BRITISH FAMILY LIFE, 1780–1914

5

INDEX

P&C

BRITISH FAMILY LIFE, 1780–1914

General Editor
Claudia Nelson

Volume 5
Substitute Families

Edited by
Julie-Marie Strange

PICKERING & CHATTO
2013

Published by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
21 Bloomsbury Way, London WC1A 2TH

2252 Ridge Road, Brookfield, Vermont 05036-9704, USA

www.pickeringchatto.com

BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

British family life, 1780–1914.
1. Families – Great Britain – History – 19th century – Sources. 2. Parenthood – Great Britain – History – 19th century – Sources. 3. Parent and child – Great Britain –History – 19th century – Sources. 4. Children – Great Britain – Social conditions –19th century – Sources. 5. Families in literature. 6. Parenthood in literature.
I. Nelson, Claudia. II. Strange, Julie-Marie, 1973–
III. Egenolf, Susan B.
306.8'5'0941'09034-dc23

ISBN-13: 9781848931022

This publication is printed on acid-free paper that conforms to the American National Standard for the Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

Typeset by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by Berforts Information Press

BRITISH FAMILY LIFE, 1780–1914

CONTENTS OF THE EDITION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For patience, forbearance and editorial assistance, thank you to my co-editors, Claudia Nelson and Susan Egenolf. Thanks also to colleagues at the University of Manchester and Michael Watson for being very supportive at this time. For energetic assistance with transcription, thanks to Catherine Feeley and George Dent. Material from the Journal of the Superintendent of the Reform is reproduced by permission of Surrey History Centre, holders of the original manuscript, and of FamilySearch, creators of the microfilm from which the selections below were transcribed. Permission to print material from GB 127 M369/2/1-4, Manchester Industrial Schools at Ardwick Green and Barnes' Home, was granted by Manchester Libraries, Information and Archives. The Foundling Hospital (A/FH) material is reprinted courtesy of London Metropolitan Archives while material from Liverpool Orphan Asylum (362 SAL 4/1/1-10) is reprinted by kind permission of Liverpool Record Office, Liverpool Libraries. The 'Grove House' excerpts are printed by kind permission of the Salvation Army. Special thanks to Steven Spencer, archivist at the Salvation Army, for assistance with transcribing and explaining this material.

INTRODUCTION

In *The Family Story: Blood, Contract and Intimacy, 1830–1960* (1999), Leonore Davidoff, Megan Doolittle, Janet Fink and Katherine Holden observed that 'the family' carries intense emotional and practical weight, now and historically. So strongly is family implicated in a sense of self, they argue, that the existence of 'family' is largely taken for granted. Their book unpicks the conceptualization of family to consider the multiple ways in which the term was, and is, constituted. As the subtitle to their book acknowledges, the most common components of 'family' are blood ties (consanguinity), contracts (affinity) and intimacy (which can include friendships). The obligations of family were inextricable from political, economic and legal structures, but, throughout the nineteenth century, families were increasingly defined by a shifting range of practices, ideologies (especially domesticity), spatial boundaries (notably, the household) and identities (ranging broadly from the 'self' to the 'nation'). The first four volumes in this collection focus specifically on family as defined by blood, contract and intimacy. This volume extends the definition of 'family' to consider it as an imagined category constituted through notions of compassion, obligation and responsibility.

Our desire to acknowledge the elasticity of 'family' in the nineteenth century underpins the inclusion of a final volume in *British Family Life* that showcases diverse groupings of individuals and social projects that drew, to varying degrees, on the language of family. For some groups, the family was symbolic of a religious worldview where God was Father and His children owed compassion and loyalty to each other, first, in fulfilment of filial duty to Him and, second, as witness to His love. For others, the moral ideals invested in family throughout the nineteenth century, and the increasing association between family and citizenship, lent legitimacy to public bodies and welfare agencies' intervention in private life. The assumed sanctity of family life whereby a male head of household acted with absolute legal and political authority over his dependents was increasingly challenged throughout the nineteenth century by an expanding conception of shared responsibility for a social family. The fluid conceptualization of 'family' from strict contractual or blood ties to include moral values was intrinsic to the imaginative transformation of impersonal public or welfare

'institutions' into 'homes' of refuge for the friendless or hopeless and often relied upon organizers' creative deployment of family obligations and ideals. Likewise, the voluntary basis of many welfare 'homes' depended upon organizations appealing to donors' sentimental conceptions of a social family. Drawing on the eighteenth-century philosopher Adam Smith, Gertrude Himmelfarb characterized eighteenth-century charity as typified by sympathy for the poor, that is, a fellow feeling for their hardships unaccompanied by a desire for intervention beyond generic goodwill. In contrast, compassion denoted fellow feeling specifically for the sorrows of others with a longing to ameliorate or eradicate those sorrows. For Himmelfarb, the nineteenth century witnessed the massive expansion of compassion over sympathy. This move from eighteenth-century paternalism to nineteenth-century humanitarianism had implications for the social body inasmuch as the two outlooks depended upon conceptualizations of family obligations but were grounded in fundamentally different notions of the constitution of family obligations.[1]

The title of this volume, 'Substitute Families', reflects the fluid and diverse notions of family across our period, highlighting continuities and change. In particular, it is notable how many pre-Victorian charities depicted here emphasized the importance of moral and religious training, either as a supplement to or as a replacement for family instruction, as the underpinning of society. This emphasis gave way, eventually, to the religion of citizenship. For Himmelfarb, the 'fierce' religious zeal of turn-of-the-century evangelicals focused on the slave trade and child labour while the poor at home presented contentious recipients for actual charity, given the fear of pauperizing them. The theological zest of early reformers ebbed in later generations who counteracted attenuated religion with social zeal: the 'passion for religion was transmuted into the compassion for humanity'.[2] Certainly, the contrast in this volume between turn-of-the-nineteenth and turn-of-the-twentieth century welfare initiatives reflects a shift which the socialist Beatrice Webb characterized as humanitarianism taking the place of religion. This is not to say that religion disappeared from philanthropic life, nor that late nineteenth-century interest in social problems was new. Indeed, it is worth pointing out the number of late nineteenth-century humanitarians who were, or were related to, clergymen or acted from religious imperatives.[3] Rather, there was a change in the language of debt and obligation.

For some of the groups represented in this volume, reformers clearly intended welfare initiatives to supplement, enhance and exploit biological ties for a greater good. Other organizations offered shelter to individuals who were otherwise friendless and thereby sought to, literally, substitute the material services of biological family. For children especially, admission to an orphanage usually meant severance from biological family and subjection to socialization by the public or welfare body. Although the institution sought to deliver the financial

and educational obligations of biological family, the abstract language of 'family' as an affective tie may have held little meaning to the individuals accommodated. For some, organizations' strident intention to become a 'substitute family', as for example with the Industrial Schools or Barnardo's Homes, represented a source of conflict and contestation with biological families.

Like the biological family, welfare families were organized along gendered lines. It is notable, especially at the outset of our period, how many of the initiatives included here fell under the authority of men and had 'family' connotations in a controlling sense. The orphanage for the children of officers in the East India Company, while couched in compassionate terms and reference to men's obligation to provide for their offspring, was an extension of the colonial administration of the company and intrinsic to an imperial project. Institutions for orphans, especially female orphans, emphasized the paternalistic need to protect the most vulnerable. In most cases, this amounted to protecting female children who were easy prey to sexual danger and preventing the spread of vice. The Juvenile Reformatory likewise was undoubtedly intended to protect children from falling into crime while, simultaneously, claiming a legal and social right to protect society from the nefarious actions of such children left unchecked by biological 'protectors'.

The 'fathers' of philanthropy, key figures in numerous charitable ventures, recur throughout. Notably, Thomas Bernard (1750–1818), a baronet and lawyer, spent much of his later life involved in philanthropic ventures, including several represented here. Such men invested their personal wealth in philanthropy, lent prestige to ventures through their symbolic patronage, held political power and legal know-how, and in Bernard's case at least, exercised their authority and interest to involve themselves in the daily running of particular schemes. Such men sanctioned charity within the bounds of a strict paternalist view of social hierarchies and obligations. Bernard, for example, firmly believed in maintaining strict social hierarchies (objecting, for instance, to the introduction of a minimum wage) and interrogating the moral universe of those claiming assistance. As Douglas Hay has noted, while paternalism was a powerful ideological construct, it would be naive to think that beneficiaries did not challenge expectations and assumptions.[4] Certainly, some of the examples here, especially those concerning juveniles and single mothers, suggest contestation over rights and expectations between donors and recipients. For example, the Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor extolled Sunday School reading and saving schemes to depict the Sunday School as a forum for socializing children who, in turn, could act as agents of moral reform at home. In this sense, benevolent schemes asserted the right to claim moral guardianship over children, in the name of religious duty, while seeking to percolate biological family structures to enhance moral standards more broadly.

What is missing from such reports is the possibility that working-class families already shared some of the values such schemes were keen to promote but, also, that families were adept at exploiting benevolent schemes for their own ends without necessarily internalizing ideas and values that did not suit. Likewise, paternalism did not depend on men; Elizabeth Hamilton's (1756–1816) House of Industry, although clearly rooted in a feminine project to improve women's usefulness, was essentially paternalist in aim and objective.

Agrarian paternalism struggled in the context of industrial capitalism. David Dale's (1739–1806) cotton mills in Lanark at the start of the nineteenth century exemplified benevolent paternalism, providing comparatively progressive working conditions for millworkers and education for children. Yet the contrast between Dale's ideals and those of his successor and son-in-law Robert Owen (1771–1858), who eventually rejected Christian paternalism in favour of socialism, highlight the tensions in an older system of philanthropy that treated workers as children rather than political agents in their own right. As industrialization and urbanization expanded, philanthropic figures such as Bernard continued to grace the welfare landscape but with significantly less confidence in their knowledge of the poor and how to improve them. Similarly, the threat posed to social stability by rapid industrialization was matched by a decline in numbers attending religious services, particularly in the established church. Not only did this remove a classic space for philanthropic intervention, the perceived decline in Christianity was also inextricable from rising anxieties about social breakdown.

The Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, more widely known as the New Poor Law, was intended to address the growing problems of poverty in a rapidly changing world. Pivotal to the new law was a government desire to deter the new industrial poor from dependency by withholding outdoor relief in favour of the 'workhouse test', otherwise known as 'less eligibility', whereby conditions inside the workhouse were below those of the poorest independent labourer. In practice, the strict principles of the Amendment Act proved difficult to enforce. The workhouse test was impracticable, not least because relief inside the workhouse was significantly more expensive than outside relief. The New Poor Law did little to resolve social problems either, causing a swell of radical opposition to the law. The failings of, and agitation against, the New Poor Law were further exposed in the economic recession of the 'hungry forties' when the swell of demand for assistance highlighted that, by design, few workhouses were capable of accommodating all those who might make demand on it. In agricultural communities, the seasonal economy made significant increases in applicants for relief at particular times of year inevitable, again exposing the shortcomings of the new poor relief law. The sympathy of some poor law guardians for the spatial separation of the aged, sick and infirm poor from the unemployed or casual poor was similarly impracticable in institutions with limited space. Likewise, although the New

Poor Law created unions of parishes and supposedly centralized administration of relief, guardians retained considerable flexibility at local level to interpret and apply poor relief policy.[5]

The deep-seated shame associated with the workhouse and the antipathy of the poor to the loss of independence necessitated by entry to the workhouse meant that few individuals considered it a 'home' of any sort. Likewise, the policy of workhouses across the country to separate husbands and wives, parents and children, meant the workhouse was inimical to notions of 'family'. For these reasons, the workhouse in general has been excluded from this volume. It could be argued that the workhouse symbolized the role of the patriarch, stepping into the position of paternal authority vacated by the man unable to support his family, but this stance risks suggesting that men's role within the family was purely financial (see Volume 2 in this collection). Likewise, even where poor law guardians did ameliorate conditions for some inmates, such as the elderly, hostility to the workhouse remained; many elderly people sought assistance from their children, usually in return for the performance of childcare.[6]

The exceptions to the inclusion of the workhouse here are, first, with reference to children forcibly removed from their families in the name of 'child protection'. For these children, the industrial school really did become their 'home' until they reached adulthood (a boundary that was repeatedly raised throughout the nineteenth century). The removal of biological family from these children's lives did not mean that blood relations were forgotten or that children did not seek to re-establish contact as adults. Indeed, the persistence of family ties between institutional children and their blood relations proved a constant source of irritation for most children's welfare agencies. The second constituency of workhouse inmates included here is the unmarried mother. The New Poor Law bastardy clauses made single mothers responsible for their offspring. Prior to the Amendment Act, the parish authorities supported single pregnant women and their children while seeking to reclaim the money from named fathers. The pamphlet included here by a workhouse chaplain suggests that application of Malthusianism to the 'problem' of single-mother families failed to deter women from illegitimate pregnancy. The problem for this chaplain was not that the workhouse was abhorrent but, rather, that it was not abhorrent enough. Single mothers exploited its services and treated the workhouse too much in the manner of an amenable home for unmarried mothers.

The pamphlet is significant for suggesting the limits of an imagined humanitarian or Christian 'family' who assumed responsibility for supporting the 'fallen' and outcast. As the sermon by the Reverend Stevenson MacGill (1765–1840) demonstrates, the obligations of biological families had spiritual and social counterparts and could be replicated in the structures of welfare homes. MacGill's emphasis on the need for society to step into a paternal role in the

case of the friendless woman without a father to call on for protection marked the apogee of Christian duty. Even so, the two pieces printed here on 'homes' for fallen women, although different in tone, formed part of the same moral economy whereby rescue had to be reciprocated by the willingness to reform. The pieces present a contrast to the essay by Josephine Butler (1828–1906) reproduced in Volume 2, which demonstrates the departure of a late-Victorian feminist narrative of 'fallen' women that emphasized the sisterhood of women against the institutionalized immorality of some men that was a canker to both the public and private family.

The number of charitable enterprises catering for the poor from the middle of the century exploded, giving rise to anxieties that compassion unchecked was, in itself, antithetical to the moral guardianship of the middle classes over the poor. The formation of the Charity Organisation Society in 1869 sought to bring science, regulation and moral discrimination to the administration of private welfare initiatives. Yet the proliferation of charity was, in part, a direct response to the failings of the New Poor Law and the apparent absence of fellow feeling from public bodies. The establishment of organizations such as the Liverpool Orphan Asylum suggested an implicit critique of poor law provision for children of the decent (but dead) working classes. The asylum in Liverpool was intended to save orphan children from *having* to enter the workhouse. As Charles Dickens (1812–70) noted in the opening chapters of *Oliver Twist* (1838), had the orphan babe who cried 'lustily' known he was an orphan thrown on the 'tender mercies' of the church wardens and overseers of the poor, he would have 'cried the louder'.

Children who entered the workhouse were separated from their parents; children under seven years of age were separated from those aged seven and over, who were further segregated by sex. Although intended largely for orphans and deserted children, poor law provision also catered for what became known as 'ins and outs', children whose parents routinely sought admission to the workhouse or, where possible, charitable institutions, as a short-term economic strategy. The temporary residence of ins and outs was considered by most parish guardians to be disruptive to the order and routine of pauper children's institutional life, especially as they perceived the parents to be the roughest of the poor, seeing no shame in having recourse to the union. The workhouse reared and schooled pauper children under the 'barrack' system, large-scale institutional buildings. The barrack system, emphasizing uniformity and discipline, exemplified the Benthamite principles underpinning the poor law but were increasingly challenged towards the end of the nineteenth century, especially when, in 1874, Jane Elizabeth Nassau Senior (1828–77) published a report on the provision of poor law education for girls. Senior condemned the barrack system and advocated a 'family' system of fostering and training children. The critical reception

of Senior's report by the senior inspector of poor law schools, Edward Tuffnell (1806–86), exposed the cleavage between perceptions of authority on the education and rearing of children: Tuffnell rejected Senior's report on the grounds of economy and her limited experience of poor law management as a woman. For Senior, it was exactly her special expertise as a female that invested her with extra authority on such matters.

Industrial Schools, which came under the remit of the Privy Council for Education in 1857 and were intended to cater for children identified by civic authorities to be in danger of criminalisation, were the most draconian in the interpretation of 'barrack' uniformity, discipline and routine. Certainly, a number of Industrial Schools were investigated throughout the late nineteenth century for overzealous use of corporal punishment and overly punitive regimes. Even here, however, the 'barrack' system had long been criticized. One of the originators of the Industrial School ideal, Mary Carpenter (1807–77), had originally campaigned for training children to citizenship through replicating the domesticity of idealized family life rather than relying on discipline and order alone.

The rise of domesticity as the underpinning of citizenship in the nineteenth century was pivotal to the reform of institutions for children but, also, the expansion of such institutions' remit and their right to interfere with biological families. If social commentators lamented the lack of domestic values in working-class homes, as Lydia Murdoch illustrates with reference to children 'rescued' by 'Dr' Thomas Barnardo (1845–1905), then the institutions in which they were reformed necessarily demanded a form of 'domesticity'. Likewise, if family was the kernel of moral training and citizenship, then institutions devised to elevate children's morals had to mimic a form of 'family'.[7] Charitable and public body transformation of institutions for children from a barrack style of guardianship to a 'family' system with the provision of 'homes' for welfare children was inextricable from this rationale.

As Dickens's *Oliver Twist* showed, the cottage home system was not entirely new and it was not always quite the humane alternative to the workhouse the terminology suggests. Oliver Twist was 'farmed' with twenty to thirty other boys to an elderly woman at a 'branch workhouse' for rearing until the age of nine. The picket fence of the woman's home hinted at a 'cottage' environment but was at odds with the squalid interior, while Dickens used the faux attachment Oliver displayed to the woman when he left her guardianship to emphasize the sheer absence of affection in Oliver's childhood. Even the small institution could be bleak, the routine mind-numbing and the loneliness of being without biological family almost unbearable. One amelioration to the loneliness of institutional life was friendship, the alliances formed with other children, as between Jane and Helen at Lowood, the brutal boarding school of Jane's youth in Charlotte Bronte's novel *Jane Eyre* (1847). In such circumstances, friendships forged

by children frequently adopted the roles and functions of sibling relationships. While such relationships were sentimentalized in fundraising literature (even if strictly regulated by institutional authorities in practice), the psychological value of such alliances for bereft or welfare children should not be underestimated.

By the end of the century, even Industrial Schools tried to articulate a narrative of family life with, for instance, children participating in festive celebrations and the renaming of individual 'Industrial Schools' as 'Homes'. As Murdoch notes, middle- and upper-class women, drawing on their superior understanding of children's training, were pivotal to the promotion of institutions as potential 'domestic' spaces for the nurture of healthy and happy citizens. This vision enabled the more conceptual incorporation of children's public institutions into the private sphere of femininity and family life. The Liverpool Orphan Asylum was overwhelmingly a project for the elite women of the city, although financial support for such ventures evidently rested on the approval and benevolence of affluent gentlemen, a point also applicable, indeed, to the middle-class family.

As Davidoff and Catherine Hall demonstrated in *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (1987), evangelical ideals in the nineteenth century eulogized women's moral superiority. Adult women fell under the patriarchal authority of their spouse or father, but domestic ideology's emphasis on women's innate capacity for nurture and homemaking gave them political, social and cultural leverage. The separation of home as a private space governed by the tender care of women from the masculine public sphere of economics and politics underpinned nineteenth-century notions of family. While welfare initiatives inhabited the public realm, the rhetoric of family underpinning many philanthropic organizations meant that, even when schemes were governed by men, the assumption that families and homes were 'made' by mother facilitated women's legitimate involvement in civil society. The examples cited in this volume include two early nineteenth-century women, a widow and a spinster, whose initiatives enabled them, and their female associates, to engage in public matters by drawing on their specific feminine qualities even if, like the women in this volume, their intelligence and energy were formidable. Pat Jalland's *Death in the Victorian Family* (1996) demonstrated how widowhood consigned affluent women to social death, but, as Lady Strangford's (1826–87) remarkable forays into nursing reforms demonstrate, philanthropic activity offered a lifeline for women who could not, like Queen Victoria, bear to sit and home and indulge their grief. The peculiar claims of womanhood over a social family facilitated an elastic performance of the duties of motherhood for a large constituency of 'children'.

Half a million Englishwomen were involved voluntarily in philanthropy (excluding the women in religious sisterhoods) by the end of the nineteenth century. Others worked in philanthropic ventures as paid professionals: nurses,

social investigators, journalists and artists. According to some historians, the advance of women in philanthropy transformed welfare from a paternalistic venture into maternalism. Here, philanthropy was run overwhelmingly by women on the grounds of their qualities as innate mothers (which meant they did not have to be real mothers) for other women and their children and merged the provision of welfare services into public policies. The concern of such women with questions about state and society transformed 'private' sphere concerns of family into large political questions, becoming inextricable from the campaign for women's citizenship through the extension of the franchise. As Seth Koven and Sonya Michel note, most of the active women in philanthropy were middle class because they had the leisure to engage in welfare schemes and political campaigns. Maternalism extolled the virtues of women's domestic roles while, simultaneously, legitimating women's interventions in politics and civil society.[8] For Ellen Ross, the involvement of women in philanthropy was pivotal to the wider history of women. The social work that women performed effectively trained them for local and then national government.[9] Elizabeth Burgoyne Corbett's (1846–1930) novel *New Amazonia* (1889) suggests the utopian conclusion of maternalist politics with the transformation of the state into the 'Mother of the People'. The novel collapses the private and public realms to herald a new dawn for the family of humanity whereby women have integrated their innate capacity for nurture into an independent political life.

Towards the end of the century, welfare homes increasingly emphasized their 'domestic' attributes. This shift enabled a 'patriarch' such as Barnardo to define his role as benevolent father figure of an organization while employing an army of women to deliver the domestic training considered essential for citizenship. As the number of charities proliferated in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the competition for donations and recipients was fierce. The sentimental value of domesticity, especially for little waifs, was immeasurable. As Murdoch has noted, the emotional value of orphans, real or imagined, who needed substitute parents to provide for them, financially and morally, was powerful. Small children were especially attractive because their youth could be construed as innocence, and their characters as pliable still. Marketing by welfare bodies tapped into the sentimental ideal of waifs being brought to the straight and narrow by regulated but happy domestic environments: the Foundling Hospital, Louisa Birt's Sheltering Homes and Barnardo's each emphasized domestic comfort and notions of play, in addition to moral and manual training, in their policies and publicity. That many such institutions moved from their urban origins to rural settings further underscored the perceived relationship between the moral contamination of the urban 'slum' family in contrast to the domestic bliss and purity of institutional life. In addition, the removal of children from towns and cities where parents resided was strategic, enabling organizations to place pragmatic obstacles before

biological families who threatened to destabilize the moral training of the institution by maintaining contact. That some children attempted to run away speaks not only of spirited youth defying authority but, also, suggests that some children missed their biological families and expected relatives to defend them against the structures and discipline of the institutional family. With regard to the juvenile reformatory, it is striking that relatives who returned children to the institution, supposedly morally degenerate and unfit as parents, appeared to share the values of discipline and authority that the Reformatory expounded. A cynical reading of such returns would be that parents were unwilling to financially support these children. However, given that almost all these children were of working age, the families would probably have welcomed extra income.

Most child welfare schemes justified their intervention in family life by highlighting the moral failings of parents unable to support the offspring they so thoughtlessly produced. Some organizations were explicit in claiming that the charitable home offered bright children better prospects than biological families. Family failure doubled if parents allowed selfish possessiveness to present an obstacle to a child's removal. This outlook is most explicit with campaigns to persuade parents to consent to the emigration of children to the colonies. Propaganda promoting child emigration emphasized the opportunities overseas for children who would never flourish at home. The economic returns for the ratepayer of exporting dependent children, or those liable to become dependent upon the ratepayer, were advantageous. Yet historical investigation into emigration schemes and the conflicts between parents and institutions over rightful custody of children demonstrates the contested nature of 'substitute family' authority, not least when it is doubtful how many parents understood that they had granted permission for the emigration of their offspring.[10]

Welfare homes were overwhelmingly for children, partly from pragmatic reasons, such as providing shelter for orphans, but also because fears about pauperization made charity for adults difficult to justify and navigate. Homes for adults tended to fall into key categories: fallen women, inebriates and the homeless. Although punitive in their reformist principles and demanding the surrender of autonomy, Magdalen homes for women probably did provide a degree of refuge for some sex workers. Furthermore, as Jenny Hartley demonstrated so well in her study of the home for fallen women established by Charles Dickens and Angela Burdett-Coutts, residents retained agency: they challenged boundaries, were deliberately disruptive and formed strong friendships with other residents that provided emotional and moral succour, although not always in the way that governing authorities hoped.[11] For others, of course, residency in a 'Home' exacerbated frustration, unhappiness and awareness of structural inequalities. Homes for recovering alcoholics expanded in the latter quarter of the nineteenth century but, like the homes for fallen women, were characterized by tensions and con-

flict between some residents and staff. Most working-class adult residents were required to perform arduous labour for the home while their status was on a par with that of wayward children. In other homes, conflict arose from sliding scales of residency fees whereby inmates paying higher fees were exempted from hard domestic labour in favour of embroidery or activities more readily construed as leisure. Nevertheless, a 'new home' did provide some adults and their biological families with respite. The explicit aim of schemes such as the Salvation Army's homes for inebriate women was to reform women who had succumbed to alcohol addiction and secure their salvation in Christ. This facilitated a new life in two senses: one that was liberated from the need for alcohol and enabled women to resume their maternal duties in biological families and another new life, being born again, in the Christian faith. As the records from Grove House printed below demonstrate, homes for adults often failed in securing all or some of their objectives. For a few residents, however, the experience of a temporary, substitute family was a motor to reclaiming 'real' homes and families.

Notes

1. G. Himmelfarb, *Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991).
2. Ibid., p. 4.
3. E. Ross, *Slum Travellers: Ladies and London Poverty, 1860–1920* (Berkeley, CA, and London: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 20–3.
4. D. Hay, 'Patronage, Paternalism and Welfare: Masters, Workers and Magistrates in Eighteenth-Century England', *International Labour and Working-Class History*, 53 (1998), pp. 27–47.
5. A. Digby, *The Poor Law in Nineteenth-Century England and Wales* (London: Historical Association, 1982) and L. H. Lees, *The Solidarities of Strangers: The English Poor Laws and the People, 1700–1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
6. P. Thane, *Old Age in English History: Past Experiences, Present Issues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
7. L. Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans: Poor Families, Child Welfare, and Contested Citizenship in London* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006).
8. S. Koven and S. Michel, 'Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880–1920', *American Historical Review*, 95:4 (1990), pp. 1076–108. See also S. Koven and S. Michel (eds), *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of the Welfare State* (New York and London: Routledge, 1993).
9. Ross, *Slum Travellers*, pp. 1–39.
10. M. Diamond, *Emigration and Empire: The Life of Maria S. Rye* (New York and London: Garland, 1999), and M. Kohli, *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada, 1833–1939* (Toronto, Ont.: Natural Heritage, 2003).
11. J. Hartley, *Charles Dickens and the House of Fallen Women* (London: Methuen, 2008).