated” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 137). Miss Bridget becomes closer to Tom, but it seems her affection is driven by vanity, and as affection for Tom grows, her dislike of Master Blifil increases until “she certainly hated her own son” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 137). While Miss Bridget physically abandons one son and emotionally abandons the other, Allworthy welcomes both into his home and his heart (Stevenson 56). Unlike her brother, who is the epitome of everything virtuous, Miss Bridget is hateful and proud, as well as a fornicator and liar.

Miss Bridget’s selfish actions become more unnatural when the novel’s conclusion reveals that she is Tom’s mother. Fielding suggests that Miss Bridget’s quiet derision of Tom was initially driven by fear and that she did have some affection for her first born. Jenny says that Miss Bridget “was highly rejoiced that her plan [to secretly introduce Tom to the Squire’s home] had succeeded so well, and that you had of your own accord taken such a fancy to the child” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 994). When Allworthy expresses his displeasure—“it was a most unjustifiable conduct in my sister to carry this secret with her out of the world”—Jenny reassures him that Miss Bridget always intended to reveal Tom’s identity (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 994). It is then discovered that Master Blifil destroyed the confessional letter, which was given to the same servant who witnessed Miss Bridget’s last words: “tell my brother, Mr. Jones is his nephew—he

is my son—bless him” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 1001). Miss Bridget’s deathbed confession, which ensures Tom’s financial future via Allworthy, is a parody of the deathbed will—a frequent target of Fielding’s nonfictional attack on charity. With the deathbed will, rich men tried to appease their consciences and ensure eternal salvation after a lifetime of sin by giving to the church. If enough of their “ill-gotten possessions” were bestowed on the church, “a pardon for all kind of villainy was sure to be obtained” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 186). Fielding criticized deathbed wills because “if a man was possessed of real benevolence, and had (as he must then have) a delight in doing good, he would [not] defer the enjoyment of this satisfaction to his death-bed” (187).⁶⁴ The comparison between deathbed confessions and wills again reveals Miss Bridget’s uncharitable nature. If she genuinely loved Tom as her son, Miss Bridget would have revealed his identity earlier. Her posthumous revelation is also not enough to mitigate the fact that Allworthy consistently treated her son with more generosity than his birth mother even when he believed Tom was the son of a stranger.

Tom and Master Blifil are another sibling pairing that emphasizes the connection between inner goodness and charity. Like Miss Bridget and Allworthy, their actions and inner characters are compatible. But Tom and Master Blifil are a more complex pairing, and they show that outward appearance is an unreliable basis upon which to judge a person’s character. Initially, Master Blifil’s piety and respectful manners “gained...the love of everyone who knew him, whilst Tom Jones was universally disliked” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 116). However, their actions towards the poor, in particular Black George, Allworthy’s gamekeeper, reveal their true character. Black George supplements his income by poaching from Allworthy’s neighbors, a

⁶⁴ Mandeville also criticizes deathbed bequests in “An Essay on Charity and Charity Schools.” Fielding’s and Mandeville’s criticism of public charity reflected the fact that while charity was greatly encouraged, “the eighteenth-century English were in fact only prepared to tolerate acts of public philanthropy within strictly guarded limits” (Solkin 467).

habit which lands Tom in trouble. Tom tries to protect the gamekeeper from punishment while Master Blifil maliciously lies to ensure Black George is fired. Cementing the tie between inner goodness and charity, Tom sells his horse and gives the money to Black George, who is now in financial straits after his dismissal. When the true character of the two boys is revealed, Tom is awarded “with the appellations of a brave lad, a jolly dog, and an honest fellow,” and Master Blifil is “generally called sneaking rascal, a poor-spirited wretch; with other epithets of the like kind” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 129-130).

The initial opinions that the villagers and tutors form about Tom and Master Blifil echo another series of Hogarth prints, “Industry and Idleness” (1947).⁶⁵ The first two plates of Hogarth’s series connect outward appearance and essential nature. The apprentice Goodchild “with a radiant, almost saintly countenance labors religiously at his loom, shuttle in hand,” while Idle, “the disheveled idle apprentice, his hair uncombed and his eyes sicken and dark, sleeps against the loom with his arms folded” (Hogarth). Each is surrounded with objects that reinforce their differences: Goodchild has a neat copy of “The Prentices Guide” and attends church, where he listens attentively. On the other hand, Idle has “a page from *Moll Flanders*... [that] hangs above his head” and plays with a group of disreputable people in the graveyard attached to the church (Hogarth). At first glance, Master Blifil seems a lot like Goodchild. He is described as “a lad of a remarkable disposition; sober, discreet, and pious, beyond his age” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 116). He listens attentively to his tutors and is often found with a Bible in hand. The image of Master Blifil reading the Bible mirrors Hogarth’s representation of Goodchild devoutly attending church.

⁶⁵ There is no doubt—considering how frequently Fielding mentions Hogarth or his works by name—that he was familiar with “Industry and Idleness,” so it is possible that Tom and Master Blifil were influenced by Francis Goodchild and Tom Idle.

Juxtaposed to Master Blifil and Goodchild are Tom Jones and Tom Idle, who seem to share more than a first name. Idle skips church service to play with disreputable characters while Goodchild attends church. His truancy is a rejection of Christian virtue that foreshadows the dissolute, vicious life he will lead. Like Idle, Tom is also viewed as irreligious, dissolute, and “the universal opinion of all Mr. Allworthy’s family, [is] that he was certainly born to be hanged” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 115). Tom Jones “was not only deficient in outward tokens of respect, often forgetting to pull off his hat, or to bow at his master’s approach...he was indeed a thoughtless, giddy youth, with little sobriety in his manners” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 130-131). Tom appears to live up to expectations again when he poaches on Squire Western’s land. Tom refuses to reveal his accomplice (Black George), a move that earns him “so severe a whipping, that it possibly fell little short of the torture with which confessions are in some countries extorted from criminals” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 120). Thwackum believes that Tom possesses an incorrigibly criminal mind, so the severity of his punishment is appropriate.⁶⁶ Tom even sells his Bible (of course the financial exchange is with none other than Master Blifil). Thwackum calls it “sacrilegious” and a “monstrous crime” for which Tom should be severely punished (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 143). Tom’s actions seemed worse “when opposed of the virtues of Master Blifil, his companion: a youth of so different cast from little Jones, that not only the family, but, all the neighbourhood, resounded his praises” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 116). When viewed from the limited perspective of the novel’s characters, Tom Jones looks like another bad seed similar to Tom Idle.

⁶⁶ Jill Campbell links Thwackum’s enthusiasm for flogging to Locke’s educational theory: “flogging is not only unnecessary and ineffective, but at odds with the preparation of English boys to take their place as free subjects in civil society” (Campbell 191).

Fielding diverges from the formula Hogarth lays out by identifying private charity, not Bibles or manners, as the most reliable judge of character.⁶⁷ In truth, Master Blifil is the villain of the piece, versed in religion but disinclined to actually practice Christian charity. On the other hand, Tom is the misunderstood and misdirected hero. His crimes are minor; he picks fruit from an orchard, steals a duck, and poaches, all in order to help feed the gamekeeper's family (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 116). The fact that many people make assumptions about the boys based on superficially good and bad behavior quickly becomes clear when Tom and Master Blifil get into an altercation. Master Blifil calls Tom a "beggarly bastard," and Tom responds by bloodying his nose. When the case is heard, Thwackum immediately assumes Tom is guilty, and "an indictment of assault, battery, and wounding, was instantly preferred against Tom" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 126). Master Blifil leaves his verbal provocation out of his testimony, and when asked, "he positively insisted, that he had made use of no such appellation; adding, 'Heaven forbid such naught words should ever come out of his mouth'" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 126). The narrator playfully suggests, "It is indeed possible, that this circumstance might have escaped his memory" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 126). But it is clear Master Blifil did not forget; he is a master manipulator and liar. After listening to the entire story, the Squire concludes that Tom faced a difficult question of honor that shows his good nature. Later, when Tom has to defend to Allworthy selling his horse and giving the money to Black George, he uses a strategic comparison, "you yourself, sir I am convinced, in my case would have done the same: for none ever so sensibly felt the misfortune of others" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 141). Allworthy dismisses "Tom with a gentle rebuke, advising him for the future to apply to him in cases of distress" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 141). While Tom makes mistakes in judgment, such as lying about the

⁶⁷ Robert Moore says that Fielding's novels were more concerned with "the discovery of affectation through the exposure of vanity and hypocrisy" (133). The key word here is "exposure." In Hogarth, vanity and hypocrisy are obvious, while in Fielding a series of events precedes the revelation.

hunting incident and selling the horse, Allworthy recognizes the important process of moral development he is undergoing (Brown 216).

Allworthy's character is an uncomplicated representation of charity (a finished product if you will), but Tom has to go through a long process of development to refine his good qualities and strip away the bad.⁶⁸ William Empson writes of this process, "Tom is a hero because he is born with good impulses" (40). Tom is just, faithful, courageous, and charitable, but he lacks prudence (Harrison 106; Rizzo 271).⁶⁹ His lack of self-control and moderation leads him to the beds of several women, drunkenness, and violent altercations. When viewed from this perspective, Mr. Western's disgust that his daughter Sophia has fallen in love with Tom does not seem excessive. Mr. Western tells Allworthy, "I always thought what would come o' breeding up a bastard like a gentleman, and letting un come about to volk's houses" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 311). Western blames Allworthy, who he says has "done a fine piece of work" in raising Tom to meddle with meat for his master" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 311). What Mr. Western so crudely means is that Tom is playing with the affections of his daughter because she is destined to marry someone better than an adopted bastard of unknown origins. His horror is comparable to Goodchild and Idle's master if his daughter would have fallen in love with and married Idle instead of Goodchild. Idle is never worthy of the affections of the master's daughter. All he can

⁶⁸ John Sekora argues that *Tom Jones* is a secularized variant of the soul drama, a general pattern of religious story. In these stories,

man has forfeited immortality through sin and must pass into the world of time, ruled by fortune. Here he will be faced with the two paths. If he chooses aright the strait and narrow, he will be beset by the deadly sins but will also gain the assistance of the cardinal virtues. At the end of his journey-struggle he will confront death; yet with the courage of purity in his heart he will realize he is about to enter the city of God. (Sekora 42-43)

The novel is all about Tom's character-defining journey to become an exemplary character, "charitable, benevolent, truthful, clear-thinking, self-controlled, and just" (Rizzo 269).

⁶⁹ I agree with Bernard Harrison's summation that "at the start of the book Tom is constitutionally goodhearted, but constitutionally imprudent, and it is his acquisition of prudence in the course of the book which constitutes the chief argument of Fielding's narrative" (106-7).

aspire to is the fickle attention of whores. Tom, however, eventually proves he is worthy of Sophia's affection. It is clear from the beginning of the novel that Tom is not a bad person. He is often tricked into situations that show his weaknesses in the worst possible light. While Tom does stray from the path of virtue, by the end of the novel, "whatever in the nature of Jones had a tendency to vice, has been corrected by continual conversation with this good man, and by his union with the lovely and virtuous Sophia. He hath also, by reflection on his past follies, acquired a discretion and prudence very uncommon in one of his lively parts" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 1038).⁷⁰ Tom makes it clear that Squire Allworthy played an important role in his path to virtue and expresses his gratitude, "I owe everything to that goodness of which I have been most unworthy" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 1013). The novel proves that Tom has a good heart, and at the end of his journey, his moral reformation is complete. And his charitable disposition is the strongest early indicator of that potential for reformation.

Ultimately, Fielding's novel shows that charity is a reliable indicator of inner goodness and the social value of individual people. Allworthy is a good person and useful member of society because he practices charity. While flawed, Tom is the character closest to Allworthy because he has the interest of his fellow man and woman at heart. The novel ends with the suggestion that Tom has evolved to become Allworthy's social and moral equal. Tom proves that he will put the needs of others ahead of himself, unlike Master Blifil whose every word and action promotes his own interests. *Tom Jones* reflects Fielding's belief that private individual

⁷⁰ To critics of Tom's character, Samuel Coleridge says that "every indiscretion, every immoral act of Tom Jones (and it must be remembered that he is in every one taken by surprise—his inward principles remaining firm) is so instantly punished by embarrassment and unanticipated evil consequences of his folly, that the reader's mind is not left for a moment to dwell or run riot on the criminal indulgence itself" (67). Coleridge believes that Fielding should be applauded for creating a realistic character with a moral core who learns from his mistakes and also serves as a teaching tool for readers.

assistance to the poor, while at times problematic, has an important place in eighteenth-century society.

Fielding situated his fictional representations of charity in the private realm because he had many reservations about public charity. While private charity was a reliable marker of inner good, public charity was undependable because its governors and managers were guilty of “horrid and notorious abuses” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 188). In *The Covent Garden Journal*, Fielding complains that many public charities “are so wretchedly contrived in their institution, that they seem not to have had the public utility in mind” (188). According to Fielding, many petitioners find the requirements so bewildering that “the properest [sic] objects may as well aspire at a place at court as a place in the hospital” (188). In addition, Fielding echoes the religious paranoia that Mandeville, Gordon, and Trenchard display in their writing. He attributes the establishment of schools and hospitals to vanity instead of virtue. These institutions “began to present themselves to the view of all travelers, being always in the most public places, and bearing the name and the title of the most generous founder in vast capital letters...a monument of his glory to all generations” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 187). This type of public acclaim is the opposite of what the humble and good-hearted Allworthy practices. Fielding realizes that, because of his criticism of schools, universities, and hospitals, he risks accusations of being “an enemy to all public charity” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 188). He promises to “obviate this opinion in a future paper,” which he never wrote. Regardless, while Fielding gives us no lengthy essay listing examples of good public charity, he does have a short line of glowing praise for “two glorious benefactions...the accommodation of women lying-in” and the Foundling Hospital

(Fielding, *Covent Garden* 188).⁷¹ Both of these charities were concerned with increasing the number of laboring people, a population that many feared was endangered by maternal and infant mortality among the poor.

Fielding's support of the Foundling Hospital stemmed from a concern, shared by many, that sexual promiscuity and illegitimate children were major problems among the poor and threat to the social order.⁷² The children of illicit unions were believed to be either physically weak because of their parent's gin drinking or morally weak because of their parent's sexual excesses.⁷³ So what were social reformers and planners to do with the weak, gin-soaked offspring of the poor, who threatened the strength of the nation? Fielding mockingly answers the problem in *The Covent-Garden Journal*, where he ironically endorses Jonathan Swift's social satire *A Modest Proposal*.⁷⁴ He says that it is a "proper and humane proposal" for the poor of Ireland, but "it would be extremely cruel and severe here" because the children of poor Irishmen are "sustained for the most part with milk and potatoes," so they "must be very delicious food; but here, as the children of the poor are better little than a composition of gin to force their parents to eat them would in reality be to force them to poison themselves" (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 117-118). The author of *Orphanotrophy* (1728) says that parents are guilty of "reaching out to their very infants those drams...when perhaps crying out for bread," echoing Fielding's

⁷¹ Hogarth's support of the Foundling Hospital probably encouraged Fielding's enthusiasm. Hogarth was one of the Hospital's governors and contributed to the decoration of the hospital (McClure 66-7). Hogarth was not the only artistic contributor to the Hospital; other supporters included George Handel, Joshua Reynolds, and Thomas Gainsborough.

⁷² See Peter Laslett, "Illegitimate Fertility and the Matrimonial Market" (1981), and Nicholas Rogers, "Carnal Knowledge" (1989).

⁷³ Gin was popularized in England in 1688 as an alternative to French brandy. Between 1689 and 1697, the government passed legislation to restrict brandy imports and encourage gin production. Ironically, by the early-eighteenth century, writers and politicians were identifying gin as the cause of economic and social problems instead of a solution. See Bernard Mandeville, *A Modest Defense of Public Stews* (1724), and Saunders Welch, *A Proposal to Render Effectual a Plan to Remove the Nuisance of Common Prostitutes from the Streets of this Metropolis* (1758).

⁷⁴ See Bertrand Goldgar, "Swift and the Later Fielding" (1988).

description of gin swilling babies (15). Therefore, the plan of this “great projector,” as he calls Swift, needs some adjustment, but if England will adopt an “ancient heathen religion,” human sacrifices will keep down the poor population. Further benefits of human sacrifices include lower poor taxes since there will be fewer poor and fewer people living a wretched life of hunger and suffering. His satirical proposal shows that the lack of care for foundlings was motivated by economic exigencies (lowering poor taxes levied on householders) thinly covered by religious principles.

Fielding also connected infanticide to existing poor statutes when he described human sacrifices in his Swift-esque proposal as a form of “legal provision for the poor” (Fielding, *Covent Garden* 118). Illegitimate and abandoned children were viewed as a burden on the parishes supporting them. In the workhouses, the elderly and infirm could be set to some small task, but an infant provided no such benefit, which led to incidental or deliberate abuse. Parish nurses, workhouses, and lenient magistrates were all blamed for the pitifully short existences of abandoned babies. The major complaint of foundling supporters was that parish care killed more children than it helped, so “those who cannot be so hard-hearted to murder their own offspring themselves...get it done by others, by dropping their children, and leaving them to be starved by parish-nurses” (*The Generous Projector* 10). The criticism reflected the hope among early-eighteenth-century philanthropists that their “benevolence might replace legal care for the poor” (Andrew 98). Advocates argued that foundling hospitals would offer a satisfactory alternative to the parish provisions required by law. While Fielding did not believe that charity could effectively supplant the law, he did agree with many of his contemporaries that the Foundling Hospital was an “exemplar of popular charity, a model of how organized philanthropy should

operate” (Andrew 99). Fielding held the Foundling Hospital up as an exemplar because it focused on who he believed were most needy and deserving poor.

Fielding continued his scathing indictment of infanticide in *Tom Jones*, where Squire Allworthy’s employees, family, and neighbors are happy to define charity as inappropriate for bastards and to ignore their murder. While Allworthy generously raises the abandoned baby, others wish Tom dead. The housekeeper serves as a mouthpiece for popular opinion about foundlings when she tries to discourage Allworthy from his act of charity: “if I might be so bold to give my advice, I would have it put in a basket, and sent out and laid at the church-warden’s door” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 33). She says that Allworthy could then take comfort in the fact that they “have discharged [their] duty in taking proper care of it; and it is, perhaps, better for such creatures to die in a state of innocence, than to grow up and imitate their mothers; nothing better can be expected of them” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 33). The housekeeper is swift to argue that the infant Tom deserves only the minimum charity required to appease one’s conscience. The Squire does not lower himself to respond directly to his housekeeper, but he makes it clear that he abhors infanticide. Allworthy’s lecture to Jenny is an unequivocal reproof to his eavesdropping housekeeper. He says, “I should indeed have been highly offended with you, had you exposed the little wretch in the manner of some inhuman mothers, who seem no less to have abandoned their humanity, than to have parted with their chastity” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 44). Because she did not murder her child, Allworthy is inclined to show Jenny mercy, and instead of “considering your having deposited the infant in my house, as an aggravation of your offense,” he sees it as a mark in her favor and evidence of “a natural affection for your child” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 44). Fielding’s novel shows that genuine charity values all lives, especially those of

the young and helpless. This sentiment was echoed in theory, if not practice, in the Poor Laws, which described the infant poor in sympathetic terms.

In addition to the housekeeper, Captain Blifil also views the possible death of a foundling as a blessing in disguise, since the parish will not be burdened with the care of another poor dependent or have to hang the criminal he will likely become. He says, “tho’ the law did not positively allow the destroying such base-born children, yet it held them to be the children of nobody; that the church considered them as the children of nobody; and that, at the best, they ought to be brought up to the lowest and vilest offices of the commonwealth” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 74). In response, Allworthy calls those who use religion to punish foundlings blasphemous, because “however guilty the parents might be, the children were certainly innocent” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 74-75). While there are many who agree with Captain Blifil, Allworthy stands firm in the conviction that the foundling deserves more care and charity than many are willing to give. Allworthy concurs with the views of one early-eighteenth-century foundling charity advocate who believed that illegitimate and abandoned babies were also God’s children. As the anonymous social planner explains, foundlings are among those into whom God “had breathed the breath of life, and on whom he had stamped his image” (*Generous Projector* 10). Allworthy is determined to “provide in the same manner for this poor infant, as if a legitimate child had had the fortune to have been found in the same place” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 75). The Squire’s resolution is further evidence of his charitable nature and the selfishness of those around him. He views Tom as a blessing; and his feelings of affection and responsibility stand in marked contrast to Captain Blifil and Mrs. Deborah, who are happy to abandon a helpless baby to the elements outside the churchwarden’s door. In the end, Allworthy is determined to prove that the foundling, despite his faults, is a deserving object of charity.

Fielding's focus on saving an abandoned child echoes the growing belief in the early-eighteenth century that ignoring abandoned children, which often resulted in their deaths or a life of beggary, was morally and economically wrong. The author of *The Generous Projector* (1731) believes it is "the height of charity and humanity...to extract good even out of evil" by saving "innocent babes from slaughter and bringing them up in the nurture and fear of the Lord" (11). The number of abandoned infants was also disturbing to anyone who held the populationist belief that the commonwealth's strength was its numbers.⁷⁵ Even early proponents of a foundling charity, such as William Petty and Joseph Addison, viewed infants as "a national resource too precious to be wasted" (Andrew 58). Most advocates combined religious and economic imperatives in their arguments. The anonymous *A Memorial Concerning Erecting an Orphanotrophy* (1728) promises that a hospital for foundlings will save poor children and provide them with religious instruction and husbandry training sufficient to "render all useful to the public, instead of hurtful member thereof; as those who survive, by being brought to begging generally prove" (2). The hope of all the social planners was that foundlings would profit the commonwealth by strengthening the work population and reducing the number of people dependent on charity.

While efforts and published plans to garner interest in the issue of abandoned children date from the late seventeenth-century onward, it was not until 1741 that a plan was instituted. After years of hard work, Thomas Coram received a royal charter in 1739 to build a hospital for abandoned children.⁷⁶ In 1741, the doors of the Foundling Hospital opened to admit thirty

⁷⁵ According to Tanya Evans in *Unfortunate Objects* (2005), "over a thousand a year were being left on the rubbish heaps in the streets, alleys, and other public thoroughfares of the city" (129).

⁷⁶ McClure says Coram had bad timing. Coram was working on the foundling hospital idea in 1722, the same year as the South Sea Bubble, "which had included among its lesser bubbles the 'company for erecting houses and hospitals for maintaining and educating bastard children'" (McClure 20). Many

foundlings. Between 1741 and 1756, the Hospital, which was dependent on private charity “accepted fewer than 1,400 children, and had to refuse entry to perhaps twice as many others” (Outhwaite 2). In *Coram’s Children*, Ruth McClure’s historical study of the Foundling Hospital, she appends a summary of the Hospital’s income from 1739-56. Almost eighty percent of the Hospital’s money came from general benefactions, annual subscriptions, and legacies. Other sources of income included chapel donations, rents on land owned by the hospital, charity boxes, and the children’s work (McClure 265). McClure’s numbers show that children contributed an incidental amount to their upkeep, less than one percent. These numbers are at odds with the emphasis on child labor in the Hospital’s literature. According to *An Account of the Hospital* (1749), after some trial and error (including a death rate of over 75 percent), the governors decided to remove the children from London for three years, after which they were brought back to the city and “cloathed in a manner proper to labour” (68).⁷⁷ The children’s clothing, diet, and schedule were all designed to inure them to hard labor. Each day the children were to rise at either five or seven in the morning, depending on the season; work eight to ten hours; and end the day with one or two hours of reading lessons and religious instruction (*Hospital* 68-9). The minute details of the children’s daily activities were presented as proof that the Hospital did not encourage or tolerate idle behavior.

Several eighteenth-century plans other than Coram’s proposed to include an educational component similar to the SPCK’S charity school plan. *Orphanotrophy* wants foundlings to “have the advantage of being educated in the same manner as in our charity schools” (16). The author writes, “our charity train up for, and have brought three fourths more into services, of the

people lost a fortune when the bubble burst, and consequently similar ventures were met with suspicion and hostility.

⁷⁷ For more on infant deaths at the Foundling Hospital, see Alyssa Levene, “The Estimation of Morality at the London Foundling Hospital, 1741-99” (2005).

poor of this city, than otherwise; but for this education, would ever have gone into any service that is good” (*Orphanotrophy* 17). The education of foundlings, as with charity school children, will render them “useful and fit for services, and apprenticeship to the meanest trades, instead of being inured to beggary, pilfering, and stealing, as most of those charity children were before taken into such schools” (*Orphanotrophy* 16). In *Orphanotrophy*, foundling hospitals would operate, much like charity schools, as a practical venture to enrich the pool of quality laborers. Coram obviously saw an organic connection between charity schools and his plan for a foundling hospital. Among the people he depended on for advice and support in the foundling venture was Thomas Bray, the best known of the SPCK’s founders (McClure 21). In addition, many of the major charities had very similar membership lists. Despite the connections and comparison, the Hospital’s governors avoided outright comparisons to charity schools in their promotional literature. The early literature for the Foundling Hospital made it clear that their central focus was saving the lives of children and preparing them for work, not education.⁷⁸

In contrast to his wholehearted support of private and public charity to save abandoned and orphaned infants, Fielding’s novel expresses several problems with his peers’ enthusiasm for educating the poor. First, unlike the SPCK, which intertwined education and moral character, in *Tom Jones* Fielding argues that education does not guarantee that people will be morally upstanding or make good choices (Kropf 117). For instance, Square is a philosopher whose “natural parts were not of the first rate, but he had greatly improved them by a learned

⁷⁸ When the Hospital first opened, “governors aligned themselves with the proponents of education limited to reading” (McClure 220). Its eight hours of labor and two hours of religious and reading instruction was the exact opposite of the average charity school plan. According to M. G. Jones, charity school children had on average a six-hour school day filled with religious instruction, moral application, and the three “r’s”. In 1757, the emphasis at the Foundling Hospital started to change, and the governors hired their first schoolmaster. “By the end of the century all the boys were learning to read and write, and some of the boys were studying arithmetic” (McClure 222). This chapter does not examine the shift towards more education because it is not relevant to Fielding’s writing, having occurred after his death.

education” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 121). Despite his learning, Square is a ridiculous figure in philosophical discussions, showing that knowledge is no substitute for intelligence. Square also misuses logic to justify morally unsound decisions, such as sleeping with Molly Seagrim. While Square is guilty of sexual improprieties, Thwackum, his religious counterpart, is guilty of deliberate cruelty and hypocrisy. Thwackum is recommended to Allworthy as a tutor for Tom and Master Blifil because he “was fellow of a college...had a great reputation for learning, religion, and sobriety of manners” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 132). Thwackum’s education and religious profession hide his “infirmities” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 132).⁷⁹ Square and Thwackum are among “those who claim to act in the name of religion and virtue,” yet their actions and motivation are thoughtless, petty, or cruel (Rosengarten 68). On the other hand, Allworthy “had missed the advantage of a learned education, yet, being blest with vast natural abilities, he had so well profited by a vigorous though late application to letters, and by much conversation with men of eminence” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 55).⁸⁰ While Thwackum and Square are better educated, Allworthy is a wiser, better person.⁸¹ These varied examples show that one’s good or bad nature is independent of social expectations or level of education.

⁷⁹ Fielding includes another direct reference to Hogarth here when he describes Thwackum. He says Thwackum, “very nearly resemble that gentleman, who, in the Harlot’s Progress, is seen correcting the ladies in Bridewell” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 136). Fielding is referring to the last scene of *The Harlot’s Progress* (1731), where several people are gathered for Moll’s wake. In the far left corner, there is a clergyman (Fielding’s Thwackum) with his hand up the skirt of a young girl.

⁸⁰ In *Joseph Andrews* (1742), Fielding creates another hero of modest education and admirable character, this time from a lower-class family. Joseph’s father paid “sixpence a week for his learning” because he “had not interest enough to get him into a charity-school” (Fielding, *Joseph Andrews* 23). In addition to a modest education, Joseph is also similar to Allworthy because of his faith, kindness, and wisdom. Despite the lack of charity school education and the sexual temptations he faces as footman to the predatory Lady Booby, Joseph never wavers from his moral convictions. At the end of the novel, Joseph’s true parentage (he is the son of a gentleman) is revealed. The comparison between Joseph and Allworthy becomes even more relevant once Joseph becomes Allworthy’s social equal.

⁸¹ Sean Shesgreen’s essay “The Moral Function of Thwackum, Square, and Allworthy” (1970) is the best available comparative analysis of these three characters.

Second, Fielding shows that educating the poor threatens the class distinctions that ensure civil society's stability, challenging the SPCK's insistence that education reinforces class difference. In *Tom Jones* Jenny quickly learns that public opinion strongly equates the education of servants with idleness, pride, and immorality. The villagers resent that "a young woman so well accomplished should have little relish for the society of those whom fortune had made her equals, but whom education had rendered so much her inferiors" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 41). Her neighbors see her as prideful, and they take it as a further insult that Jenny dons the trappings of her of superiors, including a "new silk gown, with a laced cap, and other proper appendages" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 41).⁸² The villagers come to the worst possible conclusion that "she could not come honestly by such things" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 42). Jenny's troubles do not end with her dismissal from the Partridge household and the unsubstantiated suspicions about how she obtained her fine clothes. Mrs. Deborah's search for Tom's mother leads straight to Jenny's door as a result of envy and some circumstantial evidence.⁸³ Upon her confession, "many of them cried out, 'They thought what madam's silk gown would end,' others spoke sarcastically of her learning" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 43). Fears about servants in general, and educated servants in

⁸² In issues 26 and 29 of *The Idler* (1758), Johnson "recounts" a similar story of Betty Broom, educated in a charity school. The school's subscriber withdraws support because of rumors that there is "scarcely a wench to be got 'for all work,' since education had made such numbers of fine ladies, that nobody would now accept a lower title than that of a waiting maid or something that might qualify her to wear laced shoes and long ruffles, and to sit at work in the parlour window" (Johnson 280). Mandeville explained in addition that "few men of substance" will hire charity school children because they are too much trouble ("Charity Schools" 305).

⁸³ It does not help Jenny's case that she fits the statistics of what historian Rogers says was the average unwed mother in the eighteenth century, an unmarried housemaid between twenty and twenty-five years old (358).

particular, influence the whole village's belief that Jenny has reached above her station and that she would sleep with the married schoolmaster, then bear and abandon his bastard.⁸⁴

Jenny's story shows that education-based charity is not a panacea for poor problems, because it does not inure the poor to their circumstances by teaching the value of hard labor. The schoolmaster, Partridge, "had the good-nature, or folly...to instruct her so far, that she obtained a very competent skill in the Latin language, and was, perhaps, as good a scholar as most of the young men of quality of the age" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 41). Fielding narrative raises doubts about the wisdom of educating a servant. As a result of Partridge's efforts, Jenny comes to the attention of Allworthy, who intends to arrange a favorable marriage and settlement for the girl. But Partridge's tutelage also results in unemployment and public condemnation for Jenny. Jenny and the Partridges part on bad terms, a plot turn that connects lower-class education and idle servants. For four years, Mrs. Partridge, lulled by Jenny's plain looks, permits her to "neglect her work, in order to pursue her learning" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 78). Jenny does not do the work for which she is paid, which is time and money lost for Partridge's household. Jenny's time in the Partridge household leads others to believe she is above physical labor. Even Mr. Partridge, her one-time advocate, complains that Jenny "had grown of little use as a servant, spending all her time in reading" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 80). The Partridges eventually view Jenny as one those servants who are "daily encroaching upon masters and mistresses, and endeavouring to be more upon the level with them" (Mandeville, "Charity Schools" 311). For instance, instead of showing the proper deference due to her master and teacher, she laughs at Partridge's bad Latin. When Mrs. Partridge fires her, Mr. Partridge describes Jenny as "very pert and obstinate"

⁸⁴ For more on sexual relations between servants and masters, see Tim Meldrum, "London Domestic Servants from Sepositional Evidence, 1660-1750: Servant-Employer Sexuality in the Patriarchal Household" (1997).

(Fielding, *Tom Jones* 80).⁸⁵ To her neighbors, former employers, and benefactor, Jenny is a cautionary tale about the dangers of educating servants.

In the end, Fielding shows that charity has an important social role in defining and helping people, but benefactors must understand the limitations of their work and form realistic expectations. Working to save abandoned babies from poverty or death is a manageable goal, which compliments the laws against infanticide. On the other hand, a promise that education will cure irreligion, idleness, or crime is rash because there are too many uncontrollable variables, including each individual's unique personality, history, and influences. Jenny's intelligence and education negatively influence her decision-making, such as running away with an officer without the benefit of marriage. Similar to Square's justification of his affair with Molly, Jenny is convinced "after much reading on the subject...that particular ceremonies are only requisite to give a legal sanction to marriage, and have only a worldly use in giving a woman the privileges of a wife" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 998). Jenny willfully misreads in order to justify her actions and ignores the moral ramifications. Her intellectual aptitude does not protect her from making morally unsound decisions and shows that education is not enough to correct the moral and social faults of the poor. Through his characterization of Jenny, Fielding shows that there is no utility in educating the lower classes, because it will not make them better people or servants, nor is it needed in their work. Thus, Fielding's essays and pamphlets on poor reform issues support work-centered plans rather than the education-based ideas espoused by the SPCK.

⁸⁵ Mr. Partridge's words are motivated in part by ire that the student has surpassed the master, because in recent literary disputes "she was become greatly his superior" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 80).

Workhouse Reform

Fielding promotes the law as the proper institution to address the poor problem because of one major drawback to private charity: the proliferation of beggars. He believes that it is the law, not charity, which most effectively controls the unruly and idle poor. Despite putting his faith in the law, Fielding recognizes a number of problems with the established parochial workhouse plan. His criticism of the system surfaces in much of his writing, including *Tom Jones*. Fielding's *A Proposal for the Poor* suggests ways to for revise the Poor Laws and improve the workhouse system in order to exert better social controls over the poor.

In Fielding's estimation, anyone who gives money to beggars contributes to the moral and economic dissolution of England. *The Covent Garden Journal* claims that "the giving of money to common beggars...is a crime against the public" (Fielding 187). Gordon and Trenchard concur with Fielding that "mischevious liberality" encourages idleness in beggars and other undeserving people and in doing so threatens to disrupt the social order of eighteenth-century England (*Cato* 133). While no substantive social changes came of the beggar's challenges to authority, the wealthy occasionally demanded "to criminalize indiscriminate givers as well as public beggars" (Roberts 71). Tim Hitchcock writes that a "long-standing culture of mutual obligation and charity" countered upper-class complaints about beggars and "ensured that beggars were able to retain their freedom to knock on kitchen doors and stand at street corners" ("Begging on the Streets" 479). Tom is operating under the rules of mutual obligation when he declares he cannot "abstain from relieving one of his brethren in such a miserable condition" (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 654). However, Fielding makes it clear elsewhere that giving money to beggars is "assisting in the continuance and promotion of a nuisance" (Fielding, *Covent Garden*

187). The scene between Tom and the beggar shows that Fielding understands, even if he cannot condone, the sympathetic impulse that leads people to give to beggars.

Fielding's writing reveals most beggars to be frauds who are trying to avoid honest labor, something that a wise magistrate such as he could discern better than a casual philanthropist. For instance, in *A Journey from this World to the Next* (1749), Fielding humorously represents begging as a family business and "as regular a trade as any other" (Fielding, *Journey* 293).⁸⁶ In the story, begging has "several rules and secrets, or mysteries, which to learn require perhaps as tedious an apprenticeship as those of any craft whatsoever." Among the many things the beggar apprentice learns is "the countenance miserable" (Fielding, *Journey* 293). Some people are naturally blessed with a miserable affect, "but there are none who cannot accomplish it, if they begin early in youth, and before the muscles are grown too stubborn" (Fielding, *Journey* 293). Despite appearances, the beggar followed in Fielding's *Journey* suffers from no "sickness of infirmity, but that which old age necessarily induced," and he dies at the ripe old age of 102 (298). The centenarian beggar comically represents Fielding's certainty that most beggars are charlatans, since anyone who "can but moderately well impersonate misery, is sure to find relief and encouragement" (Fielding, *Robbers* 46). He concedes that some people are physically or mentally incapable of working, but the number is "so trifling that two of the London Hospitals might contain them all" (Fielding, *Robbers* 45). Fielding's negative images of beggars

⁸⁶ Beggars are a part of what Tim Hitchcock calls the "pauper professions," which combined begging and service. Among the services of the pauper profession were shoeblackening, charring, crossing sweeping, and ballad singing.

correspond with the Poor Laws' categorization of beggars as subjects in need of physical punishment and control.⁸⁷

Fielding lumps beggars and servants together in *A Proposal for the Poor*, because they are, in his view, both guilty of idleness and associated with crime.⁸⁸ He shows that beggars and servants require the discipline of the law instead of the gentle hand of charity. In *A Proposal for the Poor*, Fielding makes it clear that any activity the poor engage in other than physical labor is idleness, and any idle poor fall within the purview of the law. The idle poor are worse than useless because "they must of necessity become burdensome" (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 8). In response to the problem of the idle poor, Fielding argues that it should be legal "to seize all suspicious persons who shall be found wandering on foot about the fields, lanes, or highway, or in the streets" as well as "all labourers or servants, or persons of low degree, who, after the hour of ten in the evening, shall be found harbouring in any alehouse or victualling-house" (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 17). These beggars, servants, and other idlers would then be brought before a magistrate with the power to convey the offenders to the workhouse.⁸⁹ Fielding says of the poor, "having nothing, but their labour to bestow on the society, if they with-hold this from it, they become useless members" (*Proposal for the Poor* 8). His plan for legally controlling the poor, in fact, depends on the "image of the unfree labourer, whose wages should be regulated, mobility restricted, and leisure time supervised" (Rogers 84). To those who might criticize forced labor as too harsh, Fielding distinguishes what he proposes from the draconian

⁸⁷ Lance Bertelsen shows that a significant, but by no mean the largest, number of people were presented in Fielding's court on charges of idleness and disorderliness. Theft was actually the highest number of cases charged.

⁸⁸ Tim Hitchcock discusses the association between begging and crime in *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London* (2004).

⁸⁹ Fielding wanted to extend the Vagrancy Act of 1744, which consolidated past legislation, widened the definition of vagrancy, and further incentivized policing (Rogers 85).

laws of Edward VI, who ordered loiterers branded with a hot iron and enslaved. Fielding clarifies, “There is a difference between making men slaves and felons, and compelling them to be subjects” (Fielding, *Robbers* 66). Fielding’s focus on idleness and crime reflects the concern, also evident in the debate between Mandeville and the SPCK, that the poor are an idle, dependent mass, which drains the resources of the nation.

Fielding’s recourse to the law derives from a theory of the poor that sees them as inherently prone to bad behavior and criminality, a view that has much in common with Mandeville’s assumptions. Fielding links servants with idle pursuits like drinking and gambling, as well as a variety of crimes. He wants magistrates to control the leisure activities of the poor because they generally involve drunkenness, sexual incontinence, robberies, and murder. Fielding, like Mandeville, believes the poor acquire their bad habits from watching their masters go about their amusements. Mandeville states the same case when he says the entertainments of the rich “are the academies for footmen where publick lectures are daily read on all sciences of low debauchery by the experience’d professors of them” (“Charity Schools” 309). Fielding is critical of the vices of the upper class, but his disapproval stems from concerns about the devastating social consequences that the “harmless” amusements of the privileged can cause when they are adopted by the poor.⁹⁰ As a magistrate, Fielding had to hear the testimony of many men reduced to “a state of starving and beggary” or who have “become thieves, sharpers, and robbers” (*Robbers* 4). These men frequently embark on a fatal course in order to “pay a bill that was shortly to become due” (Fielding, *Robbers* 5). Fielding warns magistrates, no matter how sad the stories, they should not practice leniency, because “pardons have brought many

⁹⁰ See William Hogarth, “Gin Lane” (1750/1); Bernard Mandeville, “An Enquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn” (1725); and Daniel Defoe, “A Brief Case of the Distillers and of the Distilling Trade in England” (1726).

more men to the gallows than they have saved from it” (*Robbers* 120). He claims that a disciplined workhouse can preserve lives and add to the common wealth in the process.

Fielding also thought that workhouses should balance punishment and rehabilitation of their inmates, which existing workhouses failed to do (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 45). Instead, with a few exceptions, workhouses were “designed to terrorize or punish the poor” (MacFarlane 264). Fielding’s disdain for the reign of terror in workhouses is clear throughout all his writing, including *Tom Jones*. When Jenny is named as Tom’s mother, her neighbors “diverted themselves with the thought of her beating hemp in a silken gown” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 52). In the communal imagination, Jenny will experience the humiliating contradiction between her uppity ways and the harshness of the workhouse, where she will be put to the “hardest and vilest labour” (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 14). Allworthy refuses to give his housekeeper and the villagers “an object for their compassion to work on in the person of poor Jenny, whom, in order to pity, they desired to have seen sacrificed to ruin and infamy by a shameful correction in Bridewell” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 54). He wants to give Jenny a second chance, which would not happen in Bridewell, where “all hopes of reformation would have been abolished, and even the gate shut against her, if her inclinations should ever hereafter lead her to chuse the road of virtue” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 54). The bad influence of the other inmates would, he believes, complete Jenny’s fall from grace, and even if Jenny escapes with her morals intact, the infamy of Bridewell will be a permanent stain on her reputation. Allworthy’s words reflect Fielding’s concern that the stigma of Bridewell is an added, unnecessary punishment, one that can keep a reformed prisoner from gainful employment and good company.

Allworthy’s grim outlook on Jenny’s moral preservation in Bridewell is mainly due to the institution’s indiscriminate mingling of inmates. Minor or first-time offenders like Jenny mixed

with hardened thieves and murders until, “with the conversation of many bad, and sometimes worse themselves, they are sure to be improved in the knowledge, and confirmed in the practice of iniquity” (Fielding, *Robbers* 63). In an example from his work as magistrate, Fielding describes how a prisoner’s “morals, however bad, are farther corrupted; his necessities, however pressing before, are increased” in just a few weeks at the workhouse (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 43). As a magistrate, Fielding had the opportunity to see that “a commitment to which place, tho it often causes great horror and lamentation in the novice, is usually treated with ridicule and contempt by those who have already been there” (Fielding, *Robbers* 63-64). Because of the corrupting elements in Bridewell, “many of the worthiest magistrates have, to the utmost of their power, declined a rigorous execution of the laws for the punishment of idleness, thinking that a severe reprimand might more probably work the conversion of such person than the committing them to Bridewell” (Fielding, *Robbers* 64). To solve the problem of corruption in places such as Bridewell, Fielding’s workhouse plan includes a rigidly separated space for incorrigibles with rooms dedicated to fasting, cells, and a barred room connected to the chapel for the prisoners to listen to the sermon. According to Nicholas Rogers, “Fielding’s scheme signaled a break with the permissive self-regulating prisons of the past and a shift towards more professional, centralized institutions devoted to reshaping the character of the criminal” (93). Fielding makes an important spatial distinction between those who just need a little discipline and supervision and those whose unrepentant refusal to work requires isolation and punishment. Fielding’s thinking about workhouses was typical in an era that was turning from a reliance on physical punishment to the use of mental and psychological discipline.

Fielding was also deeply disturbed by the fact that workhouses were not putting their inmates to work. Inuring the inmates to hard work would assist their reentry into society. His

plan aimed to exert control over the workhouse population's every waking moment. Fielding outlines a strict schedule of work and worship: the laborers will rise at four in the morning, gather for prayers at five and twice a week for a lecture on morality, work at assigned tasks for ten hours a day with short breaks for meals, prayers again at seven, and then lights out at nine in the evening. This regime would train inmates in habits of hard work and moral reflection, unlike the prisons that Fielding saw operating already. Instead of discipline and supervision, Fielding sarcastically observes, a commitment to Bridewell is "a very severe punishment...if being confirmed in habits of idleness, and in every other vicious habit, may be esteem'd so" (*Robbers* 61). Jenny's neighbors gleefully envision her hard at work in Bridewell, but Fielding shows that the lack of structure in such institutions only encourages the idle habits that landed inmates there in the first place.

Fielding concedes that workhouses "did at first greatly answer the good purposes for which they were designed," but "they are at present in general, no more than schools of vice, seminaries of idleness, and common-stores of nastiness and disease" (*Proposal for the Poor* 62-63). He blames the failure of workhouses on the fact that Elizabethan laws were out of touch with eighteenth-century problems of urbanization and population growth. The "reason why work-houses (more properly called idle-houses) have by experience been found to produce no better effect" is that "the expense and difficulty of carrying this purpose into execution will always increase in proportion to the smallness of the body of the people by whose hands it is to be executed" (Fielding, *Proposal for the Poor* 36). Fielding proposes that the larger entity of the county replace the smaller parish as the seat of poor relief. He envisions an immense county workhouse and house of correction that will lodge up to five thousand people and replace the smaller, existing parish-based workhouses. He believes that serving a larger geographical area

and maintaining one huge structure will make it easier to acquire the materials, training, and managers needed to employ the poor. Furthermore, a more centralized administrative system—the county instead of the parish—might eliminate some of the charges of corruption leveled at workhouses. For Fielding, the reformed workhouse should be integrated into society at the same time that its strict schedule would teach inmates how to re-integrate as useful citizens.

Fielding wanted the workhouse to serve a dual purpose to employ and rehabilitate. As Rogers observes, Fielding hoped his workhouse model would “mould the mind as much as punish the body of the reprobate and idle worker” (93). To begin the rehabilitation of the idle, Fielding wants them “confined on bread and water for twenty-four hours” upon admittance (*Proposal for the Poor* 46). He hopes that the isolation and mean diet will help prisoners “cool” (*Proposal for the Poor* 46). If the time spent in solitary reflection on their misdeed is not enough and “the prisoner should still retain any signs of outrageous reprobacy, it will be much more proper to confine him by himself than to suffer him to reinfect those who may possibly have made some advancement in their cure” (46). Spartan surroundings and a strict schedule will “cure” the poor of their idle bad habits. Fielding depends on physical signs—a lack of “outrageous reprobacy”—to show the cure is going according to plan. Inmates will eventually repent of their past sins (gaming, drinking, lying, and thieving) and choose to continue to work for the public good, outside of the coercion of the workhouse. In *Tom Jones*, Jenny follows a similar pattern of punishment and penance. First, after years of immoral living, she is punished with economic and social instability. The man she lives with, who is not her husband, abandons her with no means of support. Additionally, Jenny’s reputation leaves her to suffer social condemnation for her actions. The climax of Jenny’s suffering, when she is reunited with Squire Allworthy, is also a critical moment of penitence and redemption. The shame she suffers leads

to tears and confession of her sins. Allworthy then reassures her that heaven “is ready to receive a penitent sinner” (Fielding, *Tom Jones* 998). He also reminds her that her confession is only the first step in the process of social and spiritual redemption. Fielding maps the same pattern of suffering, penitence, and redemption for both Jenny and his workhouse inmates.⁹¹

Conclusion

Ultimately, Fielding’s writing reflects a genuine appreciation for both charity and the law. He did not want to privilege one over the other; instead, he defined the proper place of each. The law, flawed as it might sometimes be in scope or execution, is the appropriate means to counteract idleness and crime. In order to work, according to Fielding, the law must be coupled with the reform of systems of punishment. Charity, in Fielding’s view, should be limited to private individuals or groups with discernment that can recognize worthy recipients: the hardworking poor, helpless babies, and those with genuine physical ailments that limit their ability to work. As evidenced in his writing about workhouses, Fielding believed the numbers of deserving poor were very small. In the end, Fielding assumed the ultimate goal of philanthropists and magistrates should be to effectively ensure that the poor are useful to society. Reading his novel alongside his proposals and periodicals helps us see how *Tom Jones* contributes to the eighteenth-century philanthropic discourse by imaginatively mapping the problems and possibilities of charity and the law as institutions, which can mold the poor into a group committed to what he deems the proper moral and social order.

Fielding expressed reservations about educating the poor and the efficacy of public charity at the same moment that others like William Dodd and Jonas Hanway were refining the

⁹¹ In Chapter Three, I consider the connection between gender and penitence in greater detail by looking at Jonas Hanway’s Magdalen Hospital, a charity for reformed prostitutes, and the writing of William Dodd, the Hospital’s main preacher.

former and popularizing the latter. His perspective shows that there was not a philanthropic hegemony in the eighteenth century. But as Donna Andrew's history of eighteenth-century British charities and as subsequent chapters show, popular and financial support did shift to the for-profit, public philanthropic model developed by merchants such as Hanway.

Works Cited

- An Account of the Hospital for the Maintenance and Education of Exposed and Deserted Young Children*. London, 1749. *The Makings of the Modern World*. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Amory, Hugh. "Magistrate or Censor? The Problem of Authority in Fielding's Later Writing." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 12.3 (1972): 503-518. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Mar 2012.
- Andrew, Donna. *Philanthropy and the Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989. Print.
- Antal, F. "The Moral Purpose of Hogarth's Art." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 15.3/4 (1952): 169-197. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Nov 2011.
- Archer, Ian W. "The Charity of Early Modern Londoners." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series* 12 (2002): 223-244. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Mar 2012.
- Battestin, Martin C. and Ruth Battestin. *Henry Fielding, A Life*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- Baum, Richard M. "Hogarth and Fielding as Social Critics." *The Art Bulletin* 16.1 (Mar. 1934): 30-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Mar 2012.
- Bertelsen, Lance. "Committed by Justice Fielding: Judicial and Journalistic Representation in the Bow Street Magistrates Office January 3-November 24, 1752." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30.4 (Summer 1997): 337-363. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Mar 2012.
- . *Henry Fielding at Work*. New York: Palgrave, 2000. Print.
- Brundage, Anthony. *The English Poor Laws, 1700-1930*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.
- Campbell, Jill. *Natural Masques: Gender and Identity in Fielding's Plays and Novels*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995. Print.
- Cleary, Thomas R. *Henry Fielding, Political Writer*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities, 1984. Print.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "Notes on Tom Jones." *Tom Jones: A Norton Critical Edition*. Ed. Sheridan Baker. New York: Norton, 1973. Print.
- Defoe, Daniel. *The Generous Projector, or a Friendly Proposal to Prevent Murder and Other Enormous Abuses*. London, 1731. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 12 May 2012.
- Empson, William. "Tom Jones." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Tom Jones*. Ed. Martin C. Battestin. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 33-55. Print.

- Evans, Tanya. *Unfortunate Objects: Lone Mothers in Eighteenth-Century London*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Fielding, Henry. "Covent Garden Journal." *The Works of Henry Fielding*. Ed. William Henley. Vol 14. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967. 71-242. Print.
- . "An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber." *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber and Related Writing*. Ed. Malvin Zirker. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988. 61-174. Print.
- . *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and His Friend Mr. Abraham Adams*. New York: Signet, 1961. Print.
- . "A Proposal for Making an Effectual Provision for the Poor." *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robber and Related Writing*. Ed. Malvin Zirker. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1988. 219-280. Print.
- . *Tom Jones*. 1749. New York: Bantam, 1997. Print.
- Gay, John. "Trivia; or the Art of Walking the London Streets." *Walking the Streets of Eighteenth Century London: John Gay's Trivia (1716)*. Ed. Clare Brant and Susan E. Whyman. New York: Oxford UP, 2007. 169-218. Print.
- Gladfelder, Hal. *Criminality and Narrative in Eighteenth Century Britain: Beyond the Law*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.
- Harrison, Bernard. *Henry Fielding's Tom Jones*. London: Sussex UP, 1975. Print.
- Hendley, William. *A Defense of the Charity Schools*. London, 1728. Print.
- Hitchcock, Tim. "Begging on the Streets of Eighteenth-Century London." *Journal of British Studies* 44.3 (July 2005): 478-498. JSTOR. Web. 17 Apr 2013.
- . *Down and Out in Eighteenth-Century London*. London: Hambledon and London, 2004. Print.
- Hogarth, William. *The Four Times of Day*. 1738. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. Plate 42-45. Print.
- . *The Harlot's Progress*. 1732. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. Plate 18-23. Print.
- . *Industry and Idleness*. 1747. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. Plate 60-71. Print.
- Hudson, Nicholas. "Tom Jones." *The Cambridge Companion to Henry Fielding*. Ed. Claude Rawson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 80-93. Print.

- Hunter, J. Paul. *Occasional Form: Henry Fielding and the Chains of Circumstance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1975. Print.
- Innes, Joanna. "State, Church and Voluntarism in European Welfare, 1690-1850." *Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform*. Ed. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 15-65. Print.
- Johnson, Samuel. "Idler nos. 26 and 29." *Anti-Pamela and Shamela*. Ed. Catherine Ingrassia. Ontario: Broadview, 2004. 279-283. Print.
- Jordan, Sarah. *The Anxiety of Idleness*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003. Print.
- Jones, G.M. *The Charity School Movement*. Cambridge: U Cambridge P, 1938. Print.
- Kickel, Katherine E. *Novel Notions: Medical Discourse and the Mapping of the Imagination in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- King, Steven. *Poverty and Welfare in England: 1700-1850*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000. Print.
- Kropf, C.R. "Educational Theory and Human Nature in Fielding's Works." *PMLA* 89.1 (Jan. 1974): 113-120. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Sep 2012.
- Laqueur, Thomas W. "Working-Class and the Growth of English Elementary Education, 1750 1850." *Schooling and Society*. Ed. Stone, Lawrence. Baltimore: U Johns Hopkins P, 1976. 192-205. Print.
- Lawson, John and Harold Silver. *A Social History of Education in England*. London: Methuen, 1973. Print.
- Levene, Alyssa. "The Estimation of Mortality at the London Foundling Hospital, 1741-99." *Population Studies* 59.1 (Mar. 2005): 87-97. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 May 2012.
- Lloyd, Sarah. "'Agents in Their Own Concern'? Charity and the Economy of Makeshifts in Eighteenth-Century Britain." *The Poor in England 1700-1850*. Ed. Steven King and Alannah Tomkins. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003. 100-136. Print.
- . *Charity and Poverty in England, c. 1680-1820*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Macfarlane, Stephen. "Social Policy and the Poor in the Later Seventeenth Century." *The Making of the Metropolis: London 1500-1700*. Ed. A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay. New York: Longman, 1986. 252- 277. Print.
- Mandeville, Bernard. *A Modest Defense of Public Stews, or, an Essay upon Whoring*. London, 1724. Print.

- . *Fable of the Bees*. 1723. Ed. Phillip Harth. New York: Penguin, 1970. Print.
- Marshall, Dorothy. "Revisions in Economic History: VI. The Old Poor Law, 1662-1795." *The Economic History Review* 8.1 (Nov. 1937): 38-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- McClure, Ruth. *Coram's Children*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981. Print.
- McCrea, Brian. *Henry Fielding and the Politics of Mid-Eighteenth-Century England*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1981. Print.
- A Memorial Concerning an Orphanotrophy or Hospital for the Reception of Poor Cast-off Children*. London, 1728. Print.
- Moore, Robert Etheridge. *Hogarth's Literary Relationships*. Minneapolis. U Minnesota P, 1948. Print.
- Norton, Joseph. "Public Charity." London, 1705. Print.
- Outhwaite, R.B. "Objects of Charity: Petitions to the London Foundling Hospital 1758-72." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32.4 (1999): 497-510. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Palmer, E. Taiwo. "Irony in *Tom Jones*." *The Modern Languages Review* 66.3 (July 1971): 497-510. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Paulson, Ronald and Thomas Lockwood, eds. *Henry Fielding, The Critical Heritage*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969. Print.
- Roberts, Michael J.D. "Head versus Heart? Voluntary Associations and Charity Organizations in England c. 1700-1850." *Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform*. Ed. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 66-86. Print.
- Rogers, Nicholas. "Carnal Knowledge" Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Westminster." *Journal of Social History* 23.2 (Winter 1989): 355-375. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Rose, Craig. "'Seminarys of Faction and Rebellion': Jacobites, Whigs, and the London Charity School, 1716-1724." *The Historical Journal* 34.4 (Dec. 1991): 831-855. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Rosengarten, Richard A. *Henry Fielding and the Narration of Providence*. New York: Palgrave, 2000. Print.
- Schmidgen, Wolfram. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction and the Law of Property*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.
- Schmidt, Jeremy. "Charity and Government of the Poor in the English Charity School Movement, circa 1700-1730." *Journal of British Studies* 49.4 (October 2010): 774-800. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.

- Slack, Paul. *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999. Print.
- Snow, Malinda. "The Judgment of Evidence in *Tom Jones*." *South Atlantic Review* 48.2 (May 1983): 37-51. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Solkin, David H. "Samaritan or Scrooge?: the Contested Image of Thomas Guy in Eighteenth Century England." *The Art Bulletin* 78.3 (Sep. 1996): 467-484. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct 2012.
- Stanhope, George. "The Dangers of Hard-heartedness to the Poor." London, 1705. Print.
- Stevenson, John Allen. *The Real History of Tom Jones*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Taylor, James Stephen. "Philanthropy and Empire: Jonas Hanway and the Infant Poor of London." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 12.3 (Spring 1979): 285-305. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Oct 2012.
- Tomkins, Alannah. *The Experience of Urban Poverty: Parish Charity and Credit*. New York: Manchester UP, 2006. Print.
- Trenchard, John and Thomas Gordon. "Of Charity and Charity Schools." London, 1723. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 15 Apr 2011.
- Watts, Ian. *An Essay Towards the Encouragement of Charity Schools*. London, 1728. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 12 Oct 2012.
- Zirker, Malvin R. "Fielding and Reform in the 1750's." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 7.3 (Summer 1967): 453-465. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 May 2012.
- Zunshine, Lisa. *Bastards and Foundlings: Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century England*. Columbus: U of Ohio State P, 2005. Print.

Chapter 3

Philanthropy and Penitence: William Dodd, *The Sisters*, and the Magdalen Hospital

In 1758, several prominent London merchants, Jonas Hanway, Robert Dingley, Robert Nettleton, and John Thornton, decided prostitution and moral depredation were at critical levels in London and required their concerted attention.⁹² These merchant-philanthropists initiated a competition for the best prostitution reform plan, an event supported by the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce and advertised in *The London Chronicle*. While a number of people active in eighteenth-century police and criminal reform efforts submitted plans (including Saunders Welch, John Fielding, and Joseph Massie), Dingley's plan, *A Proposal for Establishing a Public Place of Reception for Penitent Prostitutes*, received the financial support of merchant colleagues, who then became the new charity's board of governors (Taylor 76).⁹³ In Dingley's plan for the Magdalen Hospital, prostitutes voluntarily applied for assistance and willingly submitted to religious education, a strict work schedule, employment training, and surveillance by matrons chosen by the governors (Appleby 147). Following admittance, directors expected the former prostitutes to demonstrate their penitence by wearing plain clothes, eating plain food, having a modest demeanor, and worshipping God constantly.

Hospital supporters published a number of fiction and nonfiction texts, which Laura Rosenthal calls Magdalen literature, as part of the institution's public relations campaign to

⁹² The numbers historians offer range from a couple thousand to tens of thousands. See Randolph Trumbach, *Sex and the Gender Revolution* (1998); Tony Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London* (1999); and Antony Simpson, "'The Mouth of Strange Women is a Deep Pit': Male Guilt and Legal Attitude towards Prostitution in Georgian London" (1996).

⁹³ In his biography of Hanway, James Stephen Taylor maps out the close ties between the eighteenth-century philanthropic community and the members of the Russian Trading Company. This relationship between philanthropy and trade is raised in the first section of this chapter and explored in greater detail in Chapter Four.

reform the image of the prostitute from public pariah to victim and garner the financial support of the public. The Reverend William Dodd, one of the charity's most fervent and popular supporters, served as the institution's official minister and a spiritual counselor to both the women receiving assistance from and the governors contributing to the Hospital.⁹⁴ He also wrote and published a range of texts, from novels to sermons, which he believed promoted the institution's charitable mission to instill religious values in former prostitutes and restore the women's social utility as servants, mothers, and wives.

Dodd's novels give insight into the interior thoughts and motivations of charity givers and recipients, complementing his sermons and instruction manual for the Magdalen Hospital, which focus on the need for external surveillance to ensure and verify penitence. He wrote two novels, *The Sisters; or the History of Lucy and Caroline Sanson* (1754) and the posthumous *The Magdalen or, History of the First Penitent Prostitute* (1783). These novels are best understood as descriptive supplements to the Magdalen Hospital's philanthropic mission to reform London's prostitutes and increase the number of reliable laborers and servants. *The Magdalen*, an obvious piece of propaganda for the Hospital, introduces readers to the newly orphaned and impoverished Emily Markland, who rapidly declines into the depths of poverty and despair, beginning with her seduction, impregnation, and abandonment by her mistress's son. At the story's conclusion,

⁹⁴ Dodd became the Magdalen Hospital's high-profile minister because his sermons were popular among the rich and powerful. His life follows the story of sin and repentance about which he so fervently wrote and preached. Dodd's flamboyant style led to being nicknamed the "macaroni parson." All of his biographies concur that the periodic social and legal problems Dodd faced all stemmed from extravagant tastes. At age twenty, he left school to run with a fashionable literary crowd in London. He married a serving woman, to which his father responded by dragging Dodd back to school to complete a divination degree. *The Beauties of Shakespeare*, Dodd's most well-known work was published during this time, and in the introduction, Dodd tells his audience that he plans to turn his mind to spiritual concerns. As one biographer puts it, "he foreswore the world, with its pomps and vanities" (Dublin 259). Unfortunately, his repentance was not permanent, and years later, his extravagant tastes led to large debts and charges of forgery, for which he faced prosecution. After Dodd's conviction, Samuel Johnson wrote several letters in his defense in an attempt to overturn his death sentence. Despite his popularity and friends in high places, Dodd had the ignominy of being the last person hanged at Tyburn for forgery in 1777.

Emily learns of the newly-opened Magdalen Hospital for the Reception of Penitent Prostitutes and applies for admittance. In the Magdalen Hospital, described as “a refuge from distress and misery,” the careworn prostitute finds “tenderness and pity” for her circumstances while undergoing a spiritual and social transformation (75-76). While Dodd’s *The Sisters* also identifies the vulnerability of women as a pressing social problem and prescribes charity as the cure, it deviates from *The Magdalen*’s simplistic plot of sin, suffering, redemption, and reward. *The Sisters* tells the story of Lucy and Caroline Sanson, two young country girls from a poor family, sent to London by their father to find rich husbands. Their cousin Dookalb, a procurer of flesh, preys upon their innocence and vulnerability. In the end, Lucy is seduced and dies after a short and vicious life of prostitution, while Caroline is rescued, virtue intact, and marries a wealthy peer. Given the Magdalen Hospital’s goal of saving lost souls, it seems puzzling that Caroline, the rescued woman, never falls and that Lucy, the fallen woman, never escapes the deadly grasp of the London underworld. This fact leads Ann Campbell to conclude that the women described in *The Sisters* demonstrate a “gap between theory and fictional practice” inconsistent with the Magdalen Hospital’s mission of saving women who have strayed from the proper moral and social path (133). However, careful scrutiny of the texts indicates that both of Dodd’s fictional renderings of women in distress promote the social and domestic benefits of institutionalized philanthropy.

This chapter argues that Dodd’s fictional efforts should be understood as consistent with the Magdalen Hospital’s theological, economic, and social vision. A close examination of the novels proves that Dodd concurs with the Magdalen Hospital founders’ certainty that a lack of charity and understanding for the circumstances of poor women caused prostitution. The circumstances he mentions include “the complicated arts of seducers: the treachery of perfidious

friends: the softnesses and infirmities of our common nature...the early loss of parents... [and] the deficiency of religious principle and serious education” (“Sermon Before Prince Edward” 48). Dodd’s fictional and nonfictional representations of poverty and prostitution reiterate his certainty that the women “have been kept purposely in black and total ignorance of the crime to which they were unwittingly introduced” (“Sermon to the President” xi). While *The Sisters* precedes the establishment of the Magdalen Hospital, its fictional rendering of the people and circumstances that contribute to the victimization of young women and of the transformative power of charity, corresponds with the institution’s rhetoric of salvation.⁹⁵

The Sisters and its successor, *The Magdalen*, define and circumscribe the material conditions of poor women in order to legitimate philanthropic rather than juridical intervention in their lives. In the process, Dodd extricates women’s social value from chastity and reframes it in terms of labor, thereby making the recuperation of the prostitute possible. In addition, Dodd aligns the economic security of prostitutes with national security, similar to other “proponents of the charity movement in mid-century [who] cast the rehabilitation of prostitutes and orphaned or deserted children as vital to the war effort” (Batchelor 5).⁹⁶ Ultimately, Dodd’s efforts on behalf of seduced women and the Magdalen Hospital are a contribution to mid-eighteenth century

⁹⁵ Campbell claims that *The Sisters* shows that “any sexual experience outside of marriage incapacitates a woman for society and often leads to the conclusion ordained by Hogarth, disease and death” (132). This is a very limited reading of Dodd’s novel that does not look at the novel in context, including the conventions of the romance genre, Dodd’s literary influences (including Johnson and Richardson), and the development of his literary style. Also, importantly, he wrote the novel before the establishment of the Magdalen Hospital, so there was no physical institution to which he could refer back to as a solution.

⁹⁶ Jonas Hanway certainly subscribed to the populationist view that more people meant economic and martial strength. In “A Journal of Eight Days”, he says “the greater our numbers are, ’tis probable the greater our riches will be; and if we are not blind to our own interest, the more secure will be our liberty also.” Women become central to the war effort in terms of reproductive labor. In *Island Race*, Kathleen Wilson notes that “the experience of being a ‘woman’...shaped and was shaped by the experience of being a Briton at war” (96). Hanway makes similar appeals to national security related to a number of his charitable interests, including the Foundling Hospital and the Marine Society.

philanthropic literature, which can help us better understand the connections between sex, class, and labor.

Detractors of Dodd's first novel fail to see that the assumptions about poor women's sexuality and labor that underpin the philanthropic theories and practices of the Magdalen Hospital become clearer when read alongside his literary efforts. For instance, A. D. Barker's 1798 biography of Dodd claims, *The Sisters* is "a carelessly-written novel...which Dodd the churchman could not acknowledge as his own" (226). Barker's identification of a fundamental split between Dodd's spiritual and literary lives resonates with Campbell's frustration with and inability to reconcile *The Sisters* to the philanthropic aims of the Magdalen Hospital. Their conclusions that textual or narrative contradictions equal irreconcilability focus on Dodd's literary strategy, an entertaining narration of tantalizing intimate encounters. Sarah Lloyd criticizes the voyeuristic scenes in the novel stating, "In arousing emotion in favor of the penitents, Dodd reinforced the sensual abandon which had apparently led to the women's original downfall" (61). She questions the effectiveness of a text that immerses readers in the emotions and experiences they needed to repudiate in the prostitute. One eighteenth-century reviewer goes even further, claiming the descriptions in the novel are more likely to "inflamm[e] than correct the passion, and... more likely to seduce than to reform" (*The Gentleman's Magazine* 339). This review disregards moments when Dodd carefully guides the reader through the novel's literary temptations by balancing the scenes of sexual transgression, economic greed, and violence with interjections that denounce sexual temptation and parental neglect.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ Some ignore *The Sisters* in favor of novels that easily fit the Magdalen Hospital's narrative. For example, Hugh Kelly's novel *Memoirs of a Magdalen* seems a more obvious parallel. The novel, published in 1767, tells the story of Louisa Mildmay and her fiancé Sir Robert Harold. They anticipate their wedding vows, and Sir Robert breaks the engagement. There is a duel and kidnapping. Poor

Responding to this scholarship, this chapter demonstrates that the titillating elements of the text do not prove a schism existed between Dodd's philanthropic and literary lives, because he frames the intimate details of seductions as crucial evidence of poor women's victimization by family, friends, and strangers.

Barker's and Lloyd's critiques form part of a small body of literary and historical scholarship on the Magdalen Hospital and Dodd that identifies shifts in the way women are described in eighteenth-century literature.⁹⁸ One strand of scholarship notes a shift in the connection between women and work in the Magdalen Hospital's propaganda. In "'Pleasure's Golden Bait': Prostitution, Poverty and the Magdalen Hospital in Eighteenth-Century London," Lloyd claims that poor women, defined by their work, had an economic and social agency that did not fit the rhetorical needs of the Magdalen Hospital. In response, the Hospital's literature aligned poor women with delicate femininity in an attempt to erase the connection between poor women and work, which made these women unattractive objects of charity.⁹⁹ Problematically, Lloyd does not consider the moments in Dodd's writing that attempt to identify the appropriate types of work for the penitents. For as Laura Rosenthal notes, Magdalen supporters largely based the success of the charity on observations that "women graduating from the Magdalen Hospital were better-than-adequate workers" (114). This conclusion about each penitent's labor value draws directly from the annual updates listing the women's training and accomplishments

forsaken Louisa finds her way to the Magdalen Hospital. Sir Robert eventually feels remorse for his actions, and he and Louisa are married. See *The Writing Life of Hugh Kelly* by Robert Bataille.

⁹⁸ The literary analyses performed by Lloyd, Binhammer, and Batchelor all examine sentimental novels, the Magdalen Hospital, and some of Dodd's writing, but strangely neglect his novels. Another example of this inattention is Martha Koehler's "Redemptive Spaces: Magdalen House and Prostitution in the Novels and Letters of Richardson," which skips Dodd completely for an extended analysis of Samuel Richardson. She establishes the important role Richardson played in the Hospital's establishment and the production of propaganda literature for the Magdalen Hospital.

⁹⁹ Lloyd's project largely tries to understand how the Hospital fits within the history of eighteenth-century philanthropy. She concludes that the Magdalen Hospital and Dodd represent an "odd" moment in eighteenth-century philanthropy.

published by the governors. In contrast to Lloyd, Jennie Batchelor's "'Industry in Distress': Reconfiguring Femininity and Labor in the Magdalen House" acknowledges the ways in which Magdalen literature invoked women as workers. She claims the Hospital's narrative marks a shift towards representations of "female laborers as a vital and active agent in the nation's moral and political economy" (Batchelor 3). Batchelor notes that the writings of Dodd, Dingley, and Hanway suggest that "labor would be an essential means through which the erasure of the penitent's past could be achieved and would help them forge a future by recovering the essential femininity their trade had temporarily transgressed" (8). Batchelor's observations, equating work with redemption, informs this chapter's analysis of the ways in which the Magdalen Hospital reestablished women's social value in terms divorced of sexual purity. My contribution to the body of Dodd scholarship is to show how Dodd's writing reflects a philanthropic logic that defines charity recipients (and contributors) in terms of their social and national utility, frames certain acts as prescribed and others as choice, and promotes self surveillance as a critical part of reformation.

An equally important strand of scholarship concerning Dodd and the Magdalen Hospital established by Laura Rosenthal, Vern Bullough, Vivien Jones, and Katherine Binhammer, contributes to our understanding of eighteenth-century sexuality. Their work describes the Magdalen Hospital as an institutional manifestation of a discursive shift from identifying prostitutes as economic and social predators to seeing them as victims. In *Infamous Commerce*, Rosenthal says that in the libertine tradition, the prostitute accepted and was empowered by the "instrumental use of her body" (120). In contrast, the reform narrative, which includes Dodd's novel and the various publications of the Hospital's governors, dwelled on "sentimental feeling in the face of objectification" (Rosenthal 120). Dodd repeatedly casts prostitutes as victims,

claiming that most poor women did not choose a life of prostitution; men with power, often in the households in which they worked and lived, forced it on them. His rhetoric of victimization leads scholars to conclude that his writing disempowers women.¹⁰⁰ Even Katherine Binhammer, who resists the idea of an organic connection between sentimental narratives and women's disempowerment, concludes in her book *The Seduction Narrative in Britain, 1747-1800* that Dodd erases the moral agency of penitent prostitutes in order to highlight their victimization. Dodd's writing reflects a midcentury shift away from attitudes that identified "womankind as a source of physical and moral infection" and thus limited female agency (Simpson 54). Nevertheless, it is important to understand how his representations of victimization inform and reflect the Magdalen Hospital's definition and application of charity.¹⁰¹

Thus, this chapter examines the ways in which Dodd's philanthropic literature (fiction and nonfiction) express a particular set of philanthropic ideas, which were instituted by the Magdalen Hospital. Dodd's writing highlights the connection between the thoughts and actions of fictional penitent prostitutes and charity contributors. Since his fictional histories provide crucial insight into his commitment to the Hospital's mission to reform London's prostitutes, section one maps out the theory and practices of charity described in Magdalen fiction and sermons. Section two, "Proper Objects of Charity," looks at Dodd's assumptions about the

¹⁰⁰ Female servants were definitely a sexually exploited group—seduction or forcible rape and abandonment by their masters were "occupational hazard[s]" (Simpson 55). We know from court records of the period that men from the upper class raped working-class women with impunity" (Mudge 187). See Anna Clark, *Women's Silence, Men's Violence*.

¹⁰¹ While Dodd's novel has not garnered much attention, the prostitute has been a popular object of study for eighteenth-century scholars. Three works, Sophie Carter's *Purchasing Power* (2004), Kirsten Pullen's *Actresses and Whores* (2005), and Rosenthal's *Infamous Commerce* (2006) contribute to this chapter's analysis of how Dodd's writings promoted the Magdalen Hospital as an essential institution and ideological tool. All three books consider the ways in which the prostitute invoked the idea of liberation and resistance. The theatre or bawdyhouse becomes a trope of resistance. Pullen's work in drama and performance theory and Carter's knowledge of eighteenth-century print culture are helpful in recognizing the complexity of *The Sisters*.

nature of women and the instructional imperative of charity. Like many of his contemporaries, Dodd believed women were intellectually and emotionally weaker than men, a fact that left them vulnerable to manipulation in the wrong hands. Here I look primarily at *The Sisters* and *The Magdalen* to understand how Dodd uses fictional characters to articulate a social need to save women from their weak natures, which explains the need for an institution like the Magdalen Hospital. Finally, Dodd's writing presents the women of the hospital as objects worthy of charity because of his "confidence in prostitution as a reversible condition" (Rosenthal 152). Dodd and the Magdalen governors believed the hospital's inmates suffered from spiritual afflictions, and their recommended course of treatment consisted of isolation from society, strict regulation of all activities, and work, all of which require strict self reflection and surveillance. Importantly, Dodd's writing reveals the connection between penitence and women's social value by describing the work women did in the Hospital as preparation for the labor they would do outside of it. Thus, my final section, "Applying Charity" considers the concepts of penitence and self-surveillance as it relates to the actions the Magdalen Hospital required of the women to demonstrate their recovery from sin.

Philanthropic Logic

Dodd's novels introduce charity's philanthropic logic, which centers on the "pleasures of doing good and national advantage" (Lloyd 52). The characters in his novels who are most suited to this work of salvation are guided by an altruistic desire to serve God by assisting women. Historian Ian Archer calls this altruistic impulse the religious paradox of Protestantism: good works do not equal salvation, but people must do good works as part of their salvation. Conveniently, those people who obey their Christian and civic duties to help others reap spiritual, emotional, and material rewards. Dodd balances the lure of reward with a threat: false

charity jeopardizes the physical and economic health of both individuals and society.

Sympathetic narrators in both *The Sisters* and *The Magdalen* warn that at first glance, genuine and false charity look and sound very similar, which makes it difficult for the young, unworldly girls in these novels to “distinguish a real benevolent disposition from its too often destructive semblance” (Dodd, *The Magdalen* 48). Dodd uses emotionally-driven scenarios to describe the ways genuine and false charity shapes the choices available to poor women. In short, fake charity plays a central role in the corruption of the poor, while genuine charity leads to their social redemption. Dodd uses these circumstances as the basis of his indictment of a society in which women who need charity are frequently victims of false charity because no official process exists to verify legitimate offers of assistance: someone offers to help, and the needy woman accepts to her benefit or detriment. Ultimately, Dodd’s philanthropic logic explains how he assisted the Magdalen founders in running a successful public relations campaign to reform the prostitute’s image and promote their institution’s vision of charity.

Dodd’s fictional emplotment of his philanthropic logic reconciles altruism and recompense for eighteenth-century philanthropists. Hence, in *The Sisters* Mrs. Steven accepts boarders like Caroline, who have no money to offer her. She asks very little of her other boarders, only enough money to support her children. Mrs. Hodson, an independently wealthy woman, hears of Mrs. Steven’s generosity and becomes an anonymous benefactor to the Steven family. In turn, Mrs. Steven looks for ways to help more people in need of assistance. In each example, the women’s disavowal of any personal investment, actual proves they deserve recompense, in the form of money or praise. The fictional world of philanthropy overlaps with the real world on the pages of the novel when Dodd identifies his own writing as an act of genuine charity in the preface to *The Sisters*. His “single intention,” according to Dodd, is “to

recommend virtue, and decry one species of vice,” and his only reward is the satisfaction of preventing a “train of consequences, equally affecting and horrid,” including the victimization of poor women and the destruction of English families (vii). This less-than-subtle claim positions Dodd as an exemplar of genuine charity, writing for the good of society, not public acclaim or wealth. In other words, glory and wealth are outcomes of, not motivations for, his acts of charity. Likewise, in *The Magdalen*, Emily’s sister decides to “forever forgo all her expectations” of a good marriage to save Emily from prostitution. For her sacrifice, she reasons, she “should think herself greatly rewarded by saving [Emily] from eternal ruin” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 33). Echoing the preface of *The Sisters*, Emily’s sister articulates Dodd’s public commitment to the idea that the spiritual and physical salvation of others is the ultimate reward for philanthropic actions.¹⁰²

The Sisters reflects Dodd’s certainty that an altruistic impulse to do charity manifests in a variety of people—the rich and the poor, the saint and the sinner. Characters like Mrs. Hodson are crucial to Dodd’s message of selfless charity in *The Sisters*. Her sole purpose in life is “assisting and serving her fellow creatures” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.120). A model of charity, she searches for “proper objects for her relief,” out of no greater desire than to help others (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.120). In contrast to the wealthy Mrs. Hodson, the widowed Mrs. Stevens, a “thorough [sic] charitable woman” must take in boarders to support her family (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.117). Dodd encourages readers to reconcile moneymaking and philanthropic efforts by presenting Mrs. Steven’s entrepreneurial activities as a practical solution to the vulnerability of widowhood and a

¹⁰² Emily, reflecting back on her dire situation as prostitute, speculates, “what a blessing...must hereafter be in store for persons of such enlarged minds, who...has the generosity of sentiment to rescue a helpless and unfortunate female, forsaken of all the world” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 63-64). Dodd is intentionally vague about how these generous-minded people will be rewarded, presumably to allow for emotional, spiritual, and economic rewards.

way to make her philanthropy self-sustaining.¹⁰³ This link between charity and commerce, what Sarah Lloyd calls “philanthropic commerce management,” also appears in the Magdalen Hospital’s operational structure as efforts to sell products made by the penitents and in its governance, where merchants dominated the institution’s board (Lloyd, “Pleasures” 56). Dodd presents the commercial efforts of the governors as part of fulfilling their charitable duty, similar to Mrs. Steven taking in boarders so she can help the needy. Finally, in the novel, even Lucy, in her degenerate state, exhibits a spark of charity when she offers Caroline a warning against Dookalb and gives her money to facilitate her escape. Lucy puts the needs of another ahead of her own desires when she expresses happiness in the certainty that “Caroline was safe, though I was lost” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.96). Despite her moral shortcomings, Lucy performs a service to God and society when she helps her sister. In each of these examples, charity takes a form (be it modest or expansive) fitted to the reality of an individual’s or organization’s circumstances.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Charles H. Hinnant, in his essay “Gifts and Wages: The Structures of Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Fiction and Drama,” makes an important point about the distinctions made in fiction during this period between money given directly in exchange for an action, which was seen as payment for work, and money or objects given on the basis of someone’s need or character. The distinction is slippery at times, which is what Mrs. Steven shows. She would not receive financial help if she were not a good person helping others, but what makes her a good person is that she does things for others out of their, need not her own.

¹⁰⁴ Interestingly, the Magdalen fiction represents charity as overwhelmingly feminine, with charitable acts performed by Mrs. Hodson, Mrs. Stevens, and the nameless benefactress in *The Magdalen*. Catherine Keohane’s essay “Spare From Your Luxuries”: Women, Charity, and Spending in the Eighteenth Century” is an informative study of the gendered aspect of philanthropy that sheds some light on the types of assistances and advice the women in Dodd’s novel give. She notes that women were given two models of charity: consumerist and sacrificial. The first “posits consumption and charity as mutually exclusive forms of spending,” while the second encourages women to give up luxuries in order to contribute to charity. Mrs. Hodson is definitely a representation of the sacrificial model. She takes rooms in a humble home and dresses humbly. This makes sense given Dodd’s overall denigration of luxuries in *The Sisters*.

The novel’s feminization of charity is very different from the actual governance of the Hospital, however, which was overwhelmingly male. What is the rhetorical gain in feminizing charity? One answer might be that Dodd believed a model of feminine mentorship in which women give assistance and instruction was the only way to de-eroticize a group of women who were popularly represented as sexual and social predators.

The Magdalen Hospital is, in Dodd's view, the philanthropic ideal, harnessing the contributions of multiple people and leveraging that money into labor.

Importantly, the fictional philanthropists in the novels act out Dodd's certainty that genuine charity requires an emotional investment and a substantive intervention in the lives of the poor. Like other eighteenth-century philanthropists, Dodd believed charity "was an act of mercy performed as a result of morally refined sensitivity in the giver to the sight or knowledge of human suffering" (Roberts 70). His characters demonstrate their emotional connection to the circumstances of the poor with physical marks of distress, often tears stimulated by a "prostitute's monologue [which] was designed to move the feelings of those who listened, by stressing the pathos and emotions considered the appropriate stimuli of sentiment and of philanthropic generosity" (Lloyd, "Pleasure's" 59). In *The Sisters*, Caroline's story of near seduction, imprisonment, and physical abuse stands in for the prostitute's monologue. Mrs. Steven and Mrs. Hodson demonstrate "humanity and tender benevolence," and "a benevolent and honest heart" by crying when Caroline recounts her story (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.26; 2.127). The women encourage Caroline to repeat her story, analyzing her misery and theirs as an affirmation of God's grace. Mark Koch refers to this process as the "spectacle of suffering," in which the charitable find pleasure in the emotional pain of sympathy (484). Dodd's narrator, also overwhelmed by tender emotions, exclaims, "My tears almost prevent my pursuing the fatal story" (*Sisters* 1.15). He continues to tell the story of Caroline and Lucy despite the painful feelings it evokes, a process by which Dodd explores the contradictory emotions and experiences of pleasure and pain that charity engenders.

While tears can set the stage in terms of demonstrating a charitable state, genuine charity must nevertheless actively work to change the circumstances of the poor. Thus, Mrs. Hodson

publicly exhibits her Christian charity in her service to those around her, in particular by providing financial support to the poor. As the example of Emily in *The Magdalen* demonstrates, the intervention of charity can literally change lives. According to Dodd, this model mother and wife lived illicitly as “the property of one man, and sometimes the common prey of accidental lewdness, [and] at one time tricked up for sale by the mistress of a brothel” (*Magdalen* xi-xii). The financial support and the proper guidance of her unnamed benefactress enables Emily’s drastic change from whore to housewife. Emily’s experiences encapsulate the range of suffering experienced by the real penitents. More importantly, Dodd uses the benefactress to replicate the emotional and financial commitments needed in the real world of charity and evidenced in the Magdalen Hospital’s governors.¹⁰⁵

In his sermons, Dodd wields altruism as an effective defense against critics of the Magdalen Hospital governors’ work with prostitutes. First, he parallels the work of the governors with Jesus, who in his time on earth ministered to the marginalized and reviled whether they were thieves, prostitutes, lepers, or demon possessed. Dodd notes that in reaching out to the lowly, Jesus risked his reputation and ultimately his life, but in the process he saved humanity from damnation. Similarly, the governors faced ridicule from people who believed their actions were as futile and ridiculous as “a scheme to wash Ethiopians white” (*The Magdalen* iii) and scorn from others who believed rich men used the institution as a front to cultivate new mistresses.¹⁰⁶ In reminding his audience that Jesus and the governors both

¹⁰⁵ The Sunday chapel reflected the emotional connection and activism that Dodd advocated as essential to genuine charity. Sarah Lloyd notes that “Wilder flights of emotion prompted men and women to heap money into collection plates: the Magdalen’s ability to raise more in the chapel than through annual subscriptions...attests to the power of preaching that left aristocrats crying ‘from their souls’” (64).

¹⁰⁶ These accusations contradict Russell Nieli’s claim that the eighteenth century fully embraced the merchant as a symbol of social progress and economic strength. It did not help matters that some of Dodd’s contemporaries took a more cynical view of his pulpit orations, suggesting the scene mirrored an

selflessly work with prostitutes, Dodd refutes critics and implies that what the Hospital governors do is more admirable than other works of charity. In fact, Martha Koehler observes that Dodd's sermons "frequently refer to traces of divinity in the institution's stockholders" (273).

Dodd also frames the work of the Hospital as a work of national security by calling on what historian J. M. Beattie calls the "slippery slope of damnation" (51). According to Dodd, those who genuinely love God have no choice but to help others, and disregarding this moral imperative means punishment (Archer 229). Failing to compel sinners to salvation will result in sinners overrunning the saved to the point of God expressing his disfavor with England in the form of diseases, droughts, and even military defeats. The purpose "of this charity," Dodd says, "is only to do good, and to render an important service to religion and... country" ("Sermon Before the President" ii). Dodd's explanation of spiritual punishment registered with a society that believed it was on the brink of both spiritual and economic crisis.¹⁰⁷ He gives the eighteenth-century public a manageable solution, charity, to resolve the problem of God's wrath. In helping sinners, the Magdalen Hospital's governors fulfill the fundamental requirement of charity to put the greater good before individual concerns.

earthly desires rather than spiritual impulses. For instance, Horace Walpole sarcastically describes Dodd's preaching as a "pleasing performance" where he "harangued entirely in the French style...very eloquently and touchingly." He also describes the governors marching into the chapel in a clearly ritualistic manner. What interests, or more accurately, amuses Walpole is the fact the "wands of the governors are white, but twisted at the top with black and white, which put [him] in mind of Jacob's rod, that he placed before the cattle [sic] to make them breed." Walpole's response evidences how prostitutes' sexual transgression became a part of the spectacle in Dodd's sermons.

¹⁰⁷ In his 1786 sermon to the Magdalen governors, John Butler instructs his audience to "restore such an one in the spirit, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (xi). This fear of spiritual reprisal connects all of the literature in this dissertation. For example, Chapter One's examination of the Society for the Reformation of Manners shows how they combined spiritual and economic crisis. In Chapter Two, Fielding represents spiritual reward and punishment in Squire Allworthy, his sister Miss Bridget, his ward Tom Jones, and his nephew, and a number of minor characters. Finally, in his writing for the Marine Society, discussed in Chapter Four, Jonas Hanway emphasizes a religious education for the poor to impress on them a fear of temptation and the need for obedience in the face of God's punishment.

Dodd creates a cast of characters in his novels that are antithetical to charity—a narrative inversion that highlights the fundamental and, in his opinion, worryingly obfuscated differences between false and genuine charity. As Dookalb shows in *The Sisters*, many mimic the language of true charity with ease. He presents a false identity, that of a selfless, loving person, to the Sansons, declaring that, “I have not a greater satisfaction than the doing good to any of my fellow-creatures” (1.7). Dookalb persuasively claims altruistic motivations for helping his relatives and forges a bond of trust that ultimately destroys Lucy’s and her father’s lives. The contradictions between Dookalb’s actions and his words support Dodd’s insistence that genuine charity requires active participation to prevent tragedies like Lucy’s prostitution and death.¹⁰⁸ Genuine charity is a “light-house for the benefit of future mariners” to help them avoid the “many shelves and quicksands in that dangerous ocean, wherein she is embark’d” (iv). In other words, real charity endeavors to keep recipients from physical, emotional, and spiritual harm. In contrast, false charity steers the needy into an avaricious world of liars, cheaters, adulterers, and murderers. Ultimately, false charity, motivated by self-interest, is never benign. In *The Magdalen*, the Marklands’ housekeeper is motivated by self-interest and positions herself as a maternal substitute for the newly-orphaned Emily. As the novel’s narrator notes, the housekeeper ingratiate herself with the master’s son and profits from his interest in Emily because her “first attachment was to her own interest” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 18). In addition to copying the language of genuine charity, Dodd worries that false charity can mimic the superficial performative elements of real charity. For instance, in *The Sisters*, Charlotte plays benevolent lady of the manor by giving small sums of money to the poor who beg for alms,

¹⁰⁸ Dodd really goes to narrative extremes to show how monstrous Dookalb is. In the closing chapter when it is revealed he killed one of his girls by cutting her throat, chopping up her body, and disposing of it piece by piece. This, I believe, serves to highlight the victimization of young girls. After being preyed on for sex, the young girl comes to a painful and ignominious end. She is literal a bunch of body parts.

assured that “charity covereth a multitude of sins” (1.165). However, in an echo of Bernard Mandeville’s notorious diatribe against charity and Fielding’s fictional Miss Bridget, Dodd warns readers that Charlotte’s actions are “a design calculated to feed her vanity only” (*Sisters* 1.165). A clue that Charlotte has the wrong motives is the fact that she ignores deserving petitioners who recognize the error of their sins in favor of those who praise her beauty and riches. Here Dodd assumes that genuine charity comes with the ability to discern real need, to sort the deserving from the underserving poor. Dodd’s focus on defining the deserving poor is consistent with eighteenth-century philanthropic concerns and the language of the poor laws.

In case the contrast between genuine and false charity remains unclear, Dodd inscribes false charity on his character’s bodies. For instance, in *The Sisters*, a bawd named Mrs. Searchwell pretends to be a friend to Lucy and Caroline several times in the novel. When Caroline becomes distraught over the idea of losing her virginity outside of the sanctity of marriage, Mrs. Searchwell offers comfort and advice. However, when Caroline refuses to comply with Dookalb’s demands, Mrs. Searchwell reveals her true nature. Caroline sees the bawd with a “face [that] glowed with the deep red of the ruby...[and] eyes [that] flashed with fury and indignation as into the room she waddled, grumbling, and frowning” (1.67). Her entire body, ruddy-skinned and corpulent, embodies negative, selfish emotions that cannot coexist with genuine charity. Adding to the terrible scene, according to the narrator, is the way she walks into the room, “in one hand...a glass, in the other a bottle” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.67). The bottle of gin or some other strong liquor links her with the images of greedy and dissolute poverty presented in works like William Hogarth’s *Gin Lane*. The narrator’s subsequent revelation of Mrs. Searchwell’s collusion with Dookalb in the deaths of several young women confirms the divide

between genuine charity, which aims to preserve humanity, and false charity, which willingly sacrifices lives.

In another scene from *The Sisters*, Dodd introduces a different, but equally troubling, picture of false charity that equates false charity with physical grotesqueness and suggests that only Christians practice genuine charity.¹⁰⁹ In an attempted rape scene, rife with anti-Semitic sentiment, Dookalb sells Caroline to a Jewish client who is “ready to defile and destroy a Christian virgin” (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.24). The inclusion of this Jewish character, which might seem like a random narrative detail, actually plays an important part in Dodd’s understanding of charity as distinctly Christian. The client first attempts to ingratiate himself with Caroline by presenting his advances as an act of kindness. However, his “black shining eyes [that] rolled with greedy rapture” belie this compassionate façade (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.25). Like Mrs. Searchwell, the Jewish man’s eyes reveal his true nature and vile intentions. Dodd transforms the eighteenth-century stereotype of the economically voracious Jew into the sexually rapacious Jew. In response to this horrific picture, Caroline throws “herself upon the floor, weeping and groaning in a manner that would have affected any heart but those of a bawd and a Jew” (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.56). The narrator leaves nothing to chance, using descriptive details and interjections to impress on readers the horrors a young woman experiences in a world lacking charity. His fictional dystopia, bereft of charity, propitiously frames the work of the Magdalen Hospital.

The dissemination of what Dodd deems the proper social values and order informs the fundamental divide between genuine and false charity in his novels. Characters like Mrs.

¹⁰⁹ Those who are not Christian, Dodd says, are apt to display capricious and vicious acts and an unforgiving nature. As Dodd explains, “let every religion, which pretends to divine revelation, be examined ...and they will be found wanting: offensive to the best reason, and inadequate to the most pressing exigency of human nature” (“Sermon Before Prince Edward” 33-34). In contrast to Dodd’s polarized image of charity, Jonas Hanway shows that a range of cultures and religions are more or less charitable. Chapter Four points out that, in his narrative, Britons are by nature the most charitable.

Searchwell and Dookalb in the *Sisters* model and encourage bad behaviors; they question the religious and social value of the institution of marriage and revel in a world in which the chaos of human impulses reigns. Their sinful indulgences destroy the bonds between parents and children, husbands and wives, proving false Mandeville's claim that private vice produces public virtue. In contrast, Mrs. Hodson and Mrs. Stevens uphold order and discipline in an effort to heal the spiritual wounds of the world. In Hanway's words, genuine charity "arrests the progress of ...diseases in the body natural and the politic" (35). Dodd's and Hanway's vision of charity "subscribes to the idea that individuals can be refined and implicitly reformed by their engagement with cultural institutions," which include religion, family, and marriage (Peace 151). The genuinely charitable must follow the rules of these institutions even when they constrain people from being of greater assistance to others. Consequently, in *The Magdalen*, the bonds of matrimony trump familial ties. Emily's sister, confronted by the conflicting desire to be a good wife and help Emily, must choose her marriage, linking "virtue and domestic affection and family" (Lloyd, "Pleasure's" 67).¹¹⁰ In the end, the sister's patience in the face of her husband's unyielding nature and Emily's sexual foibles ensure the happy reconciliation of all parties. The sister's dedication serves as an important model for Emily to follow as she transitions back into the real world after her stay in the Magdalen Hospital. Emily's subsequent transformation from harlot to wife also operates as an effective critique of her brother-in-law's rejection, which is grounded in an unwillingness to consider alternative ways that she can still be of value to her

¹¹⁰ After she gives birth to an illegitimate son, Emily is kicked out of the luxurious house she was kept in as a mistress. She goes to her sister for help, but is rejected because of her fallen state. This is not Emily's sister's choice, a fact made clear by a servant who follows Emily back to her hovel. The sister sends the servant with an apology and a few pounds. The conversation between the servant and Emily makes it clear that Emily's brother-in-law, not her sister, made the decision to social repudiate her and refuse any financial help.

family and society (Batchelor 3).¹¹¹ The happy conclusion of *The Magdalen* proposes, “The act of selling sex out of extreme poverty did not define a woman as irredeemable” (Binhammer, “The Whore’s Love” 513). In place of chastity, a genuine appreciation for and commitment to work defines women. Conveniently, Dodd’s literary representations of charity reinforce the social order by teaching poor women to accept their economic and social contingency as part of God’s will.

In his writing, Dodd links false charity and casual charity together as part of a causal chain that partially absolves those deemed worthy of charity of blame for their sins. While undoubtedly preferable to false charity, Dodd’s novels express the same concerns about individual acts of charity as Mandeville and Fielding, noting, the “consequences of misdirected charity were quite serious and included the impoverishment of the country and the perpetuation of poverty” (Keohane 41). He fictionalizes this worry in Emily’s experiences on the street after her lover’s abandonment. Lacking money or special skills, Emily must depend on casual charity, by which she means begging. People react with mistrust when she begs for employment and

¹¹¹ The novel’s narrator makes it clear that Emily’s sister makes the right decision even if it makes her unhappy and leaves Emily in uncertainty for a bit longer. She must uphold matrimonial law if she is to properly facilitate her sister’s transition back into the legitimate order. According to Jenny Batchelor, between Emily and her sister, “the plight of the virtuous industrious sister and that of the fallen Emily are revealed to be painfully similar despite the very different worlds the women inhabit. In highlighting how both siblings are dependent on the goodwill of a man, women’s economic dependence upon men is exposed as the common denominator of female experience within the novel” (161). Mona Scheuermann explores the economic vulnerability of married and unmarried women in “Women and Money in Eighteenth-Century Fiction” (1987). Lawrence Stone’s *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (1977) and Randolph Trumbach’s *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family* (1978) argue that the eighteenth century saw the decline of patriarchy and the development of the companionate marriage and the modern nuclear family. Anthony Fletcher’s *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500-1800* (1996) argues that patriarchy came under pressure due to the secularization of identity. Susan Moller-Okin’s “Patriarchy and Married Women’s Property in England: Questions on Some Current Views” challenges some of the more speculative claims made by Stone and Trumbach, particularly about the decline of patriarchy. More recently, Chris Roulston’s *Narrating Marriage in Eighteenth Century England and France* (2010) takes a comparative approach to examining the eighteenth-century literary representation of marriage. He shows that marriage was a vexed concept.

with disdain when she outright asks for money.¹¹² Occasionally someone does give her money, but “these small and uncertain benefactions would not preserve two persons alive, though used in the most sparing manner” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 70). Because the money she gets is inadequate and inconsistent, when a man comes along and offers her five shillings in exchange for sex, she accepts his offers. In the end, Emily falls back into the very situation she fought to escape, leading Katherine Binhammer to conclude that “prostitution is her only choice and thus, no choice at all” (59). Upon completion of the transaction, Emily goes home and feeds her son with her ill-gotten gains. She reluctantly confesses, “My recompense was great in seeing the dear babe, almost at the gates of death, revive as he ate, and the smiles of joy, by degrees take the place of the anguish which the pains of hunger had imprinted on his lovely face” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 70). Laura Rosenthal notes the pathos of this scene, which contrasts the baby starving on charity and thriving on vice. This vivid picture implicates casual charity in the devastating cycle of exploitation and neglect poor women experienced, barring “any clear determination of moral guilt” (Binhammer, “The Whore’s Love” 519).¹¹³ Dodd rejects the idea that prostitutes

¹¹² Her difficulty lies in the fact that begging, in the context of eighteenth-century culture, was closely associated with thievery and prostitution (Hitchcock). An additional problem is that Emily does not entirely understand the audience for which she is performing. She dresses up in upscale neighborhoods and down in general areas. Tim Hitchcock explains this performative element as part of the “self-presentation deployed by beggars” to which the charitable responded as part of the “moral economy” (Begging in the Streets 483). Emily does not understand the rules, contrasting with other beggars, who push her out of the area and who have a system and a better grasp of the performative elements of begging. Catherine Keohane discusses the issue of dress and begging in “‘Too Neat for a Beggar’: Charity and Debt in Burney’s *Cecilia*.” It is interesting that Dodd chooses begging as his example of casual charity. It was technically an illegal act punishable by whipping, imprisonment, or forced labor. Nevertheless, social attitudes towards begging were contradictory, because, while it was illegal, begging was haphazardly punished and generally encouraged by parishes who felt the burden of poor taxes (Hitchcock 479). See also Tony Henderson, *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London: Prostitution and Control in the Metropolis, 1730-1830*.

¹¹³ Ian Bell argues that a “move away from the emphasis on ‘sin’ as an explanation for the vast numbers of whores on the London streets towards an attempt to deal with the problem socially can be seen in the development of literature of individual philanthropy in the periodical essay and early novel” (124). Dodd’s novel does dwell on sin and forgiveness, but balances this by spreading the blame. The first sin

can give consent and highlights the need for a better system to help those worthy of charity. At the same time, his *Histories* emphasizes the voluntary structure of the Magdalen Hospital, which ignores the limited choices recipients faced before entering its doors.

The conclusion readers were to draw from Dodd's representations of charity, poverty, and prostitution was that the Magdalen Hospital had the infrastructure and resources to give consistent and correct assistance to the deserving poor. As historian Alannah Tomkins notes, "Advocates of indiscriminate giving were rare, because it was increasingly argued that such casual alms encouraged fecklessness by failing to discriminate between 'genuine' objects of charity and the idle" (Tomkins 79). When someone gave out a few shilling on the street, there was no way to ensure recipients properly used the money. In contrast, institutions could appropriately direct charity through regulation (Keohane 41). Caroline's experience with charity mimics the ideal institutional model of charity. First, charities like the Magdalen Hospital instituted application processes in order to eliminate the possibility of fraud. This was important since "the act was to benefit society as well as the distressed recipient, the donor also had a duty—the duty to ensure that the gift was properly bestowed and applied" (Roberts 70). Charity petitioners underwent a comprehensive vetting process to ensure they needed and deserved assistance.¹¹⁴ This process also proved the trustworthiness of the charity. Thus, when Caroline applies for assistance, her nurse vouches for the fact that she genuinely needs assistance and that

belongs to someone other than the prostitute, whether it is a mother, father, bawd, pimp, or predatory male.

¹¹⁴ Eligible applicants were under thirty years old and were not pregnant, diseased, or formerly admitted and dismissed. They filled out a form with general information, including name, age, parish, and county of birth. As part of the application process, they also needed to acknowledge their sins and promise to follow the rules, and undergo a physical exam. This information was submitted to a committee who decided admittance by popular vote. This relatively lengthy process was done in hopes of weeding out people who would be charity failures. The struggle to identify worthy poor when dealing with beggars and prostitutes occupies many eighteenth-century writers, including Richard Steele, Henry Fielding, Daniel Defoe, John Gay, Samuel Johnson, William Hogarth, Jonathan Swift, James Boswell, and Tobias Smollett.

Mrs. Stevens possesses good intentions. Second, a board of governors ensured a consistent flow of financial support to the Magdalen Hospital. Likewise, in the novel, Mrs. Hodson gives financial aid to Mrs. Stevens, who handles the basic operations. Finally and most importantly, the Magdalen Hospital educated the women in religious and social matters. Similarly, Mrs. Hodson gives advice to Caroline on correct Christian thought and behavior. Dodd concludes that the crowds of women and young girls desperately resorting to the most demeaning acts to earn a few coins are victims of false charity and that the Magdalen Hospital's governors serve both God and England by addressing their needs by creating a formal institution of charity.

Proper Objects of Charity

In his novels, Dodd narrates the “inside story” of female victimization, which he says stems from the influences “of a corrupt world” (Peace 143) and positions charitable people as teachers who can effectively mold the minds and redirect the emotions of prostitutes. In order to prove prostitutes are proper objects of charity, Dodd confronts their association “with disease, crime, and public disorder, immorality and the erosion of family life and religious belief” (Simpson 50).¹¹⁵ Dodd accepts the validity of eighteenth-century concerns about material consumption in

¹¹⁵ According to some “The whore’s body was...marked as dangerous; it led men astray, spread contagion and was both socially and morally liminal” (Lloyd, “Pleasures” 65). For instance, *Satan’s Harvest Home* describes prostitutes as predatory animals ready to pounce on any male who looks their way. The author warns unwary men and innocent wives that these women’s “tricks and devices are numberless, and not to be paralleled by anything but their ingratitude and inhumanity” (*Satan’s Harvest Home* 24). This warning reiterates a common concern that prostitutes harmed the fabric of English society by destroying the family, tearing husband from wife, and taking money from the mouths of children. People warned of the dangers with “stories of prostitutes luring men into dark lanes where they were attacked and robbed by their bullies” (Beattie 91). In addition, much of the literature attributes subhuman traits to prostitutes, frequently comparing them to vermin and other animals. *The Constables Hue and Cry after Whores and Bawds* (1701) claims “whors flesh... [is] more plentiful than swine’s flesh” (2). All of these statements draw on “deeply rooted patriarchal anxiety about the irresistible sexual power and danger of women” (Beattie 64). Even when they are not depicted as monstrous creatures, as Scarlett Bowen notes, “Women are often depicted as driven by desires for material gain” (264). In much of eighteenth-century fiction, economic motivations render prostitutes unsympathetic to readers; however, Mary Peace observes the

his construction of the fictional prostitute Charlotte Repook, who throws diamonds in lakes on a selfish whim and eats a money sandwich (*The Sisters* 1.36).¹¹⁶ But the fact that Charlotte was once a young girl sold into prostitution by her own parents mitigates her moments of material excess and guides readers to conclude that Charlotte is a product of learned behavior. Dodd contributed to the Hospital's mission by employing narrative strategies that questioned the idea that women had choices, could freely give consent, and be agents in their own concerns.¹¹⁷ His narration of victimization rests on an essentialized understanding of gender in which women's intellectual weakness and emotional impulsiveness create social paragons or pariahs. In his identification of the people and cultural products that negatively influence the malleable minds of young girls, Dodd proves the girls are worthy of forgiveness and capable of change.¹¹⁸

sentimental narrative of Magdalen literature recasts economic motivations as a necessity, not an indulgence, in order to produce sympathy for the women's sexual transgressions.

¹¹⁶ Dodd repeatedly draws on images from William Hogarth's *The Harlot's Progress* in his descriptions of Charlotte and other prostitutes. In one scene in the novel that highlights her selfishness, Charlotte expresses her dissatisfaction with what she has been paid for her services by kicking "down, with her angry foot, the whole tea-table...and [throwing] at his head the paltry settlement he had made her" (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.36). This mimics scene two of *The Harlot's Progress*, which Dan Cruikshank succinctly summarizes: "The cosmetics that lie around suggest the artificial nature of Moll's life: she is dressed in an ostentatious and affected manner; a mask on the table reveals that she has recently been to a masquerade" (9). In addition, "She's kicking over a table, perhaps through high spirits or because she's drunk, but more likely to distract her 'keeper'—in the background a lover is being shown out of the room by Moll's discrete maid" (9).

¹¹⁷ Katherine Binhammer disagrees with the conclusion of many scholars that Magdalen literature represents a conservative force, which disempowers women. However, her conclusions that the literature imagines and validates the concept of the women's sexual desire as love are based on a broader history of the Hospital than this chapter covers. Binhammer looks at the development of the institution from the 1750s to the 1790s, during which time the focus shifted from trying to rehabilitate prostitutes across a range of classes to rescuing seduced women of the middling class.

¹¹⁸ According to Randolph Trumbach, the Magdalen Hospital's "committee took the point of view that a woman with relations or friends to care for her would never become a prostitute" (198). But as Dodd shows, plenty of parents fail to do their job, usually out of ignorance. His criticism of parents corresponds with the sentiments of at least one of the Magdalen Hospital's governors. Hanway warns that "If parents...are remiss in their duty, the morality of the people will as surely be deficient" ("Defects" 4). According to Ian Bell, "At this transitional stage, there remained a number of contending theories about ...whether blame should be transferred from the whores themselves to their procuresses or to their clients" (Bell 127). Dodd distributes blame across all of these groups, but a greater share of the blame

Foremost, Dodd accuses parents of inculcating the wrong values, especially avarice, in their children, which leaves them vulnerable to the showy façade of the prostitute's life. In *The Sisters*, the narrator claims that "the only means to revive true virtue in this land" is an "early care of the minds of youth, and diligently training them up in the paths of religion; a duty greatly neglected even by parents themselves" (x). Using narrative interjections such as this, Dodd insists that many parents are bad teachers, skewing the values of their children and wreaking havoc on the social order. The Sansons fail because contradictions abound in their parental instruction. In their moral education, Lucy and Caroline "hear the dictates, and listen to the lure of virtue"; however, the parents' "chimerical notions of grandeur, and coaches, titles, honour, diamonds, and brocades" undermine these important lessons (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.60; 1.3). Instead of satisfaction with their modest situation, Mr. and Mrs. Sanson obsess over the glories and virtues of their noble ancestors.¹¹⁹ Accordingly, images of "the little envious folks staring and gaping at their chariots and footmen" dazzle Lucy and Caroline (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.9). Ann Campbell's analysis of the novel concludes that these images of "carnality and frivolity...establish" women "as agents rather than the victim of their impending ruin" (135). Yet Dodd spends much of his time addressing the parents and their role in their children's misery. Dodd condemns the fantasies about material wealth that overwhelm parental instincts and set in motion the series of events that lead to one daughter's death.¹²⁰ The parents also model contradictory values about

goes to the clients. He also adds several other groups who are outside of the sexual transaction but who he believes put women in the position of being objects for consumption.

¹¹⁹ The Sansons were of the lowest rank of gentry, a step above the middling. From details in the novel, it seems that the mother married down. They are distantly related to higher-ranking landed families, but they do not have money or land. Dodd says Mrs. Sanson's finances were "very small, and his children yearly increasing" (*The Sisters* 1.2).

¹²⁰ The fact that Campbell bases her entire reading of the novel on Lucy's death and Dodd's references to *The Harlot's Progress* produces a very limited interpretation of the text. There are also multiple references to Richardson, Fielding, Shakespeare, Milton, and more plays than I can possibly list here.

virtue and labor, which influence the girls' actions. On the one hand, "their mother... [is] a thorough good and faithful wife, and from her example they... [saw] nothing to encourage wantonness and guilt" (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.60). On the other hand, Mr. Sanson refuses to direct his daughters to "those branches of business, by which an industrious young woman may support herself with credit" (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.3). The Sansons resist giving their daughters a practical education and instead reinforce the girls' materialistic approach to the world. Given the Magdalen Hospital's emphasis on labor as a critical marker of social value, the Sansons' inaction is at best benign neglect of their children's futures and at worst a threat to the very structure of eighteenth-century society.

Additionally, blinded by avarice, the parents in Dodd's novels fail to protect their innocent daughters, instead deliberately or accidentally placing them in the hands of people who exploit and corrupt them. While he does consider, like many eighteenth-century writers, the corrupt influences of "the iniquities of London," Dodd is more concerned with "the necessity of parental protection of daughters" (Campbell 134).¹²¹ In *The Sisters*, Lucy and Caroline, armed with "trinkets, caps, laces, and finery" (1.16) tragically set off for London, only to find themselves trapped by Dookalb, a London pimp. The elder Sansons fail to serve as active guides; and ultimately their neglect puts Caroline and Lucy in Dookalb's power. Dodd warns his readers against putting their daughters in the hands of strangers. He says, "unhappy parents!—

The intertextual complexity of the novel highlights the different genre conventions and social theories informing Dodd's narration and writing style.

¹²¹ Many saw London as a corrupt space, and the number of women and men prosecuted for criminal offenses, which was decidedly higher in the city than the surrounding countryside, did nothing to dispel this anxiety (Beattie). In his history of women and crime, John Beattie attributes the higher number of women prosecuted for offenses in London to the facts that an urban setting allowed for a greater number of social freedoms for women and that the communal forces exerted on the rural woman limited their actions (Beattie 99). Also, in the city of London there was a greater demand for labor of every kind, which meant women's direct participation in the economic system was much broader than elsewhere and that many lived lives of marginal subsistence (Beattie 100).

miserable children! You are binding wreaths of flowrets, you are decking with triumphant garland, and with all the pomp of sacrifice, harmless lambs, destined speedily to fall victims; destined speedily to be led through the temples of ruin, and to bleed on the altars of iniquity” (*Sisters* 1.16). This melodramatic scolding frames the path to prostitution as a perverted parody of marriage, in which parents participate. In London, Lucy and Caroline follow the example of their parents in trusting Dookalb. Because they lack proper instruction, Lucy is undone “most of all by her absolute confidence on her cousin Dookalb”; and Caroline is made vulnerable due to her that he is “one of the best of men” and “there [is] no deceit in him” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.54; 1.60-61). Instead of passing their daughters on to the protection of husbands, the Sansons tragically leave the girls in the hands of predatory strangers.

An embedded narrative within Lucy’s and Caroline’s story echoes their parents’ misplaced trust and forecasts their fate. The girls meet a woman who explains that she intends to visit her daughter, who is locked up in a madhouse. The strange woman recounts how she made the mistake of allowing her daughter to travel to London in the company of a distant relative who allowed the young girl to do things she would not have permitted. Among the unauthorized activities is a trip to a masquerade where she is kidnapped, taken to a brothel, and raped (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.23).¹²² The mother suffers unimaginable agony upon realizing her complicity in her daughter’s moral and mental demise. The conclusion of the novel, when Lucy’s and Caroline’s parents realize “the folly of their past lives, the madness of their vain and destructive pride” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.176), mirrors this scene of guilt and sorrow. The different but equally tragic

¹²² On masquerades, see Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization: The Carnavalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*; Sophie Carter, “‘Tis’ Female Proteus’: Representing Prostitution and Masquerade in Eighteenth-Century English Popular Print Culture” (1999); and Catherine Craft-Fairchild, *Masquerade and Gender: Disguise and Female Identity in Eighteenth-Century Fictions by Women* (1993).

fates of the stranger's daughter and Lucy serve as a lesson to readers on the duty of parents and the dangers public, and particularly urban, spaces hold for young women.

Dodd also criticizes the upper ranks—masters and mistresses who exacerbate the problem of prostitution by failing to teach and protect the young girls in their service.¹²³ He adopts the ubiquitous eighteenth-century assumption that in the absence of parents (generally due to death), masters or mistresses are supposed to function as a parental anchor, providing moral and social guidance. In *The First Magdalen*, Emily's mistress scolds her for reading the Bible. The mistress throws the book down, saying, "The girl will turn her head. I never knew a puritanical servant, who did not turn out a whore or a thief" (Dodd, *Magdalen* 21). Mrs. Markland's actions are of particular significance because "a wife as mistress of her household played a crucial role in the lives of young domestic servants" (Evans 161). Instead of encouraging the young girl on a virtuous path, with the Bible as a source of direction, Emily observes her mistress "winking at the intrigues of...servants, and speaking lightly of religion and virtue" (Dodd, *Magdalen* 20). Emily describes her feelings of confusion over her mistress's directives because they contradict the values her parent taught her. Adding to her mental distress is the Marklands' son, who takes "every opportunity of finding [Emily] alone" (Dodd, *Magdalen* 20). Her situation echoes the concerns of "most contemporary conduct and advice literature on service [that] suggested that female servants were constantly at risk from sexual ruin at the hands of their masters and other men in the household" (Evans 161). Emily initially reacts with fright, because her parents taught her to value her Christian faith and chastity. A lack of proper

¹²³ J. Jean Hecht's *The Domestic Servant Class in Eighteenth-Century England* (1956) is widely noted as the first detailed account of the lives of servants and how they defined the aristocracy and merchant classes. More recently, the relationship between masters and servants in the eighteenth century is analyzed in Kristina Straub's *Domestic Affairs: Intimacy, Eroticism, and Violence between Servants and Masters in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (2008), which incorporates servants into the eighteenth-century family matrix.

conversation, examples, and supervision erodes her moral outrage. Here, Dodd uses Emily's situation to respond to upper-class complaints about the quality of servants. Dodd, like Henry Fielding and others, points the finger at the upper class as the source of their own problem.¹²⁴ They fail in their duty to the poor and to instruct through example. In Emily's case, only thorough immersion in the proper moral and social models can reverse the effects. Additionally, Dodd uses Emily's vulnerability and exploitation to show eighteenth-century readers and would-be philanthropists that it is uncharitable and shortsighted financially to ignore and abuse a group that can serve society faithfully and usefully if properly rehabilitated.

Dodd's fictionalized representations of women's victimization also heap blame on men who conflate love and sex to seduce women into prostitution. He shows that the prostitute's "innocence was transparent in proportion to the deviousness of the men out to deflower her" (Lloyd, "Pleasure's" 65). "What maiden," asks the narrator of *The Sisters*, "can withstand the torrent of impetuous desires; or how, when strong passion so pressingly pleads, can feeble woman resist" (1.26). Dodd encourages readers to balance judgment of sinners with sympathy for women's lack of control over their circumstances (Grant 102).¹²⁵ In both of his novels, men take advantage of women's ignorance of ecclesiastical and secular law. Accordingly, Dookalb

¹²⁴ Fielding argues that the rich encourage the poor's bad habits, including an attraction to luxury, gambling, and drinking. On the other hand, Hanway takes a more measured perspective, more than likely to ensure he didn't insult any powerful supporters. He describes England as a country where both the upper and lower classes have somewhat lost their way. In *A Journal of Eight Days*, he says the rich have forgotten their job to provide moral guidance to the poor, which has resulted in the high number of idle and criminal poor.

¹²⁵ Ann Campbell, in her article "Magdalen or Harlot?: Satire, Sentiment, and the Fallen Woman in William Dodd's *The Sisters*," repeatedly talks about Lucy as a lesson about the problems of female agency. This is a misleading term to describe her situation. Lucy goes from one keeper to the next, and Dodd shows that she is at times duped into believing she has freedom to choose, but there is generally someone manipulating the situation or limiting the options she can choose from. In addition, Campbell's interpretation of Hogarth's prints as a wholesale condemnation of prostitutes, condemning them to death, is not one I agree with. I concur with Charlotte Grant that Hogarth makes "a moral case, that such low characters and their economic circumstances were worthy of notice and concern" (100).

tries to convince Lucy and Caroline that marriage in a church is simply a legal measure: “if a man and woman of honour mutually pledge their troth to each other, and live together faithfully, where is the difference in the sight of God” (Dodd, *The Sisters* 1.29). Dookalb persuasively emphasizes the words honor and faith, concepts that the girls do understand, in order to gain their trust and agreement. Realizing that women need the language of matrimony, he reassures Lucy that “you are to be his wife in private... [to] enjoy all blessings this earth can afford, and only for a little while to submit to secrecy” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.43). In Dodd’s other novel, Emily Markland also falls victim to this deceptive rhetoric, as her master’s son refers to her as “the woman who in all eyes, but those of the priest must be looked upon as his wife” (*Magdalen* 29). Here, Dodd references the problem of secret marriages, to which Parliament responded with the Marriage Act of 1753.¹²⁶ To underscore the extent to which Lucy believes these lies, Dodd describes the scene of her deflowering in terms that emphasize her innocence and the captain’s guile. Lucy welcomes Captain Smith with “panting bosom...which heaved up and down with wild and wishing throbs, tears of pleasure...overflowing her artless eyes” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.44). After their reunion and dinner, Lucy, “covered over with blushes retire[s] into the next room, destined for love and her undoing” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.45). The scene mimics a wedding night, with the virginal bride overcome with emotion, preparing herself for her husband. As far as Lucy knows, this is her wedding night, and she responds “like something enchanted and lost in

¹²⁶ In the eighteenth century, “London developed the widest range of opportunities for clandestine marriages as they came to replace marriages formalized through private contract or betrothal” (Evans 47). Tanya Evans notes that people chose clandestine marriages for a number of reasons, including to save the expense of posting the banns, duties, and the celebration; for others, they “allowed them some flexibility in future relationships” (Evans 48). She says, “The uncertainty that surrounded marriage during this period provided a fertile subject for eighteenth-century ballads and chapbooks and more often than not described how it was women rather than men who bore the consequences of these fluid relationships” (Evans 48). The Marriage Act tried to tackle this problem by requiring those who wanted to marry to get their fathers’ consent, post banns or get an special license, and marry in a church. For analysis of the problem of secret marriages after the Marriage Act of 1752, see Binhammer, “The Whore’s Love” and Eve Tavor-Bannet, “The Marriage Act of 1753: ‘A Most Cruel Law for the Fair Sex.’”

an amazing dream...she knew not what to think of being so soon made a wife” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.44). As Sarah Lloyd observes, the fact that the women are seduced by mental coercion, “was crucial in forging the link between prostitutes’ worthiness and compassion” (61). Dodd guides the reader to feel sympathy for Lucy, to view her as a victim of verbal and sensual manipulations that she does not have the skills to withstand given her background and nature.

Of all the people criticized in the novels, Dodd reserves the most vitriol for men, because he believes they are directly responsible for the physical suffering women experience.¹²⁷ In *The Magdalen*, Emily notes that many women are “abandoned by the cruel hands of obdurate parents on the commission of the first offence, though drawn thereto by designing artifice, and under the most faithful promise of marriage” (80). Emily articulates Dodd’s belief that while parents frequently serve as unwitting accomplices and blind disciplinarians due to their avarice, men actively and deliberately use deception to corrupt innocence.

Like other eighteenth-century philanthropic writers, Dodd represents men “as the more libidinous sex, the more dangerous” (Dabhiowala 213) in order to support a narrative of

¹²⁷ In the novel, men of every rank, profession, and age victimize women. Their fathers reject them, young men looking for adventure seduce them, and old men jaded with life use them. Dodd’s novel and other writings cut a wide swath through the male population to prove their guilt. The predators are men with titles, little money, and owners of small businesses. Dodd makes it clear that men above all are to blame for each woman’s sin, suffering, and/or death. Thus, while there is a bawd in the story, she follows the lead of Dookalb, and shows signs of repentance before her death. Dodd was not alone in sympathetic representations of prostitutes that blamed men. For example, in *The Spectator* (1712) Richard Steele “blamed the immorality of the age not on whores but on those men who, given to the ‘villainy of the practice of deluding women’, entice ‘little raw unthinking girls, and leave them after possession of them without any mercy to shame, infamy, poverty and disease’” (Cruikshank 37).

Just as frequently, men were relieved of blame. Sophie Carter argues that most eighteenth-century narratives “exonerate its male audience from any significant responsibility for urban prostitution” (“‘This Female Proteus’” 72). Richardson and other novelists “absolve men of their responsibility for the sexual exploitation of young women by shifting the blame to the female bawd” (Bowen 276). For more on this shift in blame, see Ian Bell, *Literature and Crime in Augustan England*; and Jennine Hurl-Eamon, “Policing Male Heterosexuality: The Reformation of Manners Societies Campaign against the Brothels in Westminster, 1690-1720.”

victimization for the prostitute. He implies that men pose a physical threat to women that goes beyond lost virginity. In a very graphic scene in *The Sisters*, two men force Lucy to strip naked and “submit to the hellish purposes of either” (1.204). After hours of “fun”, the men demand “the perpetration of something too black to be named, too diabolical to be mentioned,” and when Lucy refuses, they burn her with hot pokers (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.204). As Katherine Binhammer notes, these details make the “novel prurient, bordering on pornographic. Clearly [Dodd] went too far and he learns to correct this mistakes in his later publications” (Binhammer 67). Despite the narrative misjudgment, Dodd posits an important claim that Lucy, the injured party in this sadistic scene, stands in for all the prostitutes that Dodd insists are forced into the life.¹²⁸ Lucy’s body cannot endure the daily abuse, sexual violence, disease, and malnutrition prostitutes endure; and, when Mr. Sanson finds Lucy, she has deteriorated to the point that he initially does not recognize his own daughter. Lucy’s “soft round arms, the snowy whiteness, [are] all reduc’d to...pale flaccid skin drawn o’er the staring bones” (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.261). This stark description contrasts the health of innocence and the disease of illicit sexual congress. Upon Lucy’s death, the narrator takes a moment to again remind readers that “the once lovely, the once innocent, and once happy Lucy...[fell] prey to the vile artifices of a wicked monster and the unbridled lust of a barbarous destroyer” (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.277). Lucy’s physical suffering viscerally demonstrates her complete abjection and stresses the need for charity. This moment also frames the tragedy of Lucy’s death in terms of the role men played in her moral and physical decline.

¹²⁸ According to Binhammer, “Dodd’s third-person narration allows for this horrific depiction of the prostitute’s victimization and abjection; the penitent, herself could never be this explicit without compromising her modesty” (67). In “Obscenity and Work in Eighteenth-Century British Fictions,” Laura Rosenthal makes an interesting argument that sex work becomes visible at the moment that merchant activities are obscured. She reads this as the obscenity of work. In this vein, Lucy’s rape comes to represent the violence of eighteenth-century labor. The use of force, physical and ideological, on the poor.

But it's not only people who contribute to the victimization of women as Dodd claims "Foolish and idle books of romance" add to the morass of misinformation inundating women's weak minds (*Sisters* 2.81). In the face of the genre's increased popularity among the rich and poor, a number of eighteenth-century social observers clung to the belief that novels, in particular romances, were not proper for instruction.¹²⁹ Dodd goes so far as to blame them for "the destruction of youth" (*Sisters* 2.81). Who, Dodd wants his readers to ask, can fault young, unsophisticated girls for believing what they see and hear, especially after reading the novels and romances "wherewith the present age, so happily abounds" (*Sisters* 1.4)? Novel reading leads young girls to conflate the real and fictional worlds. In the real world, virtue leads to marriage and happiness; but in the world of the fictional text, "it is only a ceremony, and ceremonies cannot tie hearts" (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.85). For instance, in *The Sisters*, when Mrs. Stevens' daughter Jenny runs off with her lover, she reassures her mother that she knows how to make the correct decisions after reading the stories of "Miss Clarissa Harlowe, Miss Sophia Western, Arabella, [and] Amelia" (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.84). Instead of concluding that the heroine's virtuous actions are a proper model for real life, Jenny deduces that "if they had each given way a little, it is plain they had avoided infinite mischiefs and misery" (Dodd, *Sisters* 2.84). In other words, the women in the novels would have been happier giving in to the sexual advances of their admirers.

¹²⁹ It was not "an accident that attitudes about prostitution began to change at the same time reformers started cleaning up the novel. One group worried about real whores, the other about their fictional counterparts. What happened at mid-century was that both groups of reformers shifted their attentions from eradication to rehabilitation" (Mudge 229). Thus, Dodd was part of a group of midcentury male writers, including Samuel Richardson, working to rehabilitate the novel. Both writers "deployed the strategies of conduct book literature within fiction, and contained the strategies of the most deleterious fiction—a tale of seduction—within the framework of a conduct book" (Armstrong 109). The title page of *Pamela* explains the novel "is entirely divested of all those images which in too many pieces calculated for amusement only, tend to inflame the minds they should instruct." In a similar vein, Samuel Johnson worries that readers are "easily susceptible of impressions...and consequently open to every false suggestion and partial account" (176). According to Antony E. Simpson, the novel, especially Richardson's, strongly influenced the beliefs and attitudes the eighteenth-century public held about prostitutes, in particular the shift from villainization to sympathy for the prostitute.

Dodd believes Jenny misreads the texts because of the intellectual inferiority of women, which limits their ability to reason, and because of a lack of parental instruction on the texts she chooses to read. Similarly, in *The Magdalen*, Fanny Melmouth falls into an unfortunate “taste for reading” that “neither assisted her judgment, nor improved her morals” (88). She is, in fact, drawn to “false and ridiculous pictures of life and human nature” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 88-89, 97). In the end, the men cast as the heroes in their real-life romances deflower and abandon Jenny and Fanny. Additionally, romances encourage female readers to interpret the world through the unrealistic representations and expectations of the novels. When Caroline and Lucy are warned that “the good and worthy...[are] generally in plain, or perhaps a tattered garment,” while “gilt and Flanders mares draw usurers, extortioners, spendthrifts, whores, bullies, and infidels” (Dodd, *Sisters* 22), they do not heed the caution. In the romances, which the girls take as authoritative texts, beautiful clothes denote nobility and honor, and sweet words represent sincerity. Dodd’s stories show the tragic results of female minds clouded by romantic fantasies, unable to sort good people and intentions from bad.

Dodd graphically reveals women’s victimization as part of his literary campaign to reconstitute the prostitute into an object of pity instead of fear. In *The Sisters*, Lucy uses alcohol to escape her suffering and feel aroused, which reinforces Dodd’s certainty that the life of a prostitute is one of suffering overlaid with a façade of gaiety.¹³⁰ Thus, “Dodd describes...Lucy’s early experiences as a common prostitute as a sort of sexual purgatory” (Campbell 137). Sex for

¹³⁰ This image of drunkenness is a convenient moment to plug the dangers of drinking, which was a concern for Dodd and the Magdalen governors. Lucy and Caroline are plied with drinks by Dookalb and his friends, which encourages them to relax and enjoy the loose conversation and the less-than-legitimate attentions of the men. In another scene, Caroline witnesses the prostitutes drinking, and, as they get more tipsy, they move from complaints about their lives to merriment. Additionally, Hanway, as proof of the dangers of strong drink, recounts the case of a town that had no public-houses and thus no poor applying for poor-relief; however, when three are opened in less than three years, the parish begins taxing a poor rate. When the liquor licenses are withdrawn, there is no more need for a poor rate (*Defect* 24).

prostitutes is not a pleasurable experience in *The Magdalen* either, as Dodd shows when Emily sacrifices her body in order to save her son. Finally, despite Charlotte's claim that "there is something so delicious in bilking a foolish keeper," Lucy lives in an almost constant state of fear fueled by her social and economic insecurity (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.47). Importantly, as Katherine Binhammer notes "the image of the prostitute as victim of seduction had the effect of redefining prostitution from an act of sexual volition to an act of economic necessity, a turn from sex to money that emphasizes the prostitute's relationship to a new commercial marketplace at the same time as it sentimentalizes her fall" (Binhammer 42). More importantly, the correlation between virginity and value in *The Magdalen*, which Dodd does by transforming Emily from prostitute to wife, justifies an institutional structure like the Magdalen Hospital that can assist, not simply punish, women.¹³¹

Applying Charity

Regardless of who is to blame for prostitution, according to Dodd, the prostitute's sins are deeply rooted in their souls, but he also claims that prompt treatment with "the voice of upbraiding and the language of reformation" increases the odds of a woman's recovery (*Sisters* 1.162). As Martha Koehler observes, "the Magdalen stories fashion a new path: they treat the sexual fall as a narratable, middle phase that, instead of leading inexorably to an undistinguished hardening and a miserable death, takes on new value as the necessary condition for being returned to virtue or even placed into new roles" (261). The Magdalen Hospital's system of voluntary admission meant any applicant needed to "sufficiently demonstrate...their sincere desire to recover their lost character; and of their disapprobation of the ways of vice" (Dodd,

¹³¹ In her essay "Searching for the Self in Eighteenth-Century English Criminal Trials, 1730-1800," Dana Y. Rabin argues that both literature and the courts were increasingly concerned with mitigating circumstances that could allow for sympathy.

“Sermon before Prince Edward” 51). According to Dodd’s history of the Magdalen Hospital, between 1758 and 1769 anywhere from 1,500 to 2,000 women found shelter under the Hospital’s roof (*History of Magdalen* 76). Of those numbers, the many women “dismissed with credit” or “reconciled to their parents and friends” proved the success of the Hospital’s methods, claims Dodd (*History of Magdalen* 76). These women “become useful and faithful wives...habituated to industry...[and] enabled to procure their own bread” (Dodd, *Magdalen* ix). The miraculous healing power of the Hospital contrasts with the squalor, chaos, and corruption of the eighteenth-century policing system.¹³² Dodd’s writing raises common complaints about the system of imprisonment, from fraternization between different classes of criminals and genders to the unhealthy condition of the prisons and the for-profit structure of management. All of these issues served to further criminalize, rather than rehabilitate, the incarcerated. As Hanway complains, prisons and workhouses are “a friend only to the gallows” (*Defects* xii).¹³³ Dodd’s writing prescribes a three-part cure for prostitutes: separation, instruction, and work, each reinforced with surveillance. His solution “anticipated the technology of social engineering that

¹³² I use “policing system” here, as does Jonas Hanway in *The Defects of Police*, to refer to different institutions that enforced or interpreted the law and what he calls the “minutia of government” (*Defects* 11). Therefore, this term covers magistrates, jailors, beadles, bailiffs, and any other officially appointed individuals who oversaw the secular realm, according to Hanway. See J. M. Beattie, *Policing and Punishment in London, 1660-1750*; F. M. Dodsworth, “The Idea of Police in Eighteenth-Century England: Discipline, Reformation, Superintendence”; and Elaine A. Reynolds, *Before the Bobbies: The Night Watch and Police Reform in Metropolitan London, 1720-1830*.

¹³³ In *The Idler* no. 38, Samuel Johnson informs readers that prisons “are filled with every corruption which poverty and wickedness can generate between them; with all the shameless and profligate enormities than can be produced by the impudence of ignominy, the rage of want, and the malignity of despair.” Johnson describes prison as a type of hell on earth, where corrupt thoughts, impulses, and actions gather and multiply. As shown in Chapter Two, Fielding held similar views about prisons and workhouses.

is best exemplified by the state-run nineteenth-century prison penitentiary” in the meshing of physical and ideological disciplinary methods (Nash 624).¹³⁴

In both *The Sisters* and *The Magdalen*, Dodd criticizes a corrupt policing system that criminalizes and victimizes the poor, who rightfully deserve sympathy and aid. Dodd focuses on the physical manifestations of corrupt policing in Lucy’s description of her incarceration in “a miserable house, where dirt, horror, noise, and confusion reign in wild and lawless anarchy” (*Sisters* 1.185). In *The Sisters*, drunken half-naked women wander about and others with clear signs of madness and mired in filth sit on the floor of the privately-run jail. The grim tone of the graphic scenes of suffering echoes the concerns of prison reformers, including Dodd and Hanway, who felt “affronted by the idleness, corruption, drunkenness, and profane jollity in the prisons” (Henriques 63). Policing, a system that included jails and prison, in Dodd’s estimation, should discipline the poor into good and faithful servants, but instead subjects them to needlessly wasteful neglect and abuse. He also criticizes the blatant self-interest of public officials, including beadles, bailiffs, and magistrates. For example, in *The Magdalen*, while Emily is out begging, she fails to pay a bribe to the local beadles, who threaten to “execute the rigours of their office if they” see her begging again (Dodd, *Magdalen* 72). The corruption of policing is an old tradition, as Antony Simpson notes, and the beadles’ demands for payment were a part of a “time-honored practice with the law enforcement agencies” (8). This disheartening scene comes after the bawd steals Emily’s baby and bluntly tells her she has no recourse in the law “because

¹³⁴ Barbara Littlewood and Linda Mahood reach similar conclusions in their analysis of nineteenth-century social attitudes towards prostitutes and Magdalen Hospitals in “Prostitutes, Magdalenes and Wayward Girls: Dangerous Sexualities and Working Class Women in Victorian Scotland” (1991). Among their conclusions, they note that the control apparatuses employed in this system were gendered and class based. This was “part of a more general process by which dangerous sexualities were identified and disciplined” (161). The forces of ideological control are subtle (compared to workhouses or earlier charity schemes) but central in all of the charity schemes Hanway sponsored.

money only can obtain justice; and those who cannot buy must go without it” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 61). She laughs at Emily’s naïve assumption that she can find justice by simply stating her case to a magistrate. *The Sisters* also shows the corruption of the policing system when Dookalb purchases a writ against the innocent Caroline, which lands her in debtor’s prison.¹³⁵ The fact that different characters use legal avenues to exploit Emily and Caroline aligns Dodd with other eighteenth-century observers who concluded that policing does not actually reduce social problems like prostitution (Bell 122).

Lucy’s, Caroline’s, and Emily’s experiences reveal to Dodd’s readers a worrying connection between legal measures to discipline and punish bad behavior and corruption of the poor. Dodd’s writing corresponds with other eighteenth-century authors, who worried that, in addition to “the possibility of disease and physical abuse,” places like Bridewell served as a “training-ground for criminals” (Simpson 31). As a prison reformer, Dodd was dedicated to “the enforcement of industry, the imposition of moral and religious instruction to inculcate habits of obedience and sobriety, and an end to the indiscriminate association of criminals with each other” (Henriques 64). His fellow philanthropist, Jonas Hanway complains that “the labour done in [jails] contributes so little to reformation; the objects sent out from their imprisonment are generally reputed to be much less moral than when they came into it” (*Defects* 35). Concerns

¹³⁵ The writ is a favor of Dookalb’s friend Justice Thrasher, whom the narrator claims is the same venal, ignorant magistrate from Henry Fielding’s *Amelia*. Shortly before Dodd wrote his novel, the courts enacted laws that set a minimum amount of forty shillings in debt to eliminate “frivolous debts” (108). Before several reforms to the debtor’s laws, anyone could “be incarcerated for a debt of any amount, no matter how small, provided a judgement could be obtained against him in a court of law” (Stephens 107). Creditors had to follow a process that included the presentation of witnesses in order to obtain a writ. Dookalb smugly confesses to Caroline that he was able to avoid this entire process by paying a court official. Dodd and Hanway pay special attention to the imprisonment of debtors, a large number of whom were women. In *The Sisters*, both Caroline and Lucy spend time in sponging houses—private residences used to hold debtors.

that prisons actually increased crime cemented the philanthropic fervor of men like Dodd who saw charity as the ideal solution to poverty and crime.

Lucy experiences firsthand the range of ways officers of the law victimized and criminalized women. Friendless and penniless, Lucy is powerless when the officer of the sponging house, Mr. Holdfast, demands her watch in exchange for better accommodations.¹³⁶ Here and elsewhere, in the story, Dodd shows that “prisons were places of privilege and extortion” (Henriques 61). After stealing her property, Holdfast “generously” offers to use his contacts to help Lucy find some clients in order to pay her debts and stay out of Bridewell. Her situation echoes Hanway’s concerns in *The Defects of Police*, in which he claims that “many a prisoner taken into custody, is conveyed to a sponging-house...[and] by a horrible abuse of mercy, the prisoner is even robbed by extortion, and the temptation afforded of purchasing humane treatments, by plunging so much deeper in debt” (Defects xiv). A large part of the problem is a lack oversight, due to the “eighteenth-century habit of farming out houses of correction to private enterprise” (Henriques 61). Of course, all of these moments in the novel provide an opportunity to reflect on the need for an organization like the Magdalen Hospital that could organize and direct charitable contributions.

In contrast to the criminal mismanagement of the eighteenth-century sponging houses and jails, Dodd describes the Magdalen Hospital as a place of institutionalized surveillance that encourages good behavior. The Magdalen Hospital appointed matrons to provide the instruction and guidance parents failed to give to the young women, so that “in theory at least, every aspect

¹³⁶ Dodd uses every angle in the story to emphasize the corruption of the prison system. Mrs. Holdfast is “the bastard daughter of an old bawd and the head keeper of Newgate” (Dodd, *Sisters* 1.192). His The Newgate headkeeper’s illegitimate daughter and his son-in-law meet in prison and he then buys his son-in-law a position. Dodd does not explain the circumstances of the couple’s meeting in prison, but it all seems suspect. In a similar fashion, Defoe uses Moll’s birth in prison to cement her criminalization. Newgate becomes, in both of these texts, a nonverbal confirmation of criminal identity.

of their daily lives was planned and carefully watched” (Nash 621). The matrons who oversaw the conduct of the Magdalens needed to be constantly present in order to “influence the conduct and discourse of the women” (Dodd, “History of the Magdalen” vii). Dodd says the matron’s duty is to provide “a proper check...to stifle quarrels, correct refractory tempers, and discourage petulant and opprobrious language” (Dodd, “History of the Magdalen” viii). The matrons taught the women how to act, and part of that behavior was “an amiable and becoming manner” (Dodd, “History of the Magdalen” 63). Important parts of this directive included following the rules and responding with “humble and ready obedience” to the matrons (63). The matron’s instructional and supervisory role is in fact so critical that Dodd claims the Hospital dismissed a number of women applicants before the governors increased the number of matrons in order to ensure twenty-four-hour surveillance. The matrons also played an important role as primary witnesses to “signs” or “marks of repentance,” which proved the women’s readiness to re-enter the world and navigate its dangers.

Dodd also compels the women in the Hospital to take responsibility for their own surveillance as part of the healing process. Part of their reform efforts included instructing the women to monitor each other’s actions and conversations.¹³⁷ Dodd cautions them to never “repeat those infamous scenes” of their former lives (“Advice” 74). Their conversations with each other should be innocent and edifying. In his conduct manual for former prostitutes, Dodd also encourages the Magdalens to practice strict self-regulation, because their ultimate witness is

¹³⁷ In both of his novels, Dodd shows how loose conversation plays a role in the seduction of young girls. Lucy and Caroline are vulnerable to the types of conversations initiated by Dookalb and his friends because in the world of the romance, flowery declarations of love are the norm. The lively conversation of Dookalb’s companions inspires Caroline and Lucy to give “loose to love themselves, and [they] were pleased to find the young noblemen pressing their heaving breasts with glowing hands, and sucking from their unpolluted roseate mouths ten thousand and ten thousand sweets” (Dodd, *The Sisters* 26). This is the first, but not the last moment in which Dodd employs the overblown, sensuous language of romance. His worry about conversation extends to what the women talk about in the Hospital, because he worries it might stir up the feelings of excitement that led to their downfall in the past.

God, whose “eye of infinite purity” can see into their hearts (“Advice” 68). Even in this directive, supposedly about what women can choose to do, Dodd’s words identify an underlying threat that motivates the women’s actions: God’s displeasure can result in further physical and mental suffering.

Notably, self-surveillance does not end once women leave the Magdalen Hospital or after their families forgive them or once they find legitimate employment—it is a lifelong process. Dodd warns the women, “you must not conceive, that by entering into this House, your business is done, and your salvation is secured...The life of a Christian is a continued warfare” (“Advice” 73). Both inside and outside the Magdalen Hospital, the women constantly have to prove that they have vanquished “all the evil desires and predominant lusts of the flesh” (73). As prostitutes, they encountered and at times reveled in the pleasures of sin, which will continue to tempt them. Constant regulation ensures the women’s reclamation serves a greater social purpose; they are not simply reclaimed from sin to live their lives behind the Hospital’s walls.

In response to the undisciplined systems of Bridewell and other prisons, Dodd promotes the effectiveness of organizing and physically separating people for the purposes of control and ideological inculcation. The Hospital divided the women into classes for effective instruction and efficient surveillance.¹³⁸ This disciplinary measure, according to Dodd, developed in response to the governors’ discovery that some of the women admitted were “utterly ignorant of and uninstructed in the religion of their country: strangers too much to their God and their

¹³⁸ The advanced students were women who clearly had training in religion, manners, and some reading and writing. Others belonged to the lower class or ward, which consisted “of inferior persons, and of those who may be degraded for misbehavior” (Rules and Regulations 132). Hanway believed that this system really worked. In his later work on prisons, he went even further to advocate complete isolation for prisoners (Henriques). For more on the carceral element of the Magdalen Hospital, see Bullough and Nash.

Saviour” (Dodd, “A Sermon before the President” viii). Instruction for women in the beginner’s class began with the most rudimentary religious concepts and the truth of God’s existence. More advanced students were “taught to read by their superiors, proper books for instruction and amusement...supplied to them” (xii).¹³⁹ According to Dan Cruikshank, the divisive organizational structure of the Magdalen Hospital extended beyond classroom instruction to the women’s living space, which consisted of four wards: a three month probationary ward, intermediate, finishing, and a separate ward for the seduced. Significantly, the first month of the Magdalen’s probationary status “was spent in almost complete isolation, ensuring that the seductive forces which had driven these women to prostitution would be quickly forgotten” (Hitchcock 105). Dodd and Hanway also worried about the intermingling of different classes of criminals and unregulated contact between men and women. Therefore, while several men resided in the house, including the steward, porters, and messengers, none had “any direct communication with the wards” (Dodd, “Rules and Regulations” 131). Strictly structuring the contact between different groups, they believed increased the chances of rehabilitation for all groups, from the freshly seduced to the more hardened streetwalker. This organization of the Hospital’s patients reflected a shift toward different modes of physical and mental control, including inmate isolation, which later shaped nineteenth- and twentieth-century prison practices.

Dodd concurs with the Magdalen Hospital’s governors that women lack, but urgently need moral and social direction.¹⁴⁰ He contrasts the directionless confinement of places like

¹³⁹ Dodd reassures readers that the women’s education does not extend beyond what is necessary and appropriate for them to know, and thus there is no “deepness of learning, or vast reach of thought” (Dodd, *Sisters* xii). Chapter Two shows that the SPCK made similar observations about their efforts to educate poor children. Many were skeptical, believing education of the poor or women encouraged idleness or promiscuity.

¹⁴⁰ Dodd and Hanway repeatedly bring up the idea of instruction as part of charity. Hanway addressed the would-be philanthropist saying, “every impulse of the heart...calls on us for such regulation as will

Bridewell with the structured curriculum of the Magdalen Hospital to support his certainty that prostitutes simply “had to be reeducated into appropriate behavior” (Trumbach 197). Tellingly, “the indoctrination began by reminding them how fortunate they were to be there” (Nash 620). In addition to gratitude, Dodd reassures readers that as part of their instruction the women learned to recognize “sins in their blackest colours” (*Magdalen* 76). They were also taught what Dodd calls “outward deportment,” which he defines as “behavior...one towards another” (“Advice” 62). This outward deportment included refraining from infighting, sharing kind words, and exhibiting a humble demeanor towards each other, as well as discussing verses from the Bible or the day’s sermon (Dodd, “Advice” 69). All of the women’s actions were to be a demonstration of their rehabilitation, calculated to appeal to potential charity contributors.

Governors expected the Magdalens to attend religious services to prove they were students eagerly seeking proper instruction.¹⁴¹ In the church, which Dodd presents as a type of public classroom for the prostitutes, he preached sermons to remind the women of their former state. “Note,” he says, the contrast between “tongues sweetly tuning forth the praises of the Redeemer, which late were hoarse with oaths, and empoisoned with lasciviousness” (“Sermon Before the President” 17). The women also had opportunities to speak during the service, as a type of recitation of their learning. Dodd cites the example of a former prostitute who, while taking the sacrament, publicly declares that she is a “true penitent, humble in soul, and desirous to walk in newness of life” (“Advice” 69). For Dodd, what the woman does in taking the

encourage the industrious; chastise the idle; instruct the ignorant; and punish the profligate” (“Defects” ii). Dodd’s directives are for the former prostitute, when he quotes Proverbs 19:20, “Hear counsel and receive instruction that thou mayest be wise in thy latter end” (“Instructions”). The people appointed to oversee the women’s moral rehabilitation are thus imagined as their teachers.

¹⁴¹ The chaplain was comparable to the master instructor. He read prayers daily and preached twice daily on Sunday. He was one of the few men permitted to have contact with the women, ensuring the Hospital largely resembled a cloister.

sacrament is even more important than what she says, because a clergyman, in consultation with the matron, had to approve the women to take the sacrament. Taking the sacrament meant a woman has passed all of the earthly tests put before her by the Magdalen's matrons, proving that her physical transformation reflected a purified spiritual state that allowed her to take her proper place in eighteenth-century society.

The prayers and songs that Dodd instructs the penitents to memorize formed part of their learning process. They focused on the women's suffering, denial of self-centered desires, and investment in the greater good of society (Lloyd 63). As one of their hymns details, their sin "wastes the flesh, pollutes the mind, and tears the heart with racking pains" (Dodd, "Magdalen Prayers" 110). These words connect physical and spiritual suffering by aligning "flesh" and "mind." Unsurprisingly, the evening prayer again reminded women of their "corrupt desires and affections...carnal lusts and appetites" (Dodd, "Magdalen Prayers" 85). Matrons taught the penitents to embrace their suffering as the beginning of a positive learning process in which they confronted and repudiated their sins.¹⁴² Part of their instruction also included the women awakening "to repentance by a sense of guilt" and learning "to apply for pardon from him who came on earth to save sinners" (Dodd, "Magdalen Prayers" 76). Their morning prayer again acknowledged their transgressions, "my sins bear witness against thee," but then notes, "but there is mercy with thee" (Dodd, "Magdalen Prayers" 80). Here they acknowledge the divine nature of God's love manifested in the Magdalen Hospital's charity. In addition to expressing

¹⁴² As one of Dodd's fictionalized former prostitutes explains, "I think myself so sincerely penitent, and see my crimes so fully, that I am content to suffer these and much worse, if, by my sorrows here, I may wipe away my past offences, and obtain forgiveness at the hands of my offended Lord" (*Sisters* 1.171). Emily echoes the value of suffering when she tells her benefactress, "I can never enough bless and praise my God, that he gave me strength of mind sufficient to prevent me from laying violent hands on myself; but it was his pleasure to preserve me for further trials" (Dodd, *The Magdalen* 53). The act of relating her pain and pleasure goes back to the "spectacle of suffering" discussed in the first section of this chapter.

their love of God, the Magdalens needed to articulate feelings of gratitude for their human saviors. Among the prayers they recited, one specifically asking God to “let thine especial blessing be upon all my friends, and particularly on those who are engage in government or support of this house” (Dodd, “Magdalen Prayers” 81). All of Dodd’s instructions to the women required them to verbalize their recommitment to God, society, and country.

Any person with prurient or laudable interests who managed to finagle a seat at one of Dodd’s sermons witnessed the penitents’ transformation. As Dodd reminds readers, “the public are themselves, in some measure, judges by seeing their decent and commendable deportment in the Chapel, which had dispelled the doubts, and dissipated the scruples of many hesitating objectors to this design” (“Sermon to the President” x). Like the fictional philanthropists in *The Sisters*, Mrs. Stevens and Mrs. Hodson, many female parishioners in the Magdalen Hospital’s chapel who witnessed the prostitutes’ display of suffering and penitence responded with tears. Another compelling element of the prostitutes’ display in the chapel was that “every person in the audience could see the women with tears of penitence and remorse flowing from their eyes” (Dodd, “Advice” 16-17). In essence, the penitents “were living proof of the charity’s work and something of a spectacle” (Lloyd, “Pleasure’s 56). Dodd reminds the penitents that “in the public worship of God,” they should show “the most sober, serious, and religious deportment” (Dodd, “Magdalen Prayers” 68). Thus, attendees observed women with a humble demeanor, in contrast to the bold figure of the prostitute, thereby affirming the effectiveness of the Hospital.

Importantly, for Dodd, the Magdalens had to dress the humble part that their advocates expected them to play. Each Sunday the women paraded through the chapel in “humble clothing made from plain clothe [sic] and subdued colors” as evidence that the Magdalen Hospital effectively reforms sinners. Eschewing bright colors and ornaments, the women wore uniforms

of light grey that they made in the Hospital (Dodd, “Rules and Regulations of The Magdalen Hospital” 134). Their clothing melded industriousness and humbleness into essential elements of their newly-found values.¹⁴³ Jennie Batchelor describes the dressing of the prostitute’s body as part of a “sanitizing process” that also included renaming (7).

Clothing alone could not complete the image of penitence. As Dodd explains in *Advice to the Magdalens*, “the humble, meek, and downcast look becomes those who are in a state of penitence” (*Advice* 68-9). The women experience a figurative and literal social rebirth, shedding their past reputations and sins. As part of this message of reformation, Dodd shows that the prostitutes can become someone altogether new, different from who and what they were before or during their sexual transgression. Some even chose new names to fit with their new clothes and lives as modest, chaste servants and wives.

According to Dodd, an enthusiastic attitude towards work was the ultimate evidence of the former prostitutes’ penitence and their continued social value. For example, in *The Magdalen*, Emily recounts the story of a former prostitute becoming a servant as a lesson to other penitents on proper conduct. After leaving the Magdalen Hospital, where she learns humbleness and the value of servitude, the woman suffers a work-related injury. She ignores her pain and completes her duties, only stopping when “mortification speedily came on” (Dodd, *The Magdalen* 41). In death, her virtuousness is still visible for others to witness. Emily describes

¹⁴³ Hanway defines the “police of a family” as instructions that will help women comprehend the modesty and frugality of dress, according to condition of fortune. This will teach humility, and how to render the garb elegant without being expensive or fantastical. Nothing, not absolutely criminal, tends to pervert the female heart so much as the habit of spending much time and money in amusement, and the decoration of their persons, following the example of their superiors in fortune, and often their inferiors in understanding. The want of distinction in lower life makes half the prostitutes who now roam the streets; and in higher, half the bankruptcies, and complicated miseries, which invade the peace of domestic life. (Defects xxiii)

This quote echoes the concerns expressed by other social critics and novelists that luxuries corrupt the lower classes.

the woman as “dying with all the visible marks of penitence in her countenance” (41). Emily’s friend dies a testament to the benefits of charity, willing to neglect her own health in her dedication to her work. Dodd’s narration of penitence highlights the fact that in the mid-eighteenth-century formulation of charity, recipients literally must earn forgiveness by working.

The unnamed woman in Emily’s story learns the value of hard work in the Magdalen Hospital, where the penitents worked between nine and twelve hours a day at a variety of tasks, including making their own clothes and selling embroidery and other items to contribute to the upkeep of the Hospital. According to Steven Nash, “the overall goal was to teach the principle of industry to the women and failing reconciliation to friends or family, to place them primarily in domestic service, and secondarily in trade” (620). Nevertheless, their work, the Hospital’s literature reassures readers, is of “the utmost delicacy” to ensure “this establishment may not be thought a house of correction, or even of hard labour, but a safe retreat from their distressful circumstances” (Dodd, *Magdalen* 136).¹⁴⁴ Unlike Bridewell and other workhouses where every person regardless of age and gender worked at the same tasks, the penitents in the Magdalen Hospital were defined by the work they do. Dodd tailors even the minute details of the Hospital’s operations to fit the charity’s basic premise of the prostitute’s reformability. The feminine work the women do in the Hospital demonstrates their capacity to be good servants, wives, and mothers.

¹⁴⁴ Histories of women’s work in the eighteenth-century include Ivy Pinchbeck’s *Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850* (1930), which influenced Bridget Hill’s *Women, Work, and Sexual Politics*, as well as Maxine Berg’s article “What Difference did Women’s Work Make to the Industrial Revolution?” (1993) and Pamela Sharpe’s *Adapting to Capitalism: Working Women in the English Economy, 1700-1850* (1996). An insightful new contribution to the field, Chloe Wigston Smith’s *Women, Work, and the Eighteenth-Century Novel* (2013), links two material cultures, print and textile, to women’s work.

There are several reasons, according to Dodd, for compelling women to work. First, work is a religious and social duty that defines them against their former life (Townley 16). For instance, Dodd contrasts the penitent's hands holding "instruments of industry" with those of the prostitute, "wantoning in pernicious indolence" ("Sermon before the President" 17). Second, work allows women to prove their gratitude to their earthly saviors, who expect "disciplinary quid pro quo for their largesse" (Lees 71). Third, work ensures a woman's social value, for, as Dodd warns the former prostitutes, "a deficiency in industry will always be sufficient to lose our esteem, as it will too plainly shew your want of principles" ("Advice" 61). Finally, labor staves off the danger of reverting to the moral and material state from which they have been rescued. The Reverend Richard Townley explains that, "Religious exercises soon lose their effects if persons so lately returned from idleness and vice, were not brought back to habits of attention and industry" (15-16). In short, the former prostitutes have to work hard, physically and mentally, to ensure they do not fall back into the lives from which they were saved. All of Dodd's instructions to women, fit with the main objective of eighteenth-century philanthropists and social reformers to find ways to make the poor socially and economically productive.

Conclusion

As this chapter shows, Dodd's writing envisions an organized, subtle system of coercion, in the Magdalen Hospital, an institution that effectively transforms prostitutes into fiscally responsible, hardworking women. He compellingly frames penitence as a voluntary act motivated by spiritual desires in contrast to the physical and mental coercion of prostitution. However, the development of institutions like the Magdalen Hospital "should not be seen as benign progress but rather as more sophisticated methods of social control" (Nash 617). Dodd shows that as a technology of control, from its inception the Hospital emphasized the fact that

the women chose to apply, with the implication that, because they were free to leave at any time, the pain and thorough self-abnegation of penitence were also voluntary. In *The Magdalen*, “The prospect of entry into the Magdalen House is treated as a crux of meaning and value” (Koehler 258). It defines the women as agents in their own concerns. As such, Dodd contributes to a body of eighteenth-century literature in which “the use of the idea of freedom and free-will becomes central to representations of labor” (Franks 134). The Magdalen Hospital, “rather than representing a fundamental change in punitive policy...was simply an agent of the repressive paternalistic regime operating in a different, less obviously coercive guise” (Bell 128). Yet, in the process of defining women as proper objects of charity, Dodd and the Magdalen Hospital’s supporters undercut their own narrative of feminized free will. The contradictory pull between free will and circumscription that characterizes the victimized prostitute were irrelevant to Dodd and the Magdalen governors. More important, the Hospital’s literature shows that for Dodd and his fellow philanthropists, the powerful and contradictory combination of altruism, victimization, and work reform operated effectively on the hearts and minds of the Magdalen Hospital’s contributors and recipients.

Works Cited

- Andrew, Donna. *Philanthropy and the Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989. Print.
- Appleby, John H. "Robert Dingley F.R.S. (1710-1781), Merchant, Architect and Pioneering Philanthropist." *The Royal Society* 45.2 (Jul. 1991): 139-154. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Apr 2012.
- Barker, A.D., William Dodd "The Early Career of William Dodd. *Transactions of the Cambridge Biographical Society* 8.2 (1982): 217-235. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Mar 2013.
- Batchelor, Jennie. "'Industry in Distress': Reconfiguring Femininity and Labor in the Magdalen House." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28.1 (2004): 1-20. *Project Muse*. Web. 10 Apr 2011.
- . "Mothers and Others: Sexuality and Maternity in *Some Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen-House* (1760)." *Prostitution and Eighteenth-Century Culture: Sex, Commerce and Mortality*. Ed. Ellis, Ann and Markahm Lewis. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012. 157-169. Print.
- Beattie, J.M. "The Criminality of Women in Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of Social History* 8.4 (Summer 1975): 80-116. *JSTOR*. Web. 05 Aug 2008.
- Beattie, J.M. *Policing and Punishment in London, 1660-1750: Urban Crimes and the Limits of Terror*. New York: Oxford UP, 2001. Print.
- . *Policing and Punishment in London, 1660-1750*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.
- Beasley, Jerry C. "Romance and the "New" Novels of Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 16.3 (Summer 1976): 437-450. *JSTOR*. Web. 4 Nov 2011.
- Bell, Ian. *Literature and Crime in Augustan England*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Bellamy, Liz. *Commerce, Morality, and the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. Print.
- Bender, John. *Imagining the Penitentiary*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987. Print.
- Binhammer, Katherine. *The Seduction Narrative in Britain, 1747-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.
- . "The Whore's Love." *Eighteenth Century Fiction* 20.4 (Summer 2008): 507-534. *Project Muse*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Bouce, Paul-Gabriel. *Sexualities in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Totowa, NJ: Manchester UP, 1982. Print.
- Bowen, Scarlett. "'A Sawce-box and Boldface Indeed': Refiguring the Female Servant in the Pamela-Antipamela Debate." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 28 (1999): 257-285. *Project Muse*. Web. 12 May 2009.

- Bullough, Vern. "Prostitution and Reform in Eighteenth-Century England." *'Tis Nature's Fault: Unauthorized Sexuality During the Enlightenment*. Ed. Robert P. Maccubbin. 1987. 61-74. Print.
- Campbell, Ann. "Magdalen or Harlot?: Satire, Sentiment, and the Fallen Women in William Dodd's *The Sisters*." *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies* 13.1/2 (Spring/Fall 2007): 131-145. JSTOR. Web. 18 Nov 2012.
- Carter, Sophie. "'This Female Proteus': Representing Prostitution and Masquerade in Eighteenth Century English Popular Print Culture." *Oxford Art Journal* 22.1 (1999): 57-79. JSTOR. Web. 24 Apr 2012.
- . *Purchasing Power: Representing Prostitution in Eighteenth-Century England*. Ashgate, 2004. Print.
- Cruikshank, Dan. *London's Sinful Secret: The Bawdy History and Very Public Passions of London's Georgian Age*. New York: St. Martin's, 2009.
- Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. "The Construction of Honour, Reputation, and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Society* 6 (1996): 201-213. JSTOR. Web. 24 Apr 2012.
- Dingley, Robert. *A Proposal for Establishing a Public Place of Reception for Penitent Prostitutes Letter V. to Robert Dingley, Esq; Being a Proposal for the Relief and Employment of Friendless Girls and Repenting Prostitutes*. London, 1758. Ed. Jonas Hanway. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 June 2015.
- Dodd, William. *The Magdalen or, History of the First Penitent Prostitute*. London, 1799. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 12 Dec 2011.
- . *The Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity*. 3rd ed. London, 1766. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 June 2015.
- . "Sermon Before the President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Governors of the Magdalen House." *The Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity*. 3rd ed. London, 1766. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 June 2015.
- . *A Sermon Preached at the Magdalen-House Before His Royal Highness Prince Edward. The Rise, Progress, and Present State of the Magdalen Charity*. 3rd ed. London, 1766. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 June 2015.
- . *The Sisters; or the History of Lucy and Caroline Sanson, Entrusted to a False Friend*. London, 1781. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 3 Dec 2011.
- Ellis, Ann and Markahm Lewis. "Introduction: Venal Bodies—Prostitution and Eighteenth Century Culture." *Prostitution and Eighteenth-Century Culture: Sex, Commerce and Mortality*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012. Print.
- Hanway, Jonas. *The Defects of the Police the Cause of Immorality, and the Continual Robberies Committed, Particularly in and About the Metropolis: With Various Proposals for*

- Preventing Hanging and Transportation*. London, 1775. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 6 May 2015.
- . *Solitude in Imprisonment, with Proper Profitable Labour and a Spare Diet*. London, 1776. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 28 Sep 2012.
- . "Thoughts on the Plan for a Magdalen-House for Repentant Prostitutes." London, 1758. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 14 Jun 2013.
- Harvey, Karen. "The Century of Sex? Gender, Bodies, and Sexuality in the Long Eighteenth Century." *The Historical Journal* 45.4 (2002): 899-916. Web. *JSTOR*. 24 Apr 2012.
- Henderson, Tony. *Disorderly Women in Eighteenth-Century London*. New York: Longman, 1999. Print.
- Hogarth, William. *The Harlot's Progress*. 1732. *Engravings by Hogarth*. Ed. Seth Shesgreen. New York: Dover, 1973. Plate 18-23. Print.
- Jordan, Sarah. *The Anxiety of Idleness*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003. Print.
- Koehler, Martha. "Redemptive Spaces: Magdalen House and Prostitution in the Novels and Letters of Richardson." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22.2 (Winter 2009-10): 249-278. *Project Muse*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Landau, Norma, ed. *Law, Crime and English Society, 1660-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.
- Lloyd, Sarah. "'Pleasure's Golden Bait': Prostitution, Poverty and the Magdalen Hospital in Eighteenth Century London." *History Workshop Journal* 41 (Spring 1996): 50-70. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Nov. 2011.
- Nash, Stanley. "Prostitution and Charity: The Magdalen Hospital, a Case Study." *Journal of Social History* 17.4 (Summer 1994): 617-628. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 May 2012.
- Peace, Mary. "Figuring the London Magdalen House: Mercantilist Hospital, Sentimental Asylum or Proto-Evangelical Penitentiary." *Prostitution and Eighteenth-Century Culture: Sex, Commerce and Mortality*. Ed. Ellis, Ann and Markahm Lewis. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012. 141-155. Print.
- . "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain: 'Well-Grounded' Exemplarity vs. 'Romantic' Exceptionality." *The Eighteenth Century* 48.2 (Summer 2007): 125-148. *ProjectMuse*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Rabin, Dana. "Searching for the Self in Eighteenth-Century English Criminal Trials." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27.1 (Winter 2003): 85-105. *ProjectMuse*. Web. 10 Nov 2012.
- Richardson, Samuel. *The Apprentice's Vade Mecum; or, Young Man's Pocket Companion*. London, 1734. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 13 May 2014.
- . *Pamela; or, Virtue Rewarded*. 1740. Ed. Thomas Keymer and Alice Wakely. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.

- Roberts, Michael J.D. "Head versus Heart? Voluntary Associations and Charity Organizations in England c. 1700-1850." *Charity, Philanthropy, and Reform*. Ed. Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 66-86. Print.
- Rogers, Nicholas. "Carnal Knowledge" Illegitimacy in Eighteenth-Century Westminster." *Journal of Social History* 23.2 (Winter 1989): 355-375. JSTOR. Web. 15 Nov 2011.
- Rosenthal, Laura. *Infamous Commerce*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2006. Print.
- "Satan's Home Harvest: or the Present State of Whorecraft, Adultery, Fornication, Procuring, Pimping, Sodomu, and the Game of Flatts." London, 1749. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 17 Mar. 2011.
- Simpson, Antony. 'The Mouth of Strange Women is a Deep Pit': Male Guilt and Legal Attitude Towards Prostitution in Georgian London." *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture* 4.3 (1996): 50-79. Web. 17 Mar. 2011.
- Slack, Paul. *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999. Print.

Chapter 4

Imperial Philanthropy: Merchants, Sailors, and Charity

In 1750, Jonas Hanway arrived in London both physically and emotionally debilitated from his travels abroad representing the interests of the Russia Trading Company. He expected the Russian and Persian natives to appreciate and cooperate with his efforts to establish what he believed were mutually advantageous trade relations. Instead, he was victimized—robbed and physically threatened—by the rich and powerful as well as by lowly commoners. Hanway's published account of this journey, *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea: With a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia; and Back Again through Russia, Germany, and Holland* (1753), makes it clear that in many ways his first career as a merchant failed. Hanway established no new trade relations for the Company, he did not make even a modest fortune from his time abroad, and he failed to leverage his trading connections into a political appointment that would provide much-needed financial security upon his return to London. Regardless of his lack of material advancement, in a little more than five years after his return Hanway underwent a startling transformation from unremarkable merchant to a central figure in mid-eighteenth-century London philanthropy, beginning with the launch of the Marine Society in 1756. He wrote extensively, more than any other eighteenth-century philanthropist, about his many charitable causes. Hanway's background in trade influenced the commercial, spiritual, and national concerns expressed in his philanthropic writing.

An examination of Hanway's travel and charity writing reveals two abstract aims inspired by his time abroad, shows the thinking that undergirds the Marine Society's practical plan to bathe and clothe boys for the royal navy, and helps explain the charity's popularity among eighteenth-century donors. First, the Marine Society reflected Hanway's imperial ambition to

“advance...[Britain’s] future glory and felicity, as a marine power, and commercial people” (ii). Second, Hanway’s writing touts the Marine Society as an institution grounded in what he calls British liberty, which was demonstrated in its voluntary admission process (in contrast to the forced labor system of the workhouses). His encounters with diverse religions and cultures while in the service of the Russia Company inspired this principle of volunteerism, which was at the heart of each of Hanway’s charities. In order to show how his foreign encounters shaped his motivation and methodology for doing charity, in this chapter I examine Hanway’s travel writing alongside his philanthropic literature.

Hanway’s professional career as a merchant began in Lisbon (1729-1741) and continued through Russia and Persia (1743- 1750). While he dabbled in trade upon his return to London in 1750 and remained part of a tight network of Russian Company merchants, by 1756 Hanway had turned his energies to philanthropy and the state of the poor—causes that engrossed him for the rest of his life. He played important roles in many key charitable institutions from the mid-1750s until his death in 1786, including positions as governor and eventually vice president of the Foundling Hospital and co-founder and governor of both the Magdalen Hospital and Marine Society. Hanway’s first literary work, *A Historical Account of the British Trade Over the Caspian Sea*, gives insight into the development of his understanding of England’s place as a world power, the duty of the rich to the poor and vice versa, and the relationship between religion and trade.¹⁴⁵ This massive tome combines elements of a travel memoir and an historical account interspersed with Hanway’s philosophical musings on religion, culture, marriage, and

¹⁴⁵ Hanway contributes to a genre which, according to April Shelford, “rivalled theology in popularity” (196). Explorers, ship captains and sailors, general travelers, and government officials wrote many of the important travelogues of the period. For more on eighteenth-century travel writing, see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*; Tim Fulford and Peter J. Kitson, eds., *Travels, Exploration, and Empire*; Jonathan Lamb, Vanessa Smith, and Nicholas Thomas, eds., *Explorations and Exchange*.

government, all of which supported his belief that “the glory and the welfare of the British monarchy depend[s] on the acquisition and preservation of trade” (vii).¹⁴⁶ Hanway’s writing imagines the roles of the government and merchant as mutually beneficial and constitutive. As part of this profitable relationship, Hanway positions merchants as a group well equipped to mold the poor into workers fully committed to the British Empire.

Hanway’s writing raises a number of questions: What concepts and concerns about the poor do his travel and philanthropic writings share? What do his institutional propaganda and his travel journals reveal about the relationship between eighteenth-century imperialism and philanthropy? In response to these questions, I argue in this chapter that Hanway’s experiences abroad deeply influenced his view of the exigency for and the shape of British charity in four ways. First, Hanway believed that every Briton, young and old, rich and poor, needed to participate in the imperial project. Thus, in responding to the immediate need for sailors on board royal and merchant vessels during the Seven Year War, Hanway established the Marine Society to operate as an active and direct participant in England’s goals of geographical and ideological expansion. Second, his time in Persia and Russia clearly influenced Hanway’s desire

¹⁴⁶ Hanway’s four-volume *An Historical Account of the British Trade Over the Caspian Sea with a Journal of Travels* begins by summarizing trade between Britain, Russia, and Persia (Caspian Sea trade) starting in 1553. He maps out the few successes and many failures of the first trade relationship and then moves to his own experiences in Russia and Persia. He bolsters this section with material from Captain John Elton’s 1739 journal and Captain Thomas Woodruff’s 1745 journal of their journeys along the Caspian Sea. Volume Two moves to a more contemporary Russian Company trade history from 1743 to 1745. Hanway’s trade history foregrounds the main reason the Russian Company sent him to Russia and Persia: to rectify the mistakes of his predecessor Elton. Elton caused problems by building a fleet of ships for Nader Shah, thus working as a Persian naval commander at the same time that he was a British merchant. What starts out as an explanation of why previous traders failed turns into an explanation of adverse trade conditions along the Caspian. The second volume also covers Hanway’s travels back home, which included stops in several European cities (Hamburg, Amsterdam, and the Hague), but the majority of this volume is a history of Persia. Volume Three is a history of the Persian monarchy, including major conflicts and alliances from 3426 B.C. to 1747. I have not been able to find a copy of the fourth volume. While the first edition of his books notes that there are four volumes, mention of a fourth volume disappears from subsequent editions in 1754 and 1762.

to establish a firm cultural divide between Britons and the rest of the world. Therefore, his emphasis on the Christian values and voluntary admission process of the Marine Society situated charity as a means of distinguishing Britain from Roman Catholic and non-Christian countries. Third, Hanway's travel writing inadvertently reveals a lifelong uncertainty about the reality of English imperial strength. In response to imperial concerns, he positioned philanthropy as an institutional structure that could efficiently deploy the poor in defense of the English empire by giving them proper religious training and motivation to defend that empire. Fourth, his contacts with pagan worship and punishment gave him a great distaste for physical demonstrations of any sort, which is reflected in his instructions to the Marine Society boys on proper behavior. Consequently, Hanway's philanthropic vision focused on mental control of the poor—religious education, self-surveillance, or work as mental discipline—rather than somatic disciplinary methods like hard labor, whipping, or withholding food.

Hanway's efforts to shape the minds and actions of the British poor form what I call an imperial philanthropy. Imperialism according to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri is “an extension of the sovereignty of the European nation-states beyond their boundaries” (xii). In addition to expanding the boundaries of state power as Edward Said's *Culture and Imperialism* explains, imperialism is an ideology and a set of practices that includes activities such as colonization (Said, *Culture and Imperialism* xii-xxi); and a project shaped by institutions and cultures (McClintock 15). All of these elements of imperialism are evident in Hanway's articulation of cultural difference in his travel writing and his promotion of the Marine Society. Reading Hanway's travel writing alongside his later philanthropic texts allows for a clearer

understanding of the ideological complexity of a simple operation like the Marine Society.¹⁴⁷ This reading of Hanway's corpus identifies connections between his experiences in Persia and Russia; the institutional imperative of the Marine Society to inculcate the English population—the poor in particular—with proper English values on everything from social rank and marriage to hygiene and diet; and imperialism. In general, scholars analyze religious organizations such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at the end of the eighteenth century and even more examine the large number of missionary organizations in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. It is useful to examine Hanway's promotional materials for the Marine Society because this is a different set of texts and type of organization from those usually studied by eighteenth-century and nineteenth-century scholars to understand the link between imperialism and philanthropy.

Imperial philanthropies such as the Marine Society emphasized cultural and ideological coherence as a crucial element of assisting the poor. Their institutional mission was primarily about supporting the imperial mission at home or abroad. This is in contrast to charities like the Foundling Hospital, which names the production of more soldiers and sailors as one of many positive effects of its practices. Imperial philanthropy deliberately and strategically spread ideologies, whether those were religious, racial, cultural, or economic. Imperial philanthropy had two arms: one worked within Britain to cement the ideological inculcation of diverse and contradictory groups of people within the nation; and the other worked abroad, spreading

¹⁴⁷ Compared to some of the other major eighteenth-century charities, including the Magdalen Hospital and the Foundling Hospital, the Marine Society was a simple operation. Once boys were inspected to ensure they met the size requirement established by the navy and that they were free from infectious diseases, they received a bath, a set of new clothes, a Bible, and other literature the charity's governors deemed necessary. The boys were then quickly put on board ships. Despite efforts, there was no follow-up on the recipients; and no way to institute a supervisory structure to ensure the boys were properly trained as sailors or educated in religion.

“genuine” religion as part of a humane, civilizing mission to improve the lives of the native populations of a conquered or occupied territory. Nevertheless, both types of imperial philanthropy, international and domestic, reinforced unequal relationships between the center and periphery, coalesced around ideas of British cultural superiority, and extended authority and control of one group of people over another.¹⁴⁸ Hanway’s philanthropic work, while influenced by contact with Russian and Persian natives, focused on the British homeland. Exploring Hanway’s works as a form of imperial philanthropy shows the ways that from his perspective, imperialism needed to start at home, directing the minds and bodies of the laboring poor who would become foot soldiers/sailors for the imperial mission to protect British religion, trade, and government.¹⁴⁹

Several scholars, including James Stephen Taylor, Donna Andrew, and Sarah Lloyd, influence this chapter’s questions about the relationship between imperialism, philanthropy, and the Marine Society. Andrew’s *Philanthropy and Police* situates the Marine Society within a number of changes in the operational structure and focus of philanthropy over the course of the eighteenth century, while Lloyd’s *Charity and Poverty in England, c1680-1820: Wild and Visionary Schemes* examines the imaginative and concrete aspects of eighteenth-century

¹⁴⁸ I believe that it is important to map the history of this discourse, because, as Paul Gilroy notes, “notions of the primitive and civilized which had been integral to pre-modern understanding of ‘ethnic’ difference became fundamental cognitive and aesthetic markers in the processes which generated a constellation of subject positions in which Englishness, Christianity, and other ethnic and racialised attributes would finally give way to the dislocating dazzle of ‘whiteness’” (Gilroy 9). In Hanway’s case, while he did not imagine a racialized identity in the way Gilroy’s work delineates, his descriptions of foreign religions and customs revealed the threads of thought that eventually led to the modern institution of racism.

¹⁴⁹ See, Helen Gilbert, *Burden or Benefit?: Imperial Benevolence and its Legacies*; *The Invention of Altruism: Making Moral Meanings in Victorian Britain*; Tom Aherwyn Roberts, *The Concept of Benevolence: Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Moral Philosophy*; and David Lambert and Alan Lester, “Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy”.

projectors like Hanway.¹⁵⁰ Their work tempers any idea that Hanway represents a united eighteenth-century philanthropic spirit with the fact that he was not the only or even the dominant model for thought on trade or philanthropy.¹⁵¹ While Andrew and Lloyd produced valuable scholarship on Hanway, they understandably, given his success as a philanthropist and failure as a merchant, focus on his work in the eighteenth-century London charity scene. In contrast, Taylor's biography, *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (1985), connects the two halves of Hanway's life by declaring, "the roots of Hanway's philanthropy and imperialism lie in his formative years as an aspiring merchant in foreign lands" (35). While it is in many ways a measured and critical appraisal of Hanway's writing and charity work, unfortunately the British Empire becomes monolithic and uncomplicated in Taylor's biography. All of these philanthropic scholars fail to address how the British imperial project reified the problematic paternalistic relationship between the rich and the poor or how it created a language of religious and cultural superiority. Expanding on the work

¹⁵⁰ People who wrote proposal aimed at social and economic improvement were called projectors. Men and women proposed a number of ideas from the fantastical to the practical, on any number of topics. *An Essay on Projects* is Daniel Defoe's contribution to the discourse. Others include Mandeville's proposal for a state run brothel, John Fielding's idea for a laundry that would use unemployed poor, and all of the philanthropies discussed in this dissertation.

¹⁵¹ Unfortunately, critical work lags behind the number of vehement declarations of Hanway's importance to the history of eighteenth-century philanthropy. These include an anonymous poem titled *The Vision* (1788), which celebrates Hanway's life and mourns his death as a major loss to philanthropy (5). The poem's narrator is transported to heaven in a vision in which he encounters an angel who claims that he was ordered by God to fuse his essence with Hanway's body so that there would be a corporeal model of charity on earth that eighteenth-century people could learn from. He then witnesses Hanway's heavenly form, "his aspect more benign than when on earth he silenced misery" (8). There is also N. Merrill Distad's "Jonas Hanway and the Marine Society" (1973). This short article gives a glowing summary of Hanway's accomplishments, spurred by the concern that he is "seldom remembered for more than having popularized the umbrella" (434-5). While Distad mentions other projects Hanway was involved in, his central focus is explaining the past and continued relevance of the Marine Society and Hanway's role in its social stature. Another article, "Jonas Hanway, The Philanthropist," an unattributed piece published in *Frank Leslie's Popular Magazine* (1884), reminds the nineteenth century public of Hanway's place in the history of British philanthropy. All of these texts are very short and focused on giving biographical information about Hanway's work as a merchant or philanthropists, without critical analysis. I found these works to be indispensable for confirming important dates and publications, but not for much else.

done by Taylor, Andrew, and Lloyd, my goal in this chapter is to show that, examined together, Hanway's writing function as a crucial link between British imperialism and the development of the mid-eighteenth century London charity scene.¹⁵²

While Taylor, Andrew, and Lloyd inspire the questions I ask, Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather* and Linda Colley's *Captives* influence the ways in which I answer questions about imperialism and philanthropy. Both books identify the ambivalences and uncertainties of imperialism, whether in the writings of eighteenth- (Colley) or nineteenth-century (McClintock) British men and women. McClintock provides a nuanced definition of imperialism when she says it "was a situation under constant contest, producing historical effects that were neither predetermined, uncontested, nor ineradicable," all within the context "of extreme imbalances of power" (16). She clearly heeds Michel Foucault's warning that we should not "regard power as a phenomenon of mass and homogeneous domination—the domination of one individual over others, of one group over others, or of one class over others" (Foucault, *Society* 29).

McClintock's definition recognizes how the changeable and unstable nature of power relations

¹⁵² This is important because while a number of Hanway's social causes have been scrutinized through a number of critical lenses including gender, sexuality, and class, the same cannot be said of the Marine Society. In recent years, a number of literature and history scholars have turned a critical eye to Hanway's relationship to gender, race, and class, examining these identities within the context of the Foundling Hospital, Magdalen Hospital, Anglo-Russian trade, mercantilism, or eighteenth-century police. On Hanway and the Foundling Hospital, see Ruth McClure's *Coram's Children*, and Tanya Evans' *Unfortunate Objects*. On Hanway and the Magdalen Hospital, see Mary Peace, "Figuring the London Magdalen House: Mercantilist Hospital, Sentimental Asylum or Prototypical Evangelical Penitentiary?" and "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain: 'Well Grounded' Exemplarity vs. 'Romantic' Exceptionality". On Hanway and police, see U. R. Q. Henricque, "The Rise and Decline of the Separate System of Prison Discipline" and F.M. Dodsworth, "The Idea of Police in Eighteenth-Century England: Discipline, Reformation, Superintendence, c. 1780-1800". On Hanway and trade, see Peter Putnam, *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia, 1698-1812*, and Linda Colley, *Britons*. On Hanway and idleness, see Sarah Jordan, *The Anxiety of Idleness*. On Hanway and the Marine School plan, see Simon Baker, "The Maritime Georgic and the Lake Poet Empire of Culture." On Hanway and Samuel Johnson, see Beth Kowaleski-Wallace, "Tea, Gender, and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century England." Finally, on Hanway and the eighteenth-century Sierra Leone project see Isaac Land, "Bread and Arsenic: Citizenship from the Bottom Up in Georgian London."

shaped the history of British imperialism, and it shapes my reading of Hanway's body of work. Thus, I bring together the moments in Hanway's writing when he imagines philanthropy as a tool that can make the British Empire ideologically cohesive in the face of both the external aggression of foreign nations and the internal religious apathy (and ignorance) of the poor.

The eighteenth-century sailor has been a popular subject of scholarship. The sailor dominates narratives of class resistance and freedom in Marcus Rediker's and Peter Linebaugh's work on maritime history. In *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea* and *The Many-Headed Hydra* the sailor-turned-pirate is a symbol of civil disobedience, sowing the seeds of working-class solidarity and resistance. Rediker and Linebaugh, posits a history for the under classes that has always been about resisting the forces of capitalism, a force diametrically opposed to democracy. But in the utopian idealization of the sailor there is a tendency to minimize the different elements of the laboring class, and valorize a post-national camaraderie. While acknowledging material conditions, scholars do not examine in depth the assumptions about labor made by various eighteenth-century social observers and how those assumptions define the sailor. This chapter addresses the ways in which Hanway's philanthropic writing attempts to establish a cultural and religious homogeneity on sailors in response to his experiences abroad and investment in British imperial strength.

Ultimately, Hanway's writing reveals that his vision of and justification for philanthropy is firmly grounded in an imperial project to protect English religion and trade. Since his travel writing provides crucial insight into the different groups of people and cultures he uses to define British imperialism, the first section of this chapter, "Religion and Freedom," examines Hanway's travel writings, *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea* and *A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston upon Thames to which is Added an*

Essay on Tea (1757). Hanway's views on religion and freedom influenced his focus on developing a distinctly mercantile and British philanthropic empire. He articulates his philanthropic and imperial concerns, which include the plight of the poor, France's role as a threat to English liberties, and the erosion of religious values in *Motives for the Establishment of the Marine Society* (1757), *Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society* (1758), *A Letter from a Member of the Marine Society; Shewing the Piety, Generosity, and Utility of their Instructions, Religious and Prudential to Apprentices and Servants in General, Placed out by the Marine Society* (1757), and *The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society* (1771). Thus, my second section, "Imperial Uncertainties," considers Hanway's doubts about British imperial supremacy, and in the process establishes a deeper understanding of the complex web of social relations—national and international—that informs his conception of philanthropy. The final section, "Sailors, Servants of Empire," takes up *Instructions to Every Boy of the Marine Society* (1770) and *The Seaman's Faithful Companion* (1763), instructional materials Hanway wrote for the Marine Society's young male recruits. This section shows the different types of textual appeals he used to exert control over the poor in an effort to make a cohesive British empire. Ultimately, Hanway's corpus show how imperialism and philanthropy became inextricably linked in the eighteenth century.

Religion and Freedom

In 1741 when Hanway first reached Persia, he joined the small number of Englishmen to view the historic lands of the Safavid Empire firsthand. He notes that the "the original writers of transactions in the East have a peculiar propensity to the marvelous: and European also, who have not been to the spot are apt to give in to the same absurdity" (*A Historical Account* xii). He promises that he will not fall into the trap of giving "their history the air of romance" (Hanway

xii). Instead of crafting a tale of imperial might, Hanway offers his readers a dark tale of oppression, witchcraft, and violence. As a firsthand witness to the violent struggles between Persian royals, Hanway concludes that “the Persians by their neglect of moral duties, have prepared the way for that ruin in which they are involved” (*A Historical Account* 335), a ruin that includes “plagues, wars, cruelties, and famines” (266). This desolate world contrasts with Britain, “a Christian country, ruled by a Christian prince,” whose reward for faithful service is “the protection of the great Lord of Hosts” (*Virtue in Humble Life* xliv). Hanway’s travel writing explores the concepts of religion, tyranny, and freedom to explain the rise and fall of empires—a history that provides his exigency for charity. Ultimately, recognizing how the qualities he associates with Christianity (reason, civilization, self-discipline, and benevolence) are defined against and through his representations of different groups of people aids our understanding of Hanway’s theory and practice of imperial philanthropy.¹⁵³

Hanway’s travel writings, *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea* and *A Journal of Eight Days*, reveal the conceits and insecurities of his imperial vision. Hanway establishes a cultural scale in which Britons occupy one end, in what he calls “a state of freedom,” and everyone else from the French to the Persians occupy the opposite end of the spectrum, in varying states “of nature”. He clearly and compellingly describes a state of nature that looks very similar to Thomas Hobbes’ description of a world lacking all of the elements required of civilization, including arts and letters, a society where the people live in “continual feare, and danger of violent death; and the life of man [is] solitary, nasty, brutish, and short”

¹⁵³ In this respect my project is indebted to Felicity Nussbaum’s *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. This book examines the process of constructing identities in regards to gender, sexuality, and imperialism. She shows how British narratives constructed the sexualized “other” woman and framed middling and upper class women as agents of civilization. Similarly, Hanway’s writing contributes to the construction of a primitive “other” using the common British sailor.

(65). While Protestant Christianity provides the standard Hanway uses to judge other people and cultures, *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea* and *A Journal of Eight Days* lack direct descriptions of the qualities that define Christianity. In this respect, Hanway's travel writing diverges from the philanthropic literature of Henry Fielding and William Dodd that I examined in Chapters Two and Three. Fielding and Dodd include a number of examples of Christians, including country gentlemen and women, helping poor individuals or an anonymous benefactress contributing to a charitable institution. We can learn as much, if not more, about Hanway's understanding of British Protestant Christian philanthropy by examining its inverse as we can from looking for explicit representations of his philanthropic model. Thus, in order to flesh out Hanway's theology and his philanthropic logic, we must first examine his narration of his encounters with different cultures and classes of people.

Sensational stories that paint non-Christians in a state of nature, ruled by superstitious irrationality, riddle Hanway's *A Historical Account*. Their "minds," he claims, "are tainted with a fondness for whatever is marvelous, and belief in the agency of invisible powers on the most trivial occasions" (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 228). So when Hanway says that Persians "seem to be more in a state of nature than the Europeans" (*A Historical Account* 329), he does not imagine an idealized culture existing in a prelapsarian state. Rather, he envisions an anti-civilization ruled by superstitions and savagery, composed of men who feed their dead relatives to wolves believing they will be reborn and the Khalmuck Tartars, who "feed on the flesh of horses, camels, dromedaries, and other animals, and eat the entrails of them, even when the beast dies of the foulest distemper" (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 101). Here Hanway's narrative uses food to link together religion and civilization. Hanway's incredulity in regards to the Tartars' eating practices turns into disgust as he encounters a number of different religions,

social rituals, system of government, and gender relations. In recounting his travels, Hanway most often turns to religion to emphasize the cultural dissonance he experiences. He expresses distaste for the loud vocal expressions of “Indian pagans” and horror and disgust for their worship, during which they use “small bells with other music, and raise their voices in singing with the utmost vehemence” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 128). Hanway cannot understand their undisciplined praise and speculates that such effusions lead to idol worship—to him the height of superstition. In the first reference, hunger overwhelms reason. In the second, the physical pleasure of music sublimates a true spiritual experience. Distaste for any lack of restraint, physical or mental, clearly links Hanway’s two different descriptions of pagan religions. Both physical and mental discipline, the final section of this chapter shows, later become central requirements for Hanway’s charity recipients, including the boys helped by the Marine Society.

Hanway uses visceral and emotional language to describe the cultural inferiority of non-Christians. In his firsthand observations of “perverse” idolatry, Hanway’s language reflects his feelings of distress and disgust with experiences among Russian tribes, which include viewing their idol, Pagod, who he describes as “ugly and deformed to a degree of horror” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 128). In regards to Buddhist idolatry, he says, “it is horrid to the imagination, that any creature bearing the form of human nature should be sunk into such blindness, as to pay divine honours to so base a representation” (101).¹⁵⁴ There are two important elements of

¹⁵⁴ Hanway’s attitude is more decisive than other travelers, such as Joseph Pitts. Pitts is more conflicted in his language when observing Muslim devotions, saying, “I profess, I could not chuse but admire to see those poor creatures so extraordinary devout and affectionate when they were about these superstitions, and with all the awe and trembling they were possessed. Insomuch, that I could scarce forbear shedding tears to see their zeal, tho’ blind and idolatrous” (47). Pitts alternates between admiration and pity, the same emotions he hopes to evoke from his audience when they read about his captivity. One thing he and

Hanway's recounting of pagan religions. First, his descriptions of Indian pagans and Buddhists both express horror at their idol worship and superstitions and link them to a culture that is fundamentally irrational.¹⁵⁵ As he later observes, the most worrying aspect of his encounters with non-Christian religions is the revelation of the "abject state to which human reason is frequently reduced" (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 128). Second, the language he uses to describe Buddhism and paganism is reactionary and denigrating, and it demands a similar reaction from his Christian readers. These descriptions, combined with equally horrifying references to Englishmen "gone native," impressed on readers the importance of carefully managing contact between uneducated Britons and non-Christians.

Additional persuasive force in Hanway's criticism of non-Christian cultures comes from moments when he moves from observer to unwilling participant. Nearly one-fourth of the way into *A Historical Account*, a rebellion in the city of Astrabad disrupts the placid pace of his story, which is filled with congenial conversations and quotes from other travelers.¹⁵⁶ The caravan of

Hanway have in common is disdain for the superstitious nature and admiration for the religious fervor of the "Mohammedan."

¹⁵⁵ Admittedly, there are moments in his writing where Hanway acknowledges that some similar superstitions abound among the Britain's poor, who cling to some of the beliefs of their ancestral natural religions. He blames these false practices on the rich who have neglected their duty to cultivate the poor and prescribes thorough Christian instruction as the cure. I discuss the relationship between the rich and the poor and Hanway's thoughts on educating the poor a bit more in section three of this chapter. Additionally, Chapter Two examines the debate surrounding poor education in the eighteenth century at greater length. Nevertheless, many of Hanway's writings emphasize the difference between Christianity and natural religions and play down internal differences.

¹⁵⁶ The book moves slowly through each step of his travels, seeming to mimic the tediousness of his trip. In Russia, Hanway describes the flora and fauna of the countryside and the people and customs he finds from St. Petersburg to Moscow. This part of his account is uneventful, barring his encounters with Tartars, Cossack, and different pagan tribes. Things get more exciting when Hanway arrives in Persia, which is in the middle of a civil war. Hanway gives the history of this civil war, which marked the demise of the Safavid Dynasty, in Volume Two, but in the first volume, readers are introduced to the conflict from Hanway's perspective. In the city of Astrabad, Hanway ends up in the middle of a battle between factions loyal to Nader Shah, the military leader of the Persian Empire from 1729 to 1747, and rebels aligned with the Ottoman Empire. Several Ottomans, whom he calls Turkuman Tartars, threaten to take Hanway captive and sell him as a slave.

trade goods Hanway travels with makes him a target of rebel forces. Hanway responds with equanimity to his first moment of real danger, praying for safety and complying with the unreasonable demands of the rulers. He tries to find reassurance in the fact that there is no logical reason to kill him, “for it [his murder] could not conceal their robbery” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 194). However, the superstitious accusations of the townspeople that he is “the cause of the evils they foresaw” give Hanway a new sense of worry (194), which he only acknowledges once the immediate danger he faces has passed (198). The narrative slowly erases any idea of safety as he is subsequently threatened with slavery, starved, and then stranded in a battle zone without a horse or servants. Hanway loses any semblance of a measured tone when discussing the different people he meets during this period, as with each crisis his frustration and anger leak into the text. Importantly, these experiences of victimization allow him to assume an air of authority when juxtaposing Christian and non-Christian cultures.

Hanway uses the shift from distant observer to victim in his travel narrative as an opportunity to praise the qualities of Christianity, the most important of which is charity. While travelling the Persian countryside, he encounters men with their eyes ripped out, and gaping faces ride past him in a procession of suffering. This is evidence, he says, that “the external obligations of justice and charity are oftentimes overlooked among the Mahommedan” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 266). Unsurprisingly, charity is a distinctly Christian quality, and Hanway defines it as “humanity exercised to all creatures [in] an imitation of the divine mercy” (*A Journey* 162). Hanway compellingly argues that “in their beneficence the English have hardly any bounds” (*A Historical Account* 28) because he experienced it firsthand as a recipient and a contributor. As a person who demonstrates charity, Hanway refuses to allow his servants to beat or torture slaves, gives religious instruction to infidels, and forgives those who cheat and rob

him. More important are the moments of role reversal in his narratives, when he must depend on the kindness of others. For example, after experiencing the unfriendly and underhanded dealings of native Russian traders, he notes that he “was received by the British factors with great kindness and marks of regard,” which proves that “these gentlemen are distinguished by their affluence and generosity” (*A Historical Account* 75).¹⁵⁷ The moral rectitude of his fellow Britons helps Hanway survive the challenges of corrupt religions, governments, and people. He holds his countrymen up as Christian exemplars, capable of living in and yet staying separate from the corrupt influences of foreign cultures.

Hanway’s extensive descriptions of foreign superstitions and violence make the contrasting moments when he talks about Christianity or describes Christians more significant. For instance, an observation about Christian soldiers at the beginning of *A Historical Account*, which might be overlooked for its brevity, becomes more important when contrasted with the violence and disorder that defines most of his travels. In rapturous tones, Hanway notes, “the remarkable piety of the Danish nation appears even amongst the common soldiers. I observed

¹⁵⁷ Notably, in Hanway’s estimation, the ideal facilitator of a harmonious civilized existence is the Christian merchant, because he is a true man of reputation. In his biography, Taylor concurs that Hanway “had a high opinion of the merchant’s calling, whose work, he believed increased ‘all the pleasures of humanity’ and yet also supported ‘the national interest and honour’” (38). Nuala Zahedieh notes that an increased number of publications beginning in “late seventeenth-century England generally agreed that foreign trade underpinned the wealth, health, and strength of the nation. The merchant was hero” (143). Famously, Joseph Addison compares merchants to ambassadors and argues, “there are not more useful members in a commonwealth than merchants. They knit mankind together in a mutual intercourse of good offices, distribute the gifts of nature, find work for the poor, add wealth to the rich, and magnificence to the great” (206). Addison’s claims contribute to a longer historical discourse of trade, which Hanway clearly recognizes in *A History of Trade*. For example, Hanway quotes King Edward VI to prove sovereigns also valued the web of connection produced by trade. This narrative of mercantile ambassadorship influenced nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century histories of trade. For instance, Alexander Felix Baron von Meyendorff describes Hanway’s predecessor in the Russia Company, Anthony Jenkinson, as “one of the outstanding figures in the conduct of the commercial and diplomatic affairs between the two countries, and an instance of the close connection between diplomacy and commercial interests—the latter being at the time the driving factor” (119). The glowing approbations heaped on the merchant show the ways in which historical narratives failed to challenge the apparatuses of imperialism and in fact saw them as positive civilizing forces and agents of progress.

with great pleasure their good order and discipline. When the guard was mounted, they made their addresses to the supreme being in a regular manner” (*A Historical Account* 73). Here, Hanway identifies both external and internal discipline as qualities that set Christianity apart from and above other religions. His feelings of pleasure upon observing the orderliness of the Dutch Christian soldiers stands in stark contrast to the horror he feels upon witnessing the undisciplined worship of Russian pagans and Buddhists. Strategically, Hanway’s stories of civilized Englishmen and uncivilized savages help cement a sense of religious superiority that can bind together all Christians, merchant and non-merchant alike.

Hanway also envisions liberty as a concept that cuts across Britain’s class differences and economic inequality.¹⁵⁸ Britain’s brand of liberty is not reserved for one class of people, because, according to Hanway, “one common freedom creates a certain equality, which ought to be deemed more valuable than the distinctions of fortune and title” (*A Historical Account* 416).¹⁵⁹ Hanway makes freedom into something accessible to all Britons, even women, as part of their birthright. Thus in *A Journal of Eight Days* he assumes that “A British lady who has the right education and is endowed with understanding, has also the same love of liberty and her

¹⁵⁸ Hanway alternates between the terms freedom and liberty, using them interchangeably. While I recognize that there are different histories for these terms, they are not relevant to Hanway’s writing. Therefore, I will use them interchangeably in my discussion of Hanway.

¹⁵⁹ Like the two eighteenth-century sailors April Shelford examines in her informative article, “Sea Tales: Nature and Liberty in a Seaman’s Journal,” Hanway believed himself a citizen “of a polity unique in its possession of liberty, which was simultaneously a source of pride, moral integrity, and purpose” (Shelford 204). The fact that these two men, one a common sailor and the other an officer, believed with Hanway that they were defined by a unique liberty is telling. The idea that freedom is a classless element of British society links Hanway’s travel writing and the Marine Society. This cross-class confidence in liberty is not an idea original to Hanway. For more on liberty in British history, see David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*; J. D. Clarke, *The Language of Liberty: 1660-1832*; and Laura Doyle, *Freedom’s Empire*.

country, as a British Lord or Gentleman” (120).¹⁶⁰ Benedict Anderson’s concept of imagined community makes sense of Hanway’s cross-gender appeal. Anderson claims that the imagined nature of nations means, “regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship” (Anderson 7). In contrast to British liberty, the Russians operate under “a state of vassalage and one man can call another his property by virtue of his purchase, or by a right of inheritance,” Hanway explains to his audience (*A Historical Account* 103). The division between the free and unfree in Russian society leads to a dangerous level of discontent among the lower order. In a similar vein, the “Christian scheme” for marriage is the opposite of Islam’s, which, he says, “violate[s] the common rights of humanity, by making slaves of one half of the species” (184).¹⁶¹ Through these contrasting descriptions, Hanway ties together Christianity and liberty as strongly as he links Islam and tyranny.

Conveniently, given his merchant profession, Hanway ties together liberty and trade, and in the process makes the merchant the most important symbol of British Christianity and liberty. He claims that there “are few callings so free and independent” (*A Historical Account* 266).

Hanway even attributes a history of British imperial benevolence to merchants boasting, “Great

¹⁶⁰ Christian women, Hanway says, experience a “freedom so natural to mankind even from infancy,” a freedom “Mahomedan (sic) women and children do not enjoy” (*A Historical Account* 266). To prove the truth of this distinction, Hanway compares Christian and Islamic marriage. He says, “Marriage, upon the Christian scheme, is undoubtedly well calculated for the happiness of mankind” in large part because “the joys of an European husband, who understands his religion as a Christian, and his obligations as a social being, are certainly founded in reason and nature” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 268-9). Like many other moments in *A Historical Account*, there is no clear articulation of the qualities that make a Christian marriage better. Predictably, Hanway relies on a contrasting experience to make his point that women have more rights and security in Christianity. He reviles the Islamic practice of having more than one wife and the fact that men can quickly and easily divorce their wives. Muslim women, he believes, are subject to the vagaries of petty domestic tyrants while British women submit to reason. Men, women, and children, rich, middling, and poor all have a role in building Hanway’s British Empire.

¹⁶¹ Taylor affirms that “a recurring theme” in Hanway’s writing “was the status of women in Persia, who were generally degraded to be the ‘abject slaves of men’s appetites, being but little removed from prostitution’” (Taylor 31).

Britain is distinguished” by the fact that “no part of her greatness [comes from] unwarrantable slaughter” and a corresponding legacy of imperial cruelty to other European merchants (55).¹⁶² Hanway’s deliberations on religion, philanthropy, and trade also work to establish an organic unity between the individual and public interests. His perspective on philanthropy challenges Bernard Mandeville’s accusations in *Fable of the Bees* and *An Essay on Charity and Charity Schools* that private interest and self-love are inherently vicious. Opposing Mandeville, Hanway insists, “in the minds of most merchants, there seemed to be no reason for conflict between the interests of the boys, the interest of the nation, and their own enrichment” (Andrew 112).¹⁶³ He represents a critical shift from “the traditional strictures against mammonism and the great moral dangers of riches” towards a compromise between economic and spiritual concerns (Niele 587). Hanway makes the merchant’s work a concern for all when he insists, “the character of a brave and commercial nation is to be ever pursuing something useful to mankind” (v). Ultimately, Hanway’s writing endeavors to prove that the British (and Christian) merchant properly match and best realize the goals of religion, commerce, and government.

Both *A Historical Account* and *A Journey of Eight Days* show that to a large extent the hostility and physical dangers Hanway experienced (while doing what he believes is work for both God and the state) reinforced his belief in Britain’s cultural and moral superiority.

However, as the next section demonstrates, despite his best efforts, a number of moments in

¹⁶² Like many other eighteenth-century Britons, Hanway focuses on the Hollanders, who he says have lost their reputation and gained dishonor due to their cruelties to native populations.

¹⁶³ Hanway’s writing shows that there were two reasons, based on his own experiences, that led him to believe merchants were highly qualified to do charity work. Similar to trading companies, public charitable institutions had a pool of investors, were governed by a board of governors made up of merchants and aristocrats, and pooled resources, making both companies and eighteenth-century charities powerful political forces (Lloyd 123). Also, their contact with different groups of people, experiences developing and implementing plans, and work as part of a collective left merchants uniquely positioned for philanthropic work.

Hanway's narratives bring into question his representations of British religious and cultural superiority and strength. The first problem, which Hanway tries to resolve but cannot, is the fact that not everyone he encounters conforms to his expectations. There are irrational and dishonest Englishmen as well as helpful and honest Persians. The second problem he confronts is that the wars in which Britain engages reveal military and moral weaknesses that are hard to reconcile with Christian rationality and charity.

Imperial Uncertainties

James Stephen Taylor argues that Hanway's time in Lisbon influenced his philanthropy more so than his experiences in Russia or Persia. As evidence, Taylor looks at Hanway's summation of his experiences abroad, noting, "It is not merely by inference that this rich philanthropic tradition can be linked to Hanway's parallel work years later in London; he himself referred to Portuguese philanthropy in a way that leaves no doubt that it influenced his thought. It may be significant that the only hospital Hanway himself was to found was named 'the Misericordia'" (Taylor 16). Taylor's biography falls short of a deep critical appraisal because he merely notes the shared name of the two institutions. He fails to dig deeper into Hanway's writing to show any overlap in institutional operations, attitudes towards patients, or relationship to other charities. More importantly, Taylor's reductive observation about Hanway's philanthropic influences is just one of many instances where he fails to recognize the extent to which Hanway's failures shaped his philanthropic theory and practice. Crucially, Hanway's imperial uncertainties about everything from naval and economic strength to cultural coherence and religious zeal play a central role in the mission and policies of the Marine Society.

In *A Historical Account*, Hanway confronts issues that arise when his travelling countrymen living and working abroad do not conform to his expectations for Christians or Britons. For instance, he finds that John Eton, the ill-fated Englishman who tried to encourage direct trade between Britain and Persia, is not as welcoming or as honest as Hanway believes he should be.¹⁶⁴ Additionally, Eton's bad behavior leads to a breakdown in trade relations between Russia and Britain. Hanway observes men from different European countries setting themselves up as small potentates in Persia and the wilds of Russia—embracing the luxuries available, gathering women for harems, and turning their backs on their countrymen who travel abroad in search of trade opportunities.¹⁶⁵ In fact, Hanway finds all of these acts of cultural mimicry so abhorrent that he stubbornly clings to his English clothing even when a disguise might provide him with some protection in the war torn country.¹⁶⁶ Also troublesome to Hanway is the fact that his Christian servant prefers to throw “superfluous meat into the street, alleging that he would sooner give it to dogs than to Mahommedans, several miserable wretches being then waiting for it, whose hunger would not have suffered the nice distinction of refusing food from a Christian” (*A Historical Account* 234). This egregious breach of charity, he reassures readers, is the exception rather than the rule. Hanway also expresses embarrassment regarding the complaints of many “infidels abroad” about “the intolerable immoralities of such as profess the

¹⁶⁴ Hanway explains the problems with Eton away in terms of professional divisions. Eton stepped over the line trying to take on the role of merchant when his training and experience were better suited to that of ship's captain.

¹⁶⁵ Several accounts of sailors sold into slavery who took on the habits and religion of their captors were published around the time Hanway wrote his book. Among them is Joseph Pitts' *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohammedans*. There were also fictional representations, including Daniel Defoe's *Captain Singleton*. Studies of captivity narratives include Daniel J. Vitkus and Nabil I. Matar's edited collection, *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England* (2001); Richard Joseph Snader's *Caught Between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction* (1998); Daniel E. Williams and Christina Riley Brown's *Liberty's Captives: Narratives of Confinement in the Print Culture of the Early Republic* (2006); and Linda Colley's *Captives*.

¹⁶⁶ His writing demonstrates, as Roxann Wheeler notes, that “skin color was not the only—or even primary—register of human difference for much of the eighteenth century” (5).

purest, the best, and indeed the only divine religion in the world, that is the Christian” (*Seamen’s Monitor* 35). In each of these examples, Hanway tries and fails to find a reasonable excuse for his countrymen’s behavior. He believes that these men transgress the rules of Christianity and in the process threaten the security of British trade.

What Hanway calls the “three kingdoms” throughout *A Journal of Eight Days* further weakens his representation of religious unity, cultural coherence, and imperial strength. Hanway tries to make England, Ireland, and Scotland into a coherent nation united by Christianity and freedom; however, a bloody history of religious and politically motivated wars underlies his use of the term *three kingdoms*. The three kingdoms that Hanway brings together and presents as a cohesive identity had a history of conflicts, including the Bishops’ Wars in Scotland (1639 and 1640), the Eleven Years’ War in Ireland (1641-1653), and the English Civil War (1642-1651). Ultimately, Hanway’s use of the phrase three kingdoms highlights the fact that the Church of England appears as an institution of repression, not liberty, to Irish and Scottish Roman Catholics, Scottish Presbyterians, and many English dissenters.¹⁶⁷ This inconsistency in Hanway’s writing shows that “the sense of a common identity here did not come into being, then, because of an integration and homogenization of disparate cultures. Instead, Britishness was superimposed over an array of internal differences in response to contact with the Other” (Colley, *Britons* 6).¹⁶⁸ Colley’s observations on the dialectical relationship between Britons and

¹⁶⁷ Patrick Collinson’s book, *The Reformation*, traces a history of conflict between England, Scotland, and Ireland going back to the early-sixteenth century, noting that “the Reformation in all parts of the British Isles, was exceptional in the extent to which it was contested, both at the time and ever since” (125). In addition, within Hanway’s lifetime there were a number of Jacobite rebellions including one in 1745. See I.J. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (2007); Trevor Royle, *The British Civil War: The Wars of the Three Kingdoms 1638-1660* (2004); and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (1984).

¹⁶⁸ See also Kathleen Wilson, *Sense of the People and Island Race*; Dane Kennedy, *Imperial History and Post-colonial Theory*; P. J. Marshall, *Oxford History of the British Empire*; and Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*.

non-Britons shows that a number of eighteenth-century social engineers, including Hanway, tried and failed to excise cultural differences from the British populace.

Hanway alternates between imagining a cohesive nation made up of three kingdoms—England, Scotland, and Ireland—and worrying about the ways in which both the poor and rich undermine the stability of the nation and imperial practices. In *A Journal of Eight Days*, Hanway turns his gaze inward to criticize the rich and the poor for failing to adhere to the values of Christianity. He compares the rich to the “petty sovereigns” of “arbitrary countries” (234). Hanway also claims that a lack of martial spirit among the upper classes made the French threat real. Instead of actively contributing time and money to institutions like the Marine Society, Hanway complains that the wealthy “amuse themselves with fond conceits of private, and national felicity, which seem to be very precarious, and may easily be lost forever if we do not exert ourselves in every shape” (*Letter from Marine Society Member 4*). This lack of charitable discipline contributes to the creation of a pool of lazy indigent poor who would be better served living and dying in Britain’s defense, working the land, and serving the upper classes.

Hanway’s writing emphasizes the importance of religious zeal even when it undermines his descriptive claims of fundamental cultural differences between Christians and non-Christians. Against his own expectations and the overarching narrative of *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea*, Hanway actually finds that “There was much he admired in the Persians,” including “many characteristics that he thought western Europeans might profitably emulate—from their fondness for reciting poetry to their simplicity of dress” (Taylor 31). For example, he finds comradery with a Mullah who believes in monogamy, noting, “the tendency of the Mullah’s doctrine was plainly upon the Christian scheme of one to one” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 265). Hanway also praises the Mullah’s belief that “the state of marriage is

the state of nature; considering man as an animal, a rational, a social, or an accountable being” (*A Historical Account* 265). Additionally, Hanway finds the zealousness of the Muslim faith and obedience admirable. He observes, “a Mahomedan, who is a general to-day, and a common soldier to-morrow says, it is the will of God. Far from laying violent hands on himself, he thinks it at least as honourable to submit, and shew obedience to the decrees of heaven, as he did in the meridian of power, to obey the commands of his sovereign” (*A Historical Account* 198). Hanway even suggests that the Muslim resignation to a higher power demonstrates the proper mental state of the poor, a state rejected by the growing number of grasping, venal London servants.¹⁶⁹ These moments of cross-cultural understanding and appreciation stand in stark contrast to his usual tone of aversion and alarm.

Hanway alternates between the idea that “true religion makes the steadiest warriors, as well as the truest saints” (“Dedication to George Pocock” ii) and more cynical observations about the ways in which any sort of religious zeal makes strong warriors. One example he gives of the connection between religious fervor and martial strength comes from *A Historical Account*. Hanway observes, “it is a matter of no small moment to consider from what causes it arises that the professors of false doctrines, and the believers of things which clash with the common sense of mankind are, notwithstanding, so zealous. The imposter Mohammed has made his followers believe they shall secure an entrance into Paradise, if they die fighting for his cause” (*A Historical Account* 11). Perhaps realizing he is on the verge of heretical admiration, Hanway quickly turns to accolades to Christianity and the supremacy of the Christian warrior.

¹⁶⁹ This observation leads to a rant about vails (tips). He argues that vails are destroying society and the bond between master and servant by encouraging economic as opposed to affective relationships. Hanway also wrote “Eight letters to His Grace ---- Duke of ----, on the custom of vails-giving in England.” On vails, see Bridget Hill, *Servants: English Domesticity in the Eighteenth Century*; Gillian Russell, “‘Keeping Place’: Servants, Theater and Sociability in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain” (2001); and Tim Hitchcock, “Begging on the Streets of Eighteenth-Century London” (2005).

Consequently, he asks, “will not the Christian whose prophet is the son of God, before whom the whole earth will one day melt away; will not the Christian die a martyr if called to death; or, live for the honor of his redeemer, in a careful and zealous observance of his laws” (11). Hanway’s observations about religion and zeal become an important selling point for the Marine Society.

Finally, Hanway also relates what he describes as society’s failure to properly cultivate the poor to Britain’s martial and economic weakness. He ascribes to the belief that “the working poor are the grand source of the riches of all nations” (Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days* 232). Like many other people and organizations discussed in previous chapters, Henry Fielding, Bernard Mandeville, William Dodd, the Society for the Reformation of Manners, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Hanway worries that the poor are largely a gin drinking, lazy, filthy, and criminal class that civic-minded people must control if they are to serve the best interests of the common wealth and health. In a moment of bluntness, he states, “I believe the common of no country are become so exceedingly intemperate and debauched as ours, especially in London” (Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days* 233). Both the indolent rich and the criminal poor pose a threat to Britain’s strength as a nation and an empire, according to Hanway.¹⁷⁰ These worries contradict Hanway’s rhetorical use of *we* throughout all of his writings, which is one of many efforts to unite fellow philanthropists and charity recipients in their religious and secular concerns.

Hanway’s ruminations on the conflict between France and Britain further undermine his declarations of imperial strength. When Hanway proposed the Marine Society in 1756, he filled the immediate needs of the British navy, which was once again at war with France and Spain

¹⁷⁰ An additional slippage, which is overtly referenced when Hanway is threatened with slavery by two Persians, is a fact Colley notes in *Captives*: that “before 1750...it was Britons who were for a long time at risk of being captured and even enslaved by Muslim powers, and not other way around” (103).

over trade interests and land in the American colonies. In response to this threat, his writing emphasizes England's acrimonious relationship with France, which stemmed from claims to the English and French thrones and competing expansionist agendas. On the one hand, Hanway imagines an eternal freedom for Britons boasting, "A free people, who are really such, brave, honest, and wise, tho' they may perish, if so is the will of heaven, yet they never can be conquered" (*Letter from Marine Society Member* 6). Yet he warns the indolent rich, lazy poor, and all those unwilling to contribute to the Marine Society that France waits in the wings eager to steal that freedom. In *Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society*, Hanway again warns that "if we are not roused at the alarm, it is now apparent, that we shall soon be obliged to yield up those advantages for which our fathers have so often bled, and bid a long farewell to all our glory" (2). The "advantages" and "glory" Hanway references are not simply trade or wealth; France also poses a threat to British faith and governance. A battle with the French is one from which the British can only emerge as "victors or conquered slaves" (Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days* 321). Of key importance here is the uncertainty of all of these warnings. Despite Hanway's claims that God rewards the virtuous and that England is the most Christian nations, he is not certain that Britain will prevail in battle against France. One of the real dangers concomitant with building an empire is that "there never was yet a country under the scope of heaven, which long preserved its riches and liberty, when another great neighboring state was ready to seize on both" (Hanway, *A Journal of Eight Days* 320). The Marine Society, according to Hanway, protects the material wealth and ideological core of the British Empire from threats like the predatory, popish French.

The many uncertainties in Hanway's writing about Britain's moral, martial, and economic strength show that his plan for an imperial philanthropy in the form of the Marine

Society operated on the principle of what Britain could be, not what it actually was.¹⁷¹ In short, Hanway takes a “fake it until you make it” approach to imperial coherence and strength, saying “the appearance of national virtue is essentially necessary to the support of a free state” (*Journey* 119). When Hanway proposed his charity to solve the issue of undermanned war and merchant ships, he predicted, “the British naval power might awe the world; and our dominion at sea be so well established, as hardly to be shaken by any potentate on earth” (*Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society* 2). His bottom line, forging a concrete, visible link between “the navy, patriotism, and charity,” led him “to use philanthropy to bolster maritime trade and national defense” (Lloyd 148). The goal of aligning mercantile and national interests made the Marine Society admirable in the eyes of Hanway and his contemporaries, as did the hope that it could create and then defend the geographic and ideological boundaries of Britain’s empire.

Notably, Hanway’s philanthropic and imperial concerns connect with the early objectives of two other eighteenth-century philanthropic institutions, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK). Early institutional goals shared by both charities included finding ways to strengthen the religious hold of the Church of England on the poor of English descent at home and abroad. Like the Marine Society, these institutions labelled the poor and colonial settlers as threats to national and spiritual security and took practical steps to re-establish what they deemed the proper values in those people.¹⁷² Hanway’s imperial philanthropy also attempts to ignore or

¹⁷¹ As Sarah Lloyd observes, “Hanway’s imperial vision of state power was forged by nearly a century of colonial expansion” (Lloyd 153). The key word in Lloyd’s claim is *vision*, which refers to the way in which imperialism was an imaginative act.

¹⁷² In the eighteenth century, the SPG worked to revitalize the Anglican faith of British people in the Americas, and the SPCK focused on Christian education, including a failed experiment in schools for poor children, discussed in Chapter Two. It was not until the nineteenth century that these charities evolved into institutions that began doing what we call missionary work in the contemporary sense of

control a number of dissenting ideas and identities.¹⁷³ This is why looking at the entire corpus of his writing helps us understand how and why charity becomes an important form of social control over the poor.

Hanway's texts confirm the complex web of relations between people and institutions within imperialism. As Anne McClintock notes, "imperialism is not something that happened elsewhere—a disagreeable fact of history external to Western identity. Rather, imperialism...became central not only to the self-definition of the middle class, but also to the policing of the "dangerous classes": the working class, the Irish, Jews, prostitutes, feminists, gays and lesbians, criminals, the militant crowd, and so on" (5). And as Hanway's writing shows, London charities like the Marine Society were one of the many institutions shaped by imperialism, which in turn defined and policed the poor.

Sailors: Servants of Empire

Hanway's writings and activities bring together religion, empire, liberty, and commerce under the umbrella of benevolence. Thus, when proposing the Marine Society to the eighteenth-century public, Hanway claims that the institution's effectiveness comes from "British benevolence being thus united with native British fire" (Hanway, *Motives* 11). Furthermore, he

funding churches, religious training, and clergy trips to foreign countries. David Lambert and Alan Lester discuss what they call "colonial philanthropy," which I call imperial philanthropy, in "Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy". They settle on the label colonial philanthropy to emphasize the geographic/spatial dimensions of imperialism and the resultant charity work. Lambert and Lester argue that by the nineteenth century, colonial philanthropy had taken on three different forms. There were of course missionaries, "but there were also more secular philanthropic agendas for the empire, bound up with notions of virtuous patriotism as well as an abhorrence of British enacted violence and dispossession" (323).

¹⁷³ While Linda Colley argues of the 1707 Act of Union that "few people pretended at the time or later that a union on paper would automatically forge a united people" (*Britons* 12), Hanway needed to convince them of precisely that fact.

predicts this alignment “will diffuse a spirit of patriotism through these realms” (Hanway, *Motives* 11).¹⁷⁴ Similar to other eighteenth-century writers explored in other chapters including William Dodd, Henry Fielding, and Bernard Mandeville, Hanway identifies an indissoluble link between charity and civic duty, and he believes that his project, the Marine Society, represents the ideal physical representation of this relationship. In *The Seaman’s Monitor*, he informs young naval recruits, “the good success of our maritime affairs being one of our principle concerns, as islanders, and as a commercial nation, nothing can more directly tend to this end, than the good behavior of our seamen.” To ensure their good conduct at home and abroad, he requires sailors submit to a “good education and religious instruction of such as designed for seafaring life.” He also encourages “constant prayers be used, and good government established in our merchant-ships as well as ships of war” (Hanway, *Seaman’s Monitor* 1). This is one of many moments in Hanway’s writing when the Marine Society is represented as a philanthropy capable of making the British Empire ideologically cohesive in the face of the internal religious apathy, and ignorance, of the poor and external aggressions of foreign nations.

¹⁷⁴ Other eighteenth-century plans for unemployed sailors were similar to Hanway’s long-term plan for the Marine Society. For instance, in 1724 Daniel Defoe proposed putting unemployed sailors from the Royal Navy to work on patrol ships “to guard sufficiently the Coast of Africa, the West-Indies, and other places whereto Pyrates resort” (Defoe, *Pirates* 3). He believed this would reduce the problem of piracy in two ways: by employing some of the men who might resort to it out of desperation and by setting them to work breaking up the gangs already raiding merchant ships. A less specific but equally viable plan in Defoe’s estimation was “to find Employment for the great Numbers of Seamen turn’d adrift at the Conclusion of a War” (3). This solution, a “national fishery...would be the best Means in the World to prevent Piracy, employ a Number of the Poor, and ease the Nation of a great Burden, by lowering the Price of Provisions in general, as well as several other commodities” (Defoe, *Pirates* 3). A plan similar to Defoe’s resulted in the founding of the Free Fishery Society in 1749 with the “immediate purpose...[of challenging] Dutch supremacy in the deep-sea herring fishery in order to recover for Britain the natural bounty that lay off her coasts” (Harris 285). All of these plans attempted to solve the issues of unemployment and crime amongst the poor, but in Hanway’s broad critique of the state of eighteenth-century charity, they fall short of the discipline and discernment needed to effect real change.

Christianity, as Hanway expresses in his writing, is an exercise in discipline that allows the eighteenth-century philanthropist greater control over the poor. As such, he tells the Marine Society boys to “avoid all affectation and not to behave...in such a manner as if you had a mind to be taken notice of” (Hanway, *Seaman’s Companion* 76). Hanway also instructs them to keep their voices at a moderate level and to always control their actions in order to reflect their inward control. Hanway’s instructions to the Marine Society boys and other servants also focus on social discipline because he believed “the happiness of every individual in a community depend[s] on good order” (*Domestic Happiness* xv). Obedience to God through charity transforms, in *The Seaman’s Companion*, into sailors’ obedience to their captain. Hanway claims, “the God of hosts will give victory to those whom he thinks best to reward with conquest, and it generally is given to those who are most ready to obey their commander and do their duty best” (Hanway 6-7). Hanway’s declaration compellingly links Christianity, discipline, and marital success, illustrating how “in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the disciplines became general formulas of domination” (Foucault, *Discipline* 137). Ultimately, the Marine Society boys’ compliance with Christian discipline meant, for Hanway, the voluntary sacrifice of their lives to ensure Britain’s national and imperial security.

Hanway’s writing confronts popular representations of the sailor as a rebellious, irreligious figure in need of moral and social reform. Hanway’s concern about the sailor’s impact on the social order comes through in his emphasis on obedience. He thus instructs the boys, “you are obliged to demean yourself respectfully and submissively towards your superiors...not only because the well-being of society depends upon it, but because it is the command of God” (Hanway, *Seaman’s Monitor* 48). He grapples with the fact that a religious appeal cannot motivate an irreligious mass. This impediment to incentivization leads Hanway to

conclude of sailors, “no people stand more in need of religious admonition” (“Advertisement” 8). He submits as firsthand evidence of this problem the fact that, while on board any British merchant ship, “the strongest profession they [sailors] generally make of the being of a God, is that of swearing by his name” (*A Historical Account* 401). Hanway links the sailor’s lack of faith to both physical and social hazards, saying, irreligion “renders their lives much shorter than they would be; and seamanship in less honorable estimation, than an employment so useful and beneficial ought to be held in, by all commercial and civilized nations” (“Introduction” 20).

Public criticism and distrust of sailors is of secondary importance to the decimation of the maritime labor force due to unnecessary deaths. Hanway’s tone alternates between admiration and criticism when he observes, “our seamen are generally as insensible of danger to their souls, as dauntless with respect to their bodies” (*A Historical Account* 20). While praising sailors’ lack of fear in the face of danger, Hanway worries that their fighting spirit is destructive, not constructive. Nevertheless, he reassures readers, “it is obvious to the candid and discerning world that vigilance and zeal in their superiors may reduce them to a state of obedience to God” (Hanway, “Dedication to George Pocock” ii). He lays the blame for sailors’ disastrous loss of life and reputation on “the irreligious carelessness of their leaders” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 167). In attributing blame to the sailors’ superiors, Hanway implies that sailors can and will become the front guard of British faith, freedom, and commerce.

Hanway also acknowledges that the raw material (poor boys) he plans to mold come from the dregs of society. Part of the challenge and reward of his charitable exercise comes from the effort “to preserve those whose misery exposes them to the gallows or other untimely death and render them immediately useful” (Hanway, “Dedication” xxviii). Hanway explains that the abject circumstances from which he retrieves the boys have already conditioned them to sin and

depredation, presenting a challenge to reformers. Throughout his writing, he waffles between emphasizing the degeneracy and promoting the social potential of the poor. To potential contributors, Hanway describes the boys as “those who were in this deplorable condition and a bane to society” (*Letter from Marine Society Member* 16). “Increasing and Encouraging The Seamen” uses more colorful language to describe them. The pamphlet calls the boys an “unhappy swarm of young vagrant boys, who at present are the burthen, not of this city only, but of all the towns in England, and who seem to be brought up for the devil, that is for the gallows” (Hanway, “Increasing” 44). The boys come from a class that Hanway readily concurs clog the streets with beggars and prostitutes and the gallows with bodies. In a risky move, Hanway appeals to the personal safety of potential contributors, again highlighting the unsavory pool of applicants. He says “it is further evident that the public welfare is promoted, in the same degree and proportion as the distressed boy is out of the way of being dangerous to peaceful citizens; and also as he is usefully employed” (Hanway, *Origins, Progress, and Present State* 35). In the face of these social challenges, Hanway claims there are “more of the diligent and laborious, and fewer of the idle, especially in the lower class” (*A Historical Account* 363/529). In *Motive for the Establishment of the Marine Society*, he repeats the idea that the poor are not inherently lazy, claiming, “far from eating the bread of idleness,”... the poor “live ambitious of exposing their lives for the common good” (“Motive” 12). In contrast, the dedication section of *The Origins, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society* comes to a less generous conclusion about the nature of poor boys, predicting they will “acquire a new habit of thought and soon become useful inspite of their propensity to wickedness” (Hanway ix).¹⁷⁵ Hanway can ultimately have it

¹⁷⁵ Hanway says, “boys, whether they are awed by education, or only the fear of the gallows, some from temper, inclination, or habit of life, are dangerous on shore, although they may be deserving subjects at sea” (*Origins, Progress, and Present State* 44). At the same time that he acknowledges the criminality of some boys assisted by the charity, he promotes the ability of the ship to rehabilitate them. In addition, he

both ways: whether born with an inclination to work or to idleness, the poor serve his overall goal to bring together charity and labor.

This new breed of sailors, as Hanway imagines them, becomes what I call imperial servants. Raymond Williams defines the servant as someone given “the illusion of choice,” which “is important, for it allows him to pretend to an identification with the society, as if the choice has been real” (Williams 105). I use the term imperial servant in order to emphasize the fact that the philanthropic idea of freedom of choice is all sleight of the hands, a lie if you will. A lot of the writing of the period describes the common sailor as a mercenary, unruly group.¹⁷⁶ This popular, negative view of the sailor explains why impressment was viewed as a necessary evil. In short, sailors had to be forced to serve nation rather than themselves. The effort to coerce sailors using an idea rather than material or physical lure sets the Marine Society apart and is part of what appealed to contributors. This goes back to the idea of choice, or at least the illusion of choice that the Marine Society offered to its charity recipients.

It is clear that in his writings Hanway constructs the sailor as an imperial servant who works for the empire in a mutually beneficial and loving relationship, a master-servant bond similar to that between parent and child. To prepare the boys for imperial service, Hanway gives them familiar models to help them comprehend the superior-subordinate relationship aboard ship. The first and most important to Hanway is the relationship between “the almighty” and “the poor,” who are “the more immediate objects of his paternal care” (*Domestic Happiness* xiii).

claims that these boys, who might become criminals on land, have the right personality to thrive at sea. This seems a bit problematic, as people might take this as evidence that sailors are criminals, which was obviously not what Hanway meant to imply.

¹⁷⁶ See Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, *Captain Singleton*, and *Colonel Jack* for fictional representations of the “bad” sailor. Also, *A General History of the Most Notorious Pyrates* attributed to Defoe or Charles Johnson contains biographies of both real and fictional sailors who turned pirates. Criminal biographies in the *Newgate Calendar* include a significant number of sailors as well.

Strategically, given his aims, Hanway describes a direct relationship of care between God and the poor. The use of “paternal” renders the relationship in domestic terms, which he hopes the boys will understand. Hanway then frames the sailor-captain relationship in the same domestic language. For example, he says, “the good officer considers them [sailors] as a wise and tender parent does his own children” (Hanway, *Letter from Marine Society Member* 10). To cement this parental substitution, the Marine Society, and by proxy the ship’s captain and officers, take on the duties of discipline and education from the “parents [who] have left [the boys] in extreme poverty” (Hanway, *Motives* 8). Hanway uses the same language of duty and paternalism to define the relationship between the upper and lower classes in *Virtue in Humble Life*. That the Marine Society’s recruits first worked as servants to the ship’s captain and officers adds another layer to Hanway’s vision of a domestic order.¹⁷⁷ Hanway’s parallels become guideposts for the boys, showing them expectations for proper behavior, which include respect and obedience.

Hanway distinguishes the Marine Society from impressment, which he deems an unforgivable form of coercion, in order to frame sailors as servants, not slaves, and to prove his investment in freedom as a cross-class right. To his disappointment, “nothing sullies the native lustre, and stains the purity of the constitution of this country, so much as the custom of impressing men” (Hanway, “Letter from Marine Society Member” 66). His declaration of impartial public interest in helping the poor belies his circle of merchant-philanthropists’ concern that losing their employees to the state’s navy left their ships vulnerable and reduced their

¹⁷⁷ In fact, Hanway’s instructions to the Marine Society boys were tacked on to an instructional manual for servants published in 1778. Many of its instructions about obedience, virtue, and faith are copied verbatim, differing only in terms of the content of the prayers they are advised to say morning, noon, and night.

profits.¹⁷⁸ Eighteenth-century maritime scholars such as Peter Linebaugh, Marcus Rediker, and Hans Turley have shown that the unpopularity of impressment among the eighteenth-century public led to literary and physical protests. Turley affirms that these objections stemmed from the fact that the “idea of “liberty” was so ingrained into the Englishman’s consciousness that even during times of war, Parliament—or the central government—had trouble drumming up support for the navy” (22). Hanway was also of the opinion that impressment was contrary to the British “love of liberty.” He attributes the naval volunteer crisis to the practice of impressment, which stirred lower-class resentment and sapped nationalistic zeal. In the face of these worries about national security, economic stability, and class tensions, Hanway turns to philanthropy as the solution.

More than anything, Hanway hoped his philanthropic writings would spur poor families to contribute their sons and would inspire those boys to step willingly onto the decks of ships to potentially die from disease or battle wounds. In a moment that can be read either as one of deep cynicism or of optimism Hanway says, “a small assistance is of the greatest moment” because recipients like the Marine Society boys are then willing “to die in a service where they are treated with humanity” (“Letter from Marine Society Member” 34). In other words, the Marine Society answers the call to ensure the nation’s security through the mental discipline and

¹⁷⁸ As England found itself embroiled in increasingly longer and more frequent wars and without a standing navy, impressment increasingly became a problem, in the opinion of merchants (largely starting at the end of the seventeenth century). Hanway claims the Marine Society operates on the assumption that “the best law by which the hearts of the common people...are won is kindness” (*Origin, Progress, and Present State* 11). In *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash*, Hans Turley also mentions several eighteenth-century texts objecting to impressment, including *The Sailors Advocate* (1728), *Plunder and Bribery* (1712), and Edward Barlow’s *Barlow’s Journal of His Life at Sea in King’s Ships, East & West Indiamen & other Merchantmen from 1659 to 1703*. See also Nicholas Rogers, *The Press Gang: Naval Impressment and its Opponents in Georgian Britain*; Denver Brunzman, *The Evil Necessity: British Naval Impressment in the Eighteenth-Century*; and Daniel James Ennis, *Enter the Press-gang: Naval Impressment in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*.

physical sacrifice of the nation's poor boys. Hanway opportunistically uses the fear of impressment to promote the value of the Marine Society, encouraging readers, who were all potential contributors, to "grasp at the present occasion, and esteem every mite which is thrown in towards superseding this necessity, as a treasure of the greatest value" (*Letter from Marine Society Member* 66). Blind to the coerciveness (and self-interestedness) of his philanthropy, Hanway confidently asserts that the Marine Society will not "infringe on the liberty of the subject, being also persuaded that volunteers will be most likely to serve their king and country with diligence and fidelity" ("Letter from Marine Society Member" 116). He recognizes that the poor are not positioned to have many choices, but he emphasizes the idea of volunteerism when it comes to charity recipients.

Advertisements for the Marine Society reified the connection between British imperialism, sailors, and freedom. As section one of this chapter demonstrates, engendering a personal sense of a common identity around freedom, faith, and commerce and across classes was an important goal of Hanway's writing. Hence, the literature the boys received after their first bath included *Instructions to Every Boy of the Marine Society*, in which Hanway reminds them of their identity. He says they are "the sons of freemen...the sons of Britons, who are born to liberty." As such, Hanway tells the boys they must "remember that true liberty consists in doing well, in defending each other" (*Instructions* 4-5). Hanway explains that this British liberty comes with expectations and duties on the part of its beneficiaries. First and most importantly, these new recruits must fight, because "the real love of a free people must ever prove the most invincible guard of the throne of their sovereign, and exalt it to its greatest height: their filial piety to him, will be the only impregnable bulwark against his enemies" (Hanway, *Three Letters* 8). Freedom also requires "obedience to just and wholesome laws, or by a due regard to the

temporary necessities of the state...we are still acting the part of good citizens, and native sons of liberty” (Hanway, *Three Letters* 7). Tellingly, even in his declarations of freedom Hanway manages to include an exhortation to obedience. In his early ruminations on charity, Hanway also links voluntary submission to a philanthropic institution to both personal and private improvement. He contemplates whether or not the lure of improvement might appeal to recipients since “labour is the parent of wealth, and the nurse of happiness: not only *our* riches but *our* safety, *our* liberty, and all of *our* domestic joys are founded on this basis; it gives strength and vigour to the individual and renders the state firm, prosperous and flourishing” (Hanway, *A Historical Account* 363). Notably, Hanway privileges labor as a means of public and private improvement and links public and private interests in the repetition of “our.” Additionally, he reminds readers that all Britons can have liberty and its concomitant wealth.¹⁷⁹

Hanway envisions the Marine Society boys’ first baths and new clothes as the first step in the voluntary process of creating imperial servants. In a practical sense, bathing and clothing the boys cured some ailments, eliminated vermin, and worked to ensure those diseases and vermin were not transmitted to the ship’s population. Additionally, clothing the landsmen and boys who boarded merchant and naval ships contributed to their integration into a new, close-knit community. But the more ideological and abstract appeals made by Hanway to charity patrons and beneficiaries temper these practical and concrete goals. The men and boys who stepped onto the ship’s deck underwent both a physical and mental transformation. For instance, in his justification of the Marine Society’s existence, Hanway notes that “many are polluted with filth, and covered with rags, the very stench of which is pestilential: then to review them cured of

¹⁷⁹ Hanway also dangles the idea of wealth before the boys in *The Seaman’s Monitor*, reminding them that some men find their fortune at sea and those who do not should be grateful that they have a profession.

those maladies, rendered clean and purified, dressed in the most proper clothing, and made as new creatures” (*Motives* 10).¹⁸⁰ Hanway draws on Christian theology, specifically the concepts of baptism and spiritual death and resurrection, to cement the importance of bathing.

Hanway also emphasizes Christian discipline and surveillance in his instructions to the Marine Society boys. In *Instructions to Every Boy*, he warns, “my good lad, unless you exert yourself, and are careful to keep yourself tight and clean, you will forfeit the benefit you now enjoy, and fall into the wretched situation of filth and rags” (3). Hanway has a long list of instructions to help keep the boys spiritually clean, including prayer, Bible reading, and obedience to their masters. The language of *Instructions to Every Boy* assumes the Marine Society boys will be well equipped and motivated to discipline and surveil themselves by the end of their transformation.

The final step in the preparatory process Hanway develops involves engendering a sense of duty in the poor through religious inculcation and education. He informs the ship’s officers, “The truer sense they have of their duty to Him, the better understanding they will have of their duty to you and the public” (Hanway, *Origins, Progress, and Present State* 64). Education becomes the means by which sailors and the poor in general learn to willfully submit to their duty. Unlike Mandeville and other eighteenth-century opponents of charity schools and Sunday schools, Hanway believes that it is a “vulgar notion...that the more ignorant the common people are, the more humble and submissive they will be.” He further explains, “ignorance in a free country operates very differently; it creates a brutish ferocity, and renders the people dupes to every artful demagogue who has skill enough to flatter them” (Hanway, *Virtue in Humble Life*

¹⁸⁰ Significantly, the second part of this quote alludes to the New Testament. Corinthians II 5:17 says, “therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are past away, behold all things are become new.”

viii). Like the upper classes, which learn the privileges and duties of British liberty from birth, the common people require tutelage. Without a basic education in religion and reading, they fall for false faiths and undermine the very fabric of British society. To those who worry about the effects of educating the poor, Hanway offers a reassurance: “but we need not be afraid of levelling conditions, on account of any superior knowledge acquired by the common education of the inferior classes of mankind” (Hanway, *Virtue in Humble Life* vii).¹⁸¹ Hanway’s pledge to Marine Society contributors proves that while he saw liberty as the cross-class birthright of all English men and women, he did not envision a world of class or gender equality. Instead, what Hanway imagines in his writings is an equal amount of ideological commitment, across classes and genders, to the goals of building and sustaining a British Empire.

Through the three-step process of bathing, clothing, and educating, Hanway guarantees the sons of the poor will become voluntary servants of the British Empire and Christian martyrs. His Marine Society literature claims that building a force of religiously educated and motivated sailors benefits the nation. He directs Marine Society donors to “instruct these young persons in the fear of God, and at the same time teach their hands to war and their fingers to fight, in the cause of their country, in the cause of real and substantial virtue.” The linking of spiritual and earthly warfare “will draw down the mercies of heaven on this nation” (Hanway, *Motive* 12). To support a Christian narrative of faith and imperial supremacy, Hanway raises the Puritan specter, saying, “we find the praying warriors in Cromwell’s days fought as if they were sure of becoming saints in heaven” (167). While not the most judicious reference, it does remind

¹⁸¹ See Chapter Two for a detailed discussion of the debate about educating the poor in the early-eighteenth century. This debate was revived in Hanway’s lifetime with the introduction of Sunday Schools, a movement he was moderately involved in.

readers that a history of British freedom exists and that the present is part of an ongoing spiritual and physical battle to maintain that birthright.

In response to imagined and real issues surrounding the sailor, the Marine Society creates the perfect sailor through a combination of religious, civic, and general education, according to Hanway. In his writing for the Marine Society, Hanway rebrands sailors as a malleable group of poor who can be trained to fight with Christian zeal in defense of coin and country, thus reclaiming the sailor as a symbol of imperial and religious discipline, liberty, and strength. This new breed of sailors, cultivated by the Marine Society and under the tutelage of English merchants, will be properly equipped to serve—defensively and representatively—the British Empire.

Conclusion

Ultimately, Hanway and many of his contemporaries applauded the grand design of the Marine Society as the philanthropic ideal. Taylor's biography claims that the Marine Society's appeal to the charitable community stemmed from Hanway's willingness to "combine the influence and material resources of private charities with the compulsory powers and still greater material resources of the state to serve ends that were both humane and polite" (Taylor 186). Here Taylor suggests that Hanway used the power of the state to establish a regime of social welfare that operated using force. Instead, as this chapter has shown, Hanway built his imperial philanthropy on mental, not physical coercions. Laying out the motives for establishing the Marine Society, he declares, "war has no terror to men, whose gratitude and affection make them eager to fly to the standards, and cheerfully risk their lives" (Hanway, *Motives* 24). Hanway used religion and the language of liberty to engender as sense of responsibility and common

interest in the poor and, in the case of the Marine Society, in sailors. All of Hanway's philanthropic projects (including the Magdalen Hospital discussed in Chapter Three) emphasized choice and personal responsibility in contrast to organizations like the Society for the Reformation of Manners and official policing institutions like the workhouse, which used physical threats and punishments to control the poor. Nevertheless, all of the charities discussed in each chapter of this project played an important role in an eighteenth-century philanthropic discourse that defined rich and poor, young and old, men, and women, and British and non-British in terms of their social value. This reductive thinking about different groups of people, especially the poor, harks back to the overarching concern, which united the moral, mercantile, and market economic theories explored in Chapter One.

Examining Hanway's travel and philanthropic literature yields several lessons about the sorts of cultural anxieties evinced by Hanway and his peers. Concern about the ways the poor increasingly questioned and subverted the social order contributed to the refinement of more subtle forms of social control. Similar strategies of isolation and surveillance in prisons and charity reflect worries that the poor were a threat to society. A perceived national crisis in faith spurred the production of domestically focused imperial philanthropies like Hanway's, which focused on internal problems of indolence and other vices among the poor; and others foreign missionary groups, which worked to shape the hearts and minds of natives populations and colonists.¹⁸² Additionally, the lack of surety with which people faced changes and differences during the eighteenth century assisted in the production of modern forms of race and racism, class and classism, sex and sexism. Roxanne Wheeler and Deirdre Coleman have noted that there are traces of social thought recognizable as gender, race, and class in the early-eighteenth

¹⁸² See chapter one for a discussion of the Society for the Reformation of Manners' fervent and public declaration of Britain's religious and moral crisis.

century. The conclusion they reach is that a racial discourse connected to gender and class with legal, economic, and social ramifications takes shape in the 1770s. Hanway's travel writing is a moments before the 1770s that shows the formulation of discourse of race through a relationship to the social body of the poor. The fact that all of these forces shaped Hanway's thinking and actions, reminds us that charity is not always synonymous with *good*; and that philanthropy is not and never has been a benign social institution.

Works Cited

- Addison, Joseph. "Spectator. No. 69." *The Commerce of Everyday Life: Selections from the Tatler and the Spectator*. Ed. Erin Mackie. Boston: Bedford, 1998. 203-206. Print.
- Andrew, Donna. *Philanthropy and the Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989. Print.
- Armitage, David. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- Baker, Simon. "The Maritime Georgic and the Lake Poet Empire of Culture." *ELH* 75.3 (Fall 2008): 531-563. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 May 2014.
- Brunsmann, Denver. *The Evil Necessity: British Naval Impressment in the Eighteenth-Century*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2013. Print.
- Clarke, J. C. D. *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World, 1660-1832*. New York: Press Syndicate, 1994. Print.
- Coleman, Deirdre. *Romantic Colonization and British Anti-Slavery*. New York: Cambridge, 2005. Print.
- Colley, Linda. *Briton*. 2nd ed. New York: Yale UP, 2005. Print.
- . *Captives*. 2nd ed. New York: Anchor, 2004. Print.
- Collinson, Patrick. *The Reformation: A History*. New York: Modern Library, 2003. Print.
- Cordingly, David. *Under the Black Flag*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1997. Print.
- Cruikshank, Dan. *London's Sinful Secret: The Bawdy History and Very Public Passions of London's Georgian Age*. New York: St. Martin's, 2009. Print.
- Dabhoiwala, Faramerz. "The Construction of Honour, Reputation, and Status in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6 (1996): 201-213. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov 2014.
- Davies, K.G. "Joint-Stock Investment in the Later Seventeenth Century." *The Economic History Review, New Series* 4.3 (1952): 283-301. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 Nov 2014.
- Defoe, Daniel. *Captain Singleton*. 1720. Cornwall: Dodo, 2006. Print.
- . *An Essay on Projects*. London, 1697. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 5 Nov 2014.
- . Defoe, Daniel. *A General History of the Pyrates*. Ed. Manuel Schonhorn. Dover: Mineola, 1972. Print.
- Distad, N. Merrill. "Jonas Hanway and the Marine Society." *History Today* 23.6 01 Jun 1973. Web. 09 Jun 2015.
- Doddsworth, F.M. "The Idea of Police in Eighteenth-Century England: Discipline, Reformation,

- Superintendence, c. 1780-1800.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 69.4 (Oct. 2008): 583-604. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Apr 2013.
- Doyle, Laura. *Freedom’s Empire: Race and the Rise of the Novel in Atlantic Modernity, 1640-1940*. Durham: Duke UP, 2008. Print.
- Evans, Tanya. *Unfortunate Objects: Lone Mothers in Eighteenth-Century London*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Ennis, Daniel James. *Enter the Press-gang: Naval Impressment in Eighteenth-Century British Literature*. Newark: U Delaware P, 2002. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1977. Print.
- . *Society Must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. Trans. David Macey. New York: MacMillan. Print.
- Fulford, Tim and Peter J. Kitson eds. *Travels, Exploration, and Empire*. Bloomsbury: Pickering & Chatto, 2001. Print.
- Gentles, I.J. *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Gilbert, Helen and Chris Tiffin. *Burden or Benefit?: Imperial Benevolence and its Legacies; The Invention of Altruism: Making Moral Meanings in Victorian Britain*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2008. Print.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.
- Hanway, Jonas. *The Defects of the Police the Cause of Immorality, and the Continual Robberies Committed, Particularly in and About the Metropolis: With Various Proposals for Preventing Hanging and Transportation*. London, 1775. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 6 May 2015.
- . *Domestic Happiness, Promoted; in a Series of Discourses From a Father to His Daughter, on Occasion of Her Going into Service; Calculated to Render Servants in General Virtuous and Happy*. London, 1786. *The Making Of The Modern World*. Web. 6 May 2015.
- . *A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea: With a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia; and Back Again through Russia, Germany, and Holland*. London, 1753. *The Making Of The Modern World*. Web. 6 May 2015.
- . *Instructions to Every Boy of the Marine Society, Given by their Secretary, When the Boys Set Out From the Seamens Office on Thursdays*. London, 1770. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 6 May 2015.
- . *A Journal of Eight Days Journey from Portsmouth to Kingston upon Thames; through*

- Southampton, Wiltshire &c, With Miscellaneous Thoughts, Moral and Religious; in a Series of Sixty-four Letters Addressed to Two Ladies of the Partie. To which is Added an Essay on Tea.* London, 1757. *The Making of the Modern World.* Web. 5 May 2014.
- . *A Letter from a Member of the Marine Society; Shewing the Piety, Generosity, and Utility of their Instructions, Religious and Prudential to Apprentices and Servants in General, Placed out by the Marine Society.* London, 1757. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online.* Web. 5 May 2014.
- . "Letter V. to Robert Dingley, Esq Being a Proposal for the Relief and Employment of Friendless Girls and Repenting Prostitutes." London, 1758. *The Making of the Modern World.* Web. 4 May 2014.
- . *Motives for the Establishment of the Marine Society.* London, 1757. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online.* Web. 5 May 2014.
- . *The Origin, Progress, and Present State of the Marine Society.* London, 1771. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online.* Web. 5 May 2014.
- . *The Seaman's Faithful Companion; Being the Religious and Moral Advice to Officers in the Royal Navy, Masters in the Merchants Service; Their Apprentices; and to Seamen in General; the Same Being Equally Calculated for Soldiers.* London, 1763. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online.* Web. 4 May 2014.
- . *Three Letters on the Subject of the Marine Society.* London. 1758. *The Making of the Modern World.* Web. 4 May 2014.
- . *Virtue in Humble Life: Containing Reflection on Relative Duties, Particularly Those of Masters and Servants.* London, 1777. *The Making of the Modern World.* Web. 5 May 2014.
- Henriques, U.R.Q. "The Rise and Decline of the Separate System of Prison Discipline." *Past & Present* 54 (Feb 1972): 61-93. *JSTOR.* Web. 23 Apr 2012.
- Hill, Bridget. *Servants: English Domesticity in the Eighteenth Century.* New York: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution.* 1984. Print.
- Hitchcock, Tim "Begging on the Streets of Eighteenth-Century London." *Journal of British Studies* 44.3 (2005): 478-498. *JSTOR.* Web. 10 Jun 2010.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan.* New York: Dutton, 1976. Print.
- "Jonas Hanway, The Philanthropist." *Frank Leslie's Popular Magazine.* 04 (1884): 499. *ProQuest.* Web. 9 June 2015.
- Kennedy, Dane. "Imperial History and Post-colonial Theory." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 24.3 (1996): 345-63. Print.

- Kowaleski-Wallace, Beth. "Tea, Gender, and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century England." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 23 (1994): 131-145. *Project Muse*. Web. 4 May 2014.
- Lamb, Jonathan, et al., eds *Explorations and Exchange: A South Seas Anthology, 1680-1900*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2001. Print.
- Lambert, David and Alan Lester. "Geographies of Colonial Philanthropy." *Progress in Human Geography*. 28.3 (2004): 320-341. *Project Muse*. Web. 13 May 2014.
- Land, Isaac. "Bread and Arsenic: Citizenship from the Bottom Up in Georgian London." *Journal of Social History* 39.1 (Fall 2005): 89-110. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 Mar 2014.
- Linebaugh, Peter. *The London Hanged*. New York: Verso, 2003. Print.
- Linebaugh, Peter and Marcus Rediker. *The Many-Headed Hydra*. Boston: Beacon, 2000. Print.
- Lloyd, Sarah. *Charity and Poverty in England, c. 1680-1820*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- Mackie, Erin. "Welcome the Outlaw: Pirates Maroons, and the Caribbean Counterculture." *Cultural Critique* 59 (2005): 24-62. *ProjectMuse*. Web. 10 Mar 2005
- Mandeville, Bernard. *Fable of the Bees*. 1723. Ed. Phillip Harth. New York: Penguin, 1970. Print.
- Marshall, P.J. Ed. *Oxford History of the British Empire*. Vol 2. New York: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.
- McLeod, Bruce. *The Geography of Empire in English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- McClure, Ruth. *Coram's Children: The London Foundling Hospital in the Eighteenth Century*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981. Print.
- McLynn, Frank. *Crime and Punishment in Eighteenth-Century England*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- McMullan, John. *The Canting Crew*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1984. Print.
- Meyendorff, A.F. "Anglo-Russian Trade in the 16th Century." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 25.64 (Nov 1946): 109-121. *JSTOR*. Web, 3 May 2013.
- Nieli, Russell. "Commercial Society and Christian Virtue: The Mandeville-Law Dispute." *The Review of Politics* 51.4 (1989): 581-610. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Jun 2011.
- Nussbaum, Felicity. *The Limits of the Human: Fictions of Anomaly, Race and Gender in the Long Eighteenth Century*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

- . *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1995. Print.
- Peace, Mary. "Figuring the London Magdalen House: Mercantilist Hospital, Sentimental Asylum or Proto-Evangelical Penitentiary." *Prostitution and Eighteenth-Century Culture: Sex, Commerce and Mortality*. Ed. Ellis, Ann and Markahm Lewis. London: Pickering & Chatto. 2012. 141-155. Print.
- . "The Magdalen Hospital and the Fortunes of Whiggish Sentimentality in Mid-Eighteenth Century Britain: "Well-Grounded" Exemplarity vs. "Romantic" Exceptionality." *The Eighteenth Century* 48.2 (Summer 2007): 125-148. *JSTOR*. Web. 19 Nov 2012.
- Pitt, Joseph. *A True and Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohammedans*. Exon, 1704. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 3 Jan 2012.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Putnam, Peter. *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia, 1698-1812*. Charleston: Nabu, 2013. Print.
- Rediker, Marcus. *Villains of All Nations*. Boston: Beacon, 2004. Print.
- . *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea*. New York: Cambridge, 1989. Print.
- Roberts, Tom Aerwyn. *The Concept of Benevolence: Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Moral Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan, 1973. Print.
- Rogers, Nicholas. *The Press Gang: Naval Impressment and its Opponents in Georgian Britain*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2008. Print.
- Royles, Trevor. *The British Civil War: The Wars of the Three Kingdoms 1638-1660*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- Russell, Gillian. "'Keeping Place': Servants, Theater and Sociability in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain." *The Eighteenth Century* 42.1 (2001): 21-42. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 Nov 2011.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1978. Print.
- Shelford, April. "Sea Tales: Nature and Liberty in a Seaman's Journal." *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture* 33 (2004): 193-219. *Project Muse*. Web. 18 Jun 2014.
- Snader, Richard Joseph. *Caught Between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction*. 1998. Print.
- Storrs, Virgil Henry. *Enterprising Slaves and Master Pirates*. New York: Peter Lang, 2004. Print.
- Taylor, James Stephen. *Jonas Hanway Founder of the Marine Society: Charity and Policy in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Berkeley: Scholar, 1985. Print.
- . "Philanthropy and Empire: Jonas Hanway and the Infant Poor of London." *Eighteenth*

- Century Studies* 12.3 (Spring 1979): 285-305. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Apr. 2014.
- Thomson, Janice. *Mercenaries, Pirates, and Sovereigns*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994. Print.
- Turley, Hans. *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash*. New York: NYU P, 1999. Print.
- The Vision, a Poem*. London, 1778. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 20 May 2013.
- Vitkus, Daniel J. ed. *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001. Print.
- Wahrman, Dror. *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004. Print.
- Wheeler, Roxann. *The Complexion of Race*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2000. Print.
- Williams, Daniel E. and Christina Riley Brown. Eds. *Liberty's Captives: Narratives of Confinement in the Print Culture of the Early Republic*. Athens: U Georgia P, 2006. Print.
- Wilson, Kathleen. *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire and Gender in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- . ed. *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- . *A Sense of the People: Politics, Culture, and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.
- Woodward, Colin. *The Republic of Pirates: Being the True Story and Surprising Story of the Caribbean Pirates and the Man Who Brought Them Down*. New York: Harcourt, 2007. Print.
- Zahedieh, Nuala. *The Capital and the Colonies: London and the Atlantic Economy, 1660-1700*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

Conclusion

Philanthropic Exploitation

The title of my dissertation, *The Gospel of Poverty*, an obvious allusion to Andrew Carnegie's 1889 essay *The Gospel of Wealth*, suggests that a single doctrine regarding the poor stood behind the different strategies and mission statements of eighteenth-century charities. The groundwork laid out in Chapter One shows that all the men establishing charities in the early to mid-eighteenth century implicitly believed that poverty must exist from both a religious and socio-economic standpoint. Thus, eighteenth-century writers used the New Testament teachings of Christ to explain their mission and the existence of the poor. As Chapter Three's consideration of William Dodd shows, philanthropists and their supporters likened their work to that done by Jesus and his disciples. They emphasized the fact that he chose to alleviate the suffering of the poor, rather than eliminate poverty. The pious explanations of poverty's existence were layered on top of socio-economic relativisms of the sort espoused by Bernard Mandeville in "of Charity and Charity Schools" (1723). In this essay he claims, "In a free society...the surest wealth consists in a multitude of laborious poor" (Mandeville 294). His essay also observes that social inequality is necessary and good. The material markers of class and economic difference are in Mandeville's estimation something to celebrate. They serve as signposts that society is moving in the proper direction. Therefore, a gospel of poverty and a gospel of wealth are two sides of the same coin.

Starting in the eighteenth century philanthropists started to use the economic language of profits and outcomes explicitly. They believed that their experiences as titans of industry and trade were transferrable and could make philanthropy more efficient and effective. Many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century philanthropic proposals raised concerns over the activities

and non-activities of the poor and proposed ways to coerce or force them into the profit-driven mode of the market economy. For example, G. M. Gent promises the government a profit of ten million pounds over five years in his tract *A Plan and Easie Way to Employ All the Poor and Idle People in England* (1698). Using weights and measures, Gent and other charity organizers focused on profit margins and streamlining. Instead of focusing on the suffering and needs of individual people, Gent's writing considers the numerical burden the poor place on parishes. Poor men, women, and children become numbers to be reduced instead of people to be assisted. The danger of this perspective is that the poor people they proposed to help became abstractions, making it easier to deny aid, cut programs, criminalize, and even enslave

Poor British subjects at home and abroad felt the effects of combining philanthropy and profit. The same philanthropic fervor enveloping Britons at home led to indoctrination efforts throughout the colonies. For instance, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG), established in 1701, was deeply invested in converting natives and slaves in order to build a Christian empire. The goal of the SPG was initially to revitalize the Anglican faith among British people in the Americas and it soon expanded its mission to bring the word of God to non-Christians. In the late eighteenth century, they launched a number of projects aimed at educating the American slave population. SPG proponents argued that religious education "seemed to make slaves more obedient" (Comminey 364). Part of the institution's willingness to justify both slavery and Christianity stemmed from their own investment in the slave system as owners of several West Indian plantations (Vibert 186). So, both at home and abroad, philanthropy worked to reconcile the state of poor and oppressed people with the demands of profit and religion.

Eighteenth-century philanthropy operated in an interventionist space where class difference was even more starkly highlighted. Since, inequality defined the relationship between charity contributors and recipients this often devolved into instances of exploitative philanthropy. Men in positions of power made assumptions about who the poor were and unilaterally decided the “best” ways to help them. In many of the examples explored in this project, individuals or institutions of charity prioritized the goals, knowledge, and worldviews of donors and managers over those of its recipients; and made decisions based, deliberately or inadvertently, on their own goals, needs, or desires. Even more problematically, the philanthropists in this dissertation, Jonas Hanway, Henry Fielding, and William Dodd, participated in and contributed to a system, which criminalized poor people who did not conform to a particular set of social expectations. The men and institutions examined in this project show the usefulness of opening up the category of philanthropic literature in order to gain a deeper understanding of how philanthropy operated as an exploitative tool.

As I have argued, philanthropic pamphlets, economic treatise, novels, histories, sermons, institutional data, and government decrees produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries show a shift in their central focus from punishment to indoctrination of the poor. This indoctrination frequently took the form of a limited, class-based education. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (SPCK) was the earliest eighteenth-century initiative to systematically educate and thus control the poor, but it was not the last. The Foundling Hospital, Magdalen Hospital, and the Marine Society offered reading, writing, and religious instruction to different groups of poor people. The push to educate the poor was not without resistance, but both pro- and anti-education camps aimed to reinforce, not upset, the social balance. While there was disagreement on the benefits of educating the poor, all of the literature agreed that the labor

was a useful tool to ensure the poor's social compliance. For these reasons, and the central role philanthropy has played and continues to play in education, employment, foreign, aid, and other social concerns, we should ask critical questions about the history, mission, and assumptions of the institution. My project is just one small contribution to a critical examination of philanthropy. Further work remains to be done on related topics including the relationship between economy, philanthropy, and eighteenth-century politics or race remains to be done. Furthermore, there are number of texts still waiting to be uncovered to help us understand the long history of philanthropy; and how it has helped shape class, gender, race, and sexuality in Britain, the Unites States, and elsewhere.

Works Cited

- Comminey, Shawn. "The Society for the Propagation of Gospel in Foreign Parts and the Black Education in South Carolina, 1702-1764." *The Journal of Negro History* 84.4 (Autumn 1999): 360-9. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Jun 2014.
- Gent, G.M. *A Plain and Easie Way to Employ All the Poor and Idle People in England and Thereby to Enrich the Nation*. London, 1698. *The Making of the Modern World*. Web. 7 Jul 2009..
- Jones, G.M. *The Charity School Movement*. Cambridge: U Cambridge P, 1938. Print.
- Mandeville, Bernard. "Of Charity and Charity Schools." *Fable of the Bees*. 1723. Ed. Phillip Harth. New York: Penguin, 1970. Print.
- Vibert, Faith. "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts: Its Work for the Negroes in North America Before 1783." *The Journal of Negro History* 18.2 (Apr 1933): 171-212. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 Jun 2014.