

Contents

<i>List of Illustrations and Tables</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xiii
Introduction: The Empire of the Father <i>Trev Lynn Broughton and Helen Rogers</i>	1
Part 1 Rights and Responsibilities	
1 Fatherhood, Religious Belief and the Protection of Children in Nineteenth-Century English Families <i>Megan Doolittle</i>	31
2 ‘Married Men and the Fathers of Families’: Fatherhood and Franchise Reform in Britain <i>Matthew McCormack</i>	43
3 ‘What do you want to know about next?’ Charles Kingsley’s Model of Educational Fatherhood <i>Valerie Sanders</i>	55
Part 2 Patterns of Involvement	
4 Father as Mother: The Image of the Widower with Children in Victorian Art <i>Terri Sabatos</i>	71
5 Hands-on Fatherhood in Trollope’s Novels <i>Margaret Markwick</i>	85
6 Father(ing) Christmas: Fatherhood, Gender and Modernity in Victorian and Edwardian England <i>Neil Armstrong</i>	96
Part 3 A Different Class?	
7 Father’s Pride? Fatherhood in Industrializing Communities <i>Andrew Walker</i>	113
8 ‘First in the House’: Daughters on Working-Class Fathers and Fatherhood <i>Helen Rogers</i>	126

- 9 'Speechless with Grief': Bereavement and the Working-Class
Father, c. 1880–1914 138
Julie-Marie Strange

Part 4 Frontiers of Fatherhood

- 10 Missionary 'Fathers' and Wayward 'Sons' in the South Pacific,
1797–1825 153
Alison Twells
- 11 A Wealth of Fatherhood: Paternity in American Adoption
Narratives 165
Claudia Nelson
- 12 Fatherhood Real, Imagined, Denied: British Men in Imperial
India 178
Elizabeth Buettner
- Select Bibliography* 190
- Index* 193

Part 1
Rights and
Responsibilities

I

Fatherhood, Religious Belief and the Protection of Children in Nineteenth- Century English Families¹

Megan Doolittle

Throughout the nineteenth century in England, fathers stood at the symbolic centre of family, home and household, and of relationships between families and other social and political worlds. This position was not just symbolic, as fathers were invested with considerable power and authority, invisibly built into many social institutions. As this chapter will show, an implicit and often taken-for-granted aspect of fatherhood was providing protection for dependants, a complex role which shaped inequalities of power between genders and generations. Both formal and informal sanctions against fathers who were unable or unwilling to fulfil this role were at a historically low ebb as community governance of aberrant fatherhood was in decline, and legal remedies were limited.² Nevertheless, the rights of fathers were challenged at many levels, from everyday family dynamics to the political movements for women's rights and child protection which gathered momentum over the century. The transmission of religious and moral orthodoxies between generations thus emerged as a key index of fatherly competence and a significant arena for the reshaping of familial relationships.

Protection is a significant marker of parenthood in many cultures and historical periods, and is a feature of kinship and other dependency relations. At its most basic level, it reflects the differences in the capacities of young and adult humans, and the shielding of children from life's dangers forms a core element of parents' relationships with their children. Over the nineteenth century, the long and uneven transition towards the prolonged, sheltered childhood familiar to us today transformed these relationships,³ reshaping the roles of fathers and father figures, especially in the responsibilities and expectations of being a protector. The social arrangements of protection are constructed through relations of power, as Pathak and Rajan argued: 'the will

to power contaminates even the most sincere claims of protection. There are multifarious relations of dominance and subordination that circulate within the term “protection”.⁴ In the nineteenth century, within unequal relationships between generations, abuse and neglect were only the most extreme forms of domination available to parents. While children were seen as offering comfort and pleasure to their parents, obedience to adults in general and parents in particular was constantly evoked as a requirement of the protected child.

The protection of children was deeply embedded in constructions of masculinity and adulthood, partly because of its close association with being a provider. For the vast majority of families, income and property were acquired from a variety of earners and sources, but it was husbands and fathers who were understood to have responsibility for providing for those under their authority.⁵ In early modern societies an important characteristic of full manhood was independence, partly defined as not living under the protection of another, and best demonstrated through the ability to support a range of dependants.⁶ These ideas underpinned the economic and social changes from which the breadwinner model emerged during the nineteenth century.⁷

On the other hand, protection increasingly came to be associated with care in this period, and mothers were most often charged with the day-to-day care of children. Care might be understood in this context as having two meanings – caring *about* and caring *for*.⁸ Thus fathering included a protective caring *about* children while they were growing up, while the day-to-day caring *for* children was very often delegated to others.⁹ As family life was increasingly associated with the home as a protected domestic space, the enjoyment of children’s company became interwoven with care, comfort and pleasure for fathers.¹⁰

Alongside providing and caring, parents were expected to protect their children from exploitation and abuse within the norms of their class and culture. By the end of the century there was a widespread belief that this could not be left to families on their own, particularly those defined as deviant and/or poor, reflected in the growing body of legislation to limit the employment of children and the rise of the child protection movement.¹¹ Campaigners for a greater role for the state and philanthropists in child welfare focused on the role of wives and mothers, rarely directly challenging the authority of fathers.¹² When women contested the extensive formal powers of fathers, they argued that they required more authority in the family to protect their children, particularly where husbands and fathers abused their position.¹³

However, there was another important dimension to protective parenting relating to the spiritual and moral dangers faced by the young, and this forms the focus of the case studies below. At a time when control over environment and health were difficult, if not impossible, for most families to sustain, questions of mortality were often very much at the surface of everyday life. Across all denominations, the comforts of religion and in particular the Christian promise of reunion with loved ones in the afterlife were constantly invoked to inculcate in children the perils of unbelief.¹⁴

Religious orthodoxy also offered demonstrable conformity with a widely understood set of moral precepts, without which a child could face social

ostracism. A significant element of conventional morality was the growing Romanticist association of childhood with innocence¹⁵ achieved by the concealment of adult knowledge of sexuality, money, violence and death,¹⁶ and reflected in the pervasive Victorian image of the redemptive innocence of children.¹⁷ The role of parents in inculcating an appropriate religious orthodoxy and concealing adult knowledge became a focus of contestation as the three case studies below demonstrate.

These case studies have been selected to show fathers who faced particularly acute difficulties in managing their role in the moral education of their children, each one resulting in conflict which emerged into public discourse. The first two involve well-known figures, Percy Bysshe Shelley and Annie Besant, whose disputes ended up in court cases; the third is Chester Armstrong, who expressed this aspect of his life in his autobiography. All of these parents were married and had at least one son and daughter. Though the families came from very different social circumstances, their association with radical politics and unconventional religious beliefs formed the crux of their familial difficulties. While these cases cannot represent the highly diverse practices and contexts for family life in this period, they provide a framework for exploring the tensions between conventional fatherhood and those who contested it.

I

The poet Percy Bysshe Shelley was one of the very few fathers to be legally deprived of his children during the first half of the nineteenth century in an 1817 court case which was drawn upon and reiterated for more than a hundred years. Shelley was the heir of a landed family, whom he defied at the age of 19 by eloping and marrying Harriet Westbrook, the 16-year-old daughter of a well-to-do coffee shop proprietor.¹⁸ When they separated three years later, Harriet had a daughter and was pregnant with his son, and Shelley had fallen in love with Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, then only 17 years old. Harriet and her children went to live with her father. She drowned herself in the Serpentine in 1816, begging her sister to look after the children. Her suicide was hushed up, but her father then went to the Court of Chancery to make the children wards of court to prevent Shelley from bringing them up. Within a few days of hearing of Harriet's death, Shelley and Mary married, partly to strengthen his custody case, to heal their rift with Mary's father William Godwin, and to legitimate the baby Mary was about to give birth to – her third pregnancy.

Under most circumstances, Shelley would have won this case. Fathers' common-law rights over legitimate children were virtually limitless, and desertion, adultery or impoverishment were rarely significant barriers to retaining custody.¹⁹ Shelley had access to a limited income from his family's estate, and his legitimate heir (Harriet's son) had considerable 'prospects' of inheriting land and title.

However, Shelley was an avowed and published atheist²⁰ who publicly stated that he would bring his children up as atheists, the most significant factor in the ensuing case. While a Catholic, Jewish or Muslim father could not be prevented from bringing up his children in his own faith, an atheist was seen as depriving

his children of eternal life, a pressing concern in an age of high infant and child mortality. Only two children from the seven pregnancies of Harriet and Mary survived into adulthood. Shelley's lack of faith thus seriously offended deeply entrenched religious orthodoxies because he was refusing his children the protections of religion. Moreover, Shelley flagrantly transgressed moral codes about the sanctity of marriage in his class, and in the middle class to which Mary Shelley, the Westbrooks and Lord Eldon, the judge, belonged.²¹ It was only through marriage that children were legally bound to their fathers, who had no rights or duties over illegitimate offspring, except for the provisions of the Poor Law.²² Shelley argued in court that marriage should be terminable whenever spouses wished, a deeply radical stance when divorce was only available through an Act of Parliament.

When giving judgement in the case, Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor, is reported as saying:

This is a case in which, as the matter appears to me, the father's principles cannot be misunderstood, in which his conduct, which I cannot but consider as highly immoral, has been established in proof . . . which he represents to himself and others, not as conduct to be considered as immoral, but to be recommended and observed in practice, and as worthy of approbation.²³

Shelley deemed it his duty to raise his children according to his principles, but Eldon stated, 'the law calls upon me to consider [his principles] as immoral and vicious . . . I cannot, therefore think that I should be justified in delivering over these children for their education exclusively, to what is called the care to which Mr S. wishes it to be intrusted'.²⁴ In Eldon's view, fathers should form the 'opinions and habits' of their children, but he thought that, in this case, Shelley's views would injuriously affect both the children and society more generally.

An argument was made that removing the children to the guardianship of the Westbrooks would threaten their prospects of inheritance from the Shelley estate. But Eldon decided that protecting their moral and spiritual well-being was more important than the social and material advantages of landed wealth: 'I should deeply regret it if any act of mine materially affects those interests. But to such interests I cannot sacrifice what I deem to be interests of greater value and higher importance.'²⁵

Thus Shelley lost possession of the children. The Master of the Court investigated their circumstances and, five months later, a guardian was appointed (Mr Westbrook having died) and they were sent to Church of England schools in the country. Shelley was given limited rights of supervised access and attempted to see them before leaving England to live in Italy, but he never saw them again.²⁶ They outlived Shelley, but Charles died aged 11 while in the care of Shelley's father. Iolanthe lived to become a respectable married woman, having been cared for by Harriet's sister.

The point at issue in the case was the protection of the children from godlessness, immorality and political radicalism, a powerful mix during this turbulent period. Their father was refusing to protect them from damnation in

the next life, and from social ostracism within both Shelley's and Harriet's class. It was one thing for an adult to renounce religion in all its forms, but to withhold it from children was seen as putting them in extreme spiritual, moral and social danger, risking their future opportunities to find a respectable living or to marry, leaving them open to exploitation and hardship.

Wardship through the Court of Chancery was constructed as a relationship of protection, and thus seen as highly appropriate in this case. Acting through the Lord Chancellor, the monarch was seen as the symbolic parent of a ward, as *parens patriae*. Wardship originated in early modern England as a way of protecting the landed property of young orphans, but by this time wardship arrangements included other provisions for the care of wealthy children, particularly in respect of education and, most importantly, their religious upbringing.²⁷ In earlier times, the Lord Chancellor would bring together all wards of court each year for a tea party, a ritual occasion which confirmed their position as children of the Crown.²⁸ With the exception of the Poor Law, wardship provided the only alternative to informal kinship or neighbourhood sources of protection for children, and its use delineates for us some of the boundaries and inflections of the role of protector which fathers were expected to perform.

However, as Shelley's case demonstrates, it was not unusual for some protection to be delegated to mothers, kin, servants and schools. Mothers in particular were seen as important in providing moral protection, especially for daughters and 'infants', legally defined as under the age of seven. This was reflected in separation agreements, which were private legal contracts between spouses drawn up to avoid divorce proceedings, which set out maintenance and custody arrangements.²⁹ It was common for wives to take custody of girls, and husbands of boys, with access arrangements for children to see each other and the other parent.³⁰ This reflected the different roles of mothers and fathers in protecting children, whereby girls were seen to require female company and chaperoning, whereas boys needed to be introduced to the increasingly homosocial worlds of business, profession, or landed responsibilities. John Tosh points to the crucial role of fathers in the transition from boyhood to manhood in middle-class families, part of which involved easing sons into a profession or position in business.³¹ Daughters without a mother were undoubtedly vulnerable, and substitutes were seen as vital to girls if their own mother was not present.³² Thus men relied on female figures, whether relatives, adult daughters, paid companions or schools, to provide suitable company for their daughters, to protect their reputations and to prepare them for a dependent womanhood.

II

By mid-century, mothers had gained limited rights to custody of their children if separated or divorced.³³ However, the underlying principle of fathers as moral and religious protectors was still very much present, as shown in the complex court dispute between Annie Besant and her husband in 1879.³⁴ Born in 1847, she married Frank Besant, a Church of England minister in 1867, and had a son and a daughter, living as a vicar's wife in a remote Norfolk parish. After her

young daughter survived a life-threatening illness, she lost her faith. She separated from her husband and became an activist in the secularist movement before becoming a prominent socialist, a leading theosophist and an Indian nationalist.³⁵ The separation agreement provided that her son should stay with his father and she should have custody of her daughter. After Besant was prosecuted with Charles Bradlaugh, and acquitted on a technicality, for publishing the *Fruits of Philosophy*, an American birth control pamphlet³⁶, her husband applied to Chancery that his daughter be made a ward of court and that he be appointed guardian and have custody.³⁷

The Custody of Infants Act of 1873 allowed separated wives to have custody of their children, overriding the common-law rights of fathers, by giving legal recognition to private separation agreements. But there was an important caveat: the agreement would not stand if it were not for the benefit of the child.³⁸ Frank Besant argued that raising a daughter as a Christian and protecting her from unsuitable company overrode any legal rights which mothers had acquired under the Act. As in Shelley's case, he supplemented the argument that the girl should be raised as a Christian by successfully claiming that her mother was guilty of immoral behaviour in publishing an obscene pamphlet. Annie Besant lost custody of her nine-year-old daughter.

The father's right to determine his children's religious education was established by legislation under Charles II,³⁹ and was deeply connected to the regulation of religious orthodoxy and the reassertion of order based on patriarchal relations in the early modern sense of rule over households. In addition to arguing that his estranged wife could not protect her daughter from religious and moral dangers and was thus an unfit guardian, Besant also drew upon this paternal right to determine religious teaching, which persisted well into the twentieth century.⁴⁰ Like Westbrook, Besant thought that radical ideas about class and religion, equality and morality exposed children to social, spiritual and moral danger and exclusion.

Although as a married woman she was unable to act on her own behalf, Annie Besant mounted an appeal, but this also failed. Lord Justice James commented,

the conduct of the Appellant in writing and publishing such works is so repugnant, so abhorrent to the feelings of the great majority of Englishmen and Englishwomen, and would be regarded by them with such disgust, not as matters of opinion, but as violations of morality, decency, and womanly propriety, that the future of a girl brought up in association with such a propaganda would be incalculably prejudiced.⁴¹

He stated,

the Court cannot allow its ward [the daughter] to run the risk of being brought up, or growing up, in opposition to the views of mankind generally as to what is moral, what is decent, what is womanly or proper, merely because her mother differs from those views and hopes that by the efforts of herself and her fellow-propagandists the world will be some day converted. If the ward were allowed to remain with the mother, it is . . . not improbable, that she would grow up to be

the writer and publisher of such works . . . From such a possible future the Master of the Rolls thought it his duty to protect her, and we have no hesitation in saying that we entirely concur with him.⁴²

Annie Besant was never accused of adultery in court, but a woman separated from her husband was highly vulnerable to losing rights of custody because such rights were always, automatically, refused to adulterous wives⁴³ who were considered incapable of protecting children from sexual knowledge. Adulterous fathers, by contrast, were not seen as subjecting their children to moral risks as long as the children were not brought into direct contact with their lovers.⁴⁴ The sexual double standard thus ensured that adultery had radically different implications for mothers and fathers, a point which formed a crucial argument in the passing of the 1857 Divorce Act. The consequent changes in custody whereby children were cared for by the 'innocent' party emphasized the growing importance of their protection from the taint of sexuality outside marriage.

Underpinning these debates was the fear that a divorced or widowed wife's second husband would be able to influence her with respect to her children, supplanting the role of their 'natural' father, potentially exposing children to forms of education and upbringing which he would not have condoned, especially relating to religious denomination.⁴⁵ A wife could not protect her children from a stepfather's 'fathering', because wives were expected to submit to the wishes of their husband just as children were constantly reminded to obey their fathers. Thus a man's inability to bring up his children according to his own beliefs was a sign of a lack of authority and control over his wife as well as a failure to protect his children's spiritual well-being. Frank Besant successfully asserted himself on all fronts, as a minister of religion, a father and a husband, in the face of an exceptionally strong-willed and determined adversary. Despite several subsequent attempts, Annie Besant never obtained a judicial separation or divorce from her husband, nor did she regain custody of her daughter. Both of the Besant children were subsequently raised by their father as orthodox Christians, and when both returned to support and befriend their mother once they were adults, he disowned them.⁴⁶

III

The third case study is drawn from the autobiography of a mine-worker, Chester Armstrong, (born 1868), who lived in Ashington, a coal-mining town near Newcastle upon Tyne, who married in 1893 and had eight children, six of whom lived into adulthood.⁴⁷ His autobiography relates his intellectual and political journey through a crisis of faith: a turning against institutional Christianity towards free thought, radical socialism and the Independent Labour Party. This was inspired by reading Shelley and other Romantic poets before moving on to secularists such as Charles Bradlaugh, all of whom deeply influenced his religious and moral development. He also studied the works of sexual radicals, including Edward Carpenter. His active membership in local literary and political groups entailed much discussion of

these ideas and how they should be applied in the working-class political movement.

Armstrong's journey was not just an intellectual one. He sought to change his personal and domestic life to reflect his increasingly unconventional views, describing this process as 'a great experiment'.⁴⁸ He was determined 'to correct what [he] regarded as errors of [his] own upbringing as a child, especially those that spelt repressive discipline, and particularly that of imposing the religious beliefs of the parent on the plastic mind of the child before such beliefs can be understood' (p. 280). He felt it was essential to win the agreement of his wife, who did not share his interest in radical ideas, because '[he] had already dispensed with that idea of overlordship involved in the marriage vows; which implies obedience on the part of the wife' (p. 197). Putting his ideas into practice profoundly affected their parenting:

I had dispensed with theological sanctions. So we bent ourselves to the task of providing that spiritual nurturing, of a moral and ethical kind, which, as I assumed, would be of basic value to our children when they came to confront the problems of life on their own accord. I was fully conscious of the responsibility involved in such an experiment, since it was a departure from commonly accepted standards (p. 130).

However, he recognized that this task would involve imposing his views upon his family, and this provoked anxieties not only because it carried social risks for his dependants, but also because it exposed his position of authority and the inequalities of power in the family. 'How were my [domestic] obligations to be adjusted in accordance with this new attitude of mind? Was it right that I should impose this attitude of mind on my wife and family?' (p. 196).

Armstrong knew that his children were in no position to make a real choice about spiritual and moral concerns until they were old enough to trace his steps through doubt and understanding, but felt that in the end 'a very real form of freedom became the normal standard of [their] home life' (p. 197). The act of removing his children from Sunday school publicly marked his determination to challenge and reshape social norms:

Imbued with a due sense of parental responsibility, ultimately I withdrew our children from the Sunday school, with the determination to attend to their moral well-being within the limits of my powers. There seemed no other course that was consistent with my new convictions. Emboldened by the adventurous sense of entering upon a new experiment, I thus came to reverse a traditional family order. In doing this I also felt that the moral rectitude of my children would be more assured ultimately by saving them from being befogged by theological impossibilities (p. 196).

We know much less about Chester Armstrong's family life than that of Shelley and Besant not least because its tensions were not aired in the courts. His marriage did not come to an early end, and questions of sexual morality did not appear in his rejection of convention in his own life story.⁴⁹ As a working-class family, the Armstrongs faced challenges of insecurity and poverty, as well as

being deeply embedded in local and community life in ways which were not experienced by the more cosmopolitan Shelleys and Besants.

Armstrong shows how one individual took to heart the radical ideas of Shelley and Besant, and how difficult it was to put them into practice in everyday life. He thought he had succeeded, but at the beginning of the twentieth century it still felt like a dangerous experiment. Many decades after Shelley's moral precepts were publicly rejected, deep anxieties about shaping family life around notions of equality and freedom can still be traced, indicating that social norms about the protection of children were very deeply embedded in family life as well as legal and state institutions.

Throughout this period, these anxieties were expressed through debates about conventional religious teaching and its associated moral codes about sexual and family relationships. While mothers were seen as playing an essential role in inculcating these ideas, protection was framed around the presence of a father who was both responsible and in control of the moral protection of his children. When protection was defined in this way, only the most 'unnatural' or unsuccessful father could fail. However, among the fathers in these case studies, there were few who completely conformed to the norms of protective fatherhood: Frank Besant, who sought to keep his daughter safe from the free-thinking company of his estranged wife, and Harriet Westbrook's father who, unable to protect his daughter from a fatal marriage, removed his grandchildren from further involvement with Shelley. Other fathers struggled to do what they thought was right, overriding conventions of morality and religion to pass on their values and ideals to their children.

The ways of carrying out protective fathering were thus very diverse, but always highly gendered processes. Through these conflicts and interactions, family life and the position of fathers within it were subject to examination and transformation. On the one hand, mothers claimed a stronger voice in bringing up children through linking their more accepted concern with caring for children with a desire to be effectively protective. On the other, there was a growing view that fathers should offer a protectiveness which would allow their children to grow and develop as individuals, rather than imposing rigid conventions and discipline upon them.

When we turn to fatherhood as a role, a status and a position in families and in the social world, we can see from these cases that being responsible for protecting children was constructed as an attribute of masculinity, as a marker of adult manhood. This was contingent, not just on being a father or the activities of fathering, but on marriage, the basis for social recognition of men's relationships with their children and also the institution within which their duties and rights were delineated. Protection was sited at the centre of fatherhood, where the duties, rights and pleasures of being a parent were deeply embedded in daily life as well as social and economic structures and processes. Historical constructions of fatherhood in these cases show the anxieties and challenges of negotiating power relations not only within families but also between families and those wider social forces which were both shaped by and shaped family life.

Notes

1. I should like to thank the many people who have discussed this paper with me, especially Katherine Holden, Janet Fink, Leonore Davidoff, the Social Policy Department at the Open University and the editors.
2. Community sanctions had included 'rough music' which publicly shamed those deemed inadequate. For discussion from this period in the context of domestic violence, see Hammerton, *Cruelty and Companionship*, pp. 15–33. For changes in formal rights and duties, see M. Finer and O. R. McGregor, *The History of the Obligation to Maintain. Report of the Committee on One Parent Families*, PP 1974 [Cmnd. 5629] XVI, App. 5 (London: HMSO, 1974), pp. 100–1.
3. A. Davin, *Growing Up Poor: Home, School and Street in London 1870–1914* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996), p. 3.
4. Z. Pathak and R. Rajan, 'Shahbano', in J. Butler and J. W. Scott (eds), *Feminists Theorize the Political* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), p. 265.
5. See L. Davidoff and C. Hall, *Family Fortunes* for the middle classes and Seccombe, *Weathering the Storm* for the working class.
6. Rose, *Limited Livelihoods*, pp. 138–41.
7. For a discussion about explanations for the emergence of the male breadwinner, see C. Creighton, 'The Rise of the Male Breadwinner Family: A Reappraisal', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 38, No. 2 (1996), pp. 310–37.
8. J. Fink, 'Questions of Care,' in Fink (ed.), *Care: Personal Lives and Social Policy* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2004), pp. 6–8.
9. Nelson discusses the differences between motherhood and fatherhood which included discussions about whether caring about children implied a feminization of men, C. Nelson, *Invisible Men: Fatherhood in Victorian Periodicals, 1850–1910* (Athens GA and London: University of Georgia Press, 1995), ch. 2.
10. Gillis, *A World of Their Own Making*, pp. 109–29. Tosh, *A Man's Place*, pp. 27–50.
11. There is an extensive literature on child labour. See, for example, E. Hopkins, *Childhood Transformed: Working Class Children in 19th Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994). On child abuse, see L. Jackson, *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England*, (London and New York: Routledge, 2000). especially pp. 120–2 and G. K. Behlmer, *Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England, 1870–1908* (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1982).
12. This arose most sharply in the anti-vaccination campaigns and the introduction of compulsory schooling: N. Durbach, 'Class, Gender and the Conscientious Objector to Vaccination, 1898–1907,' *Journal of British Studies*, 41 (January 2002), pp. 58–83; G. Behlmer, *Friends of the Family: The English Home and its Guardians, 1850–1940* (Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1998), pp 92–103, For a discussion of the shift towards identifying mothers as the source of parental failure, see M. Arnot, 'Infant Death, Child Care and the State: The Baby Farming Scandal and the First Infant Life Protection Legislation of 1872', *Continuity and Change*, 9 (1994), pp. 271–311.
13. Griffin, 'Class, Gender and Liberalism in Parliament, 1868–1882', pp. 59–87; K. Gleadle, *The Early Feminists: Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), pp. 97–196; Poovey, *Uneven Developments*, Ch. 3.
14. Tosh, *A Man's Place*, p. 38 discusses the importance of evangelical constructions of the family united after death.
15. H. Cunningham, *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500* (London: Longman, 1995), pp. 74–8.

16. R. Mills, 'Perspectives on Childhood,' in J. Mills and R. Mills (eds), *Childhood Studies: A Reader in Perspectives of Childhood* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 12–16.
17. Nelson, *Invisible Men*, p. 72.
18. Biographical details are from W. St Claire, *The Godwins and Shelleys: The Biography of a Family* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989); C. Tomalin, *Shelley and his World* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), F. L. Jones (ed.), *Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, Vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964).
19. M. L. Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage and the Law in Victorian England, 1850–1895* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Lowe, 'The Legal Status of Fathers: Past and Present'.
20. P. B. Shelley, *The Necessity of Atheism* (1811).
21. Eldon's father was a coal factor in Newcastle upon Tyne. Eldon had eloped with his wife at the age of 21, but was an arch-conservative on questions of marriage and sexuality, arguing for the criminalisation of adultery in 1800, and was an opponent of divorce. R. A. Melikan, *John Scott, Lord Eldon, 1751–1838: The Duty of Loyalty* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 157.
22. I. Pinchbeck and M. Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, Vol. II (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp. 582–600.
23. *Shelley v. Westbrook*, *English Reports* (Chancery, 1817), p. 850, p. 851.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 851–2.
26. Jones, *Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, pp. 553–5 shows a draft letter to the Lord Chancellor in September 1817 requesting that he be allowed to see his children after the Westbrooks had refused him access.
27. J. Seymour, 'Parens Patriae and Wardship Powers: Their Nature and Origins,' *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 14, No. 2 (1994), pp. 159–88.
28. N. V. Lowe and R. A. H. White, *Wards of Court* (London: Butterworths, 1979), pp. v.
29. L. Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530–1987* (Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 174–80.
30. See, for instance, the case of 'Vansittart v. Vansittart,' in *English Reports* (Chancery, 1858), p. 26, and Annie Besant's case, discussed below.
31. Tosh, *A Man's Place*, pp. 115–16.
32. Davidoff, Doolittle, Fink and Holden, *The Family Story*, pp. 115–6.
33. Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage and the Law*, pp. 136–40.
34. There is an extensive discussion of this case in N. F. Anderson, "'Not a Fit or Proper Person": Annie Besant's Struggle for Child Custody, 1878–9', in C. Nelson and A. S. Holmes (eds), *Maternal Instincts: Visions of Motherhood and Sexuality in Britain, 1875–1925* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 13–36.
35. Biographical details are from Taylor, *Annie Besant*.
36. Taylor, *Annie Besant*, pp. 127–37.
37. *In re Besant*, in *Law Reports XI* (Chancery, 1878) p. 508.
38. Shanley, *Feminism, Marriage and the Law*, pp. 139–41.
39. Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, p. 362.
40. See, for example, *In re Agar Ellis*, in *Law Reports X* (Chancery, 1878), p. 49.
41. *In re Besant* (Appeal), in *Law Reports XI* (Chancery, 1879), p. 515, p. 521.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 521.
43. See, for example, early cases in the new Divorce Court: *Bent v. Bent*, in *English Reports* (Divorce, 1861), p. 1047 and *Clout v. Clout and Hollebone*, in *English Reports* (Divorce, 1861), p. 1047. However, after the passing of the *Guardianship*

of *Infants Act 1886*, the courts were slightly more flexible: for example, *In re A and B (Infants)*, *Law Reports* (Court of Appeal, 1896), p. 786.

44. R v. Greenhill, in *English Reports* (Kings Bench, 1836), p. 922.
45. See, for example, *Austin v. Austin*, in *English Reports* (Chancery, 1865), p. 1098.
46. Taylor, *Annie Besant*, p. 252.
47. C. Armstrong, *Pilgrimage from Nenthead: An Autobiography* (London: Methuen & Co., 1938).
48. Armstrong, *Pilgrimage*, p. 130.
49. However, for many autobiographers at this time, constructing their stories involved the repression of family conflict and shame, so it is difficult to make any assumptions about how Armstrong's wife and children experienced and understood his intellectual and moral positions. See J. Peneff, 'Myths in Life Stories,' in R. Samuel and P. Thompson (eds), *The Myths We Live By* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 39.

Index

- Abrams, Lynn, 182
adoption, 10, 23
 in America, 165–77
The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn
 (1884), Mark Twain [Samuel L.
 Clemens, 1835–1910], 171
Advice to Young Men (1829) (William
 Cobbett, 1763–1835), 47
America, 8, 23, 99, 165–77
Anderson, Michael, 117, 122
anti-slavery, 18, 130
apprenticeship, 114–15, 117–22, 169–71
Armstrong, Chester, 21, 33, 37–9
Arnold, Thomas (1795–1842), 56
art, 2–5, 71–84
atheism, 33–5
autobiography, 1, 5, 37–9, 66–7, 85–6,
 101, 122, 126–37, 141–8, 155–7,
 178–9, 186
- Balfour, Clara Lucas (1808–78), 135
Banks, J.A. and O., 94
Baptists, 18, 129, 132–3, 153
Barnardo, Dr Thomas (1845–1905), 168
Barringer, Tim, 79
Bella, Leslie, 97
Bennet, George, 159–61
Benson, Edward Frederic (1867–1940),
 56
Benson, Edward White (1829–96), 56,
 61
Benson, Mary, née Sidgwick
 (1841–1918), 56
Besant, Annie (1847–1933), 21, 33,
 35–9
Besant, Frank, Revd (1840–1917), 35–9
Beveridge, Annette (1842–1929), 183–4
birth control, 19–20, 36, 86
Blackstone, William (1723–80), 1, 23
Brace, Charles Loring (1823–90), 168–9,
 171–2
Bradlaugh, Charles (1833–91), 36–7
Bright, John (1811–89), 80, 128
- brotherhood, 14–18, 63
 Christian, 18, 22, 154, 158, 161–2
Brown, Ford Madox (1821–93), 79
Burdett, Sir Francis (1770–1844), 50
Burnett, Frances Hodgson (1849–1924),
 172–3
Butler, Samuel (1835–1902), 5
- Caine, Barbara, 19
Calvinism, 18, 133, 134
Carl Kringen or the Christmas Stocking
 (1854), 99
Carlyle, Thomas (1795–1881), 79, 86
Carnes, Mark, 174
Carpenter, Mary (1807–77), 134
Cash, S.J., 102–3
census, 86, 87, 116–18, 121–2
Chartism, 11, 101, 130–1
child
 artistic representation of, 2–3, 71–84
 author as, 6
 of British in India, 172, 178–90
 death of, 138–49
 discipline of, 4, 10, 18, 38–9, 56, 62,
 64–5, 89–90, 114–15, 119, 128,
 133
 emotional responses to, 85–6, 90–1,
 100–1, 138, 141, 143–6, 174–5
 illegitimate, 11, 127, 143
 and independence, 114–15
 literature for, 55–70, 133–4, 165–77
 motherless, 12, 71–84, 129, 133,
 146–7, 172–4
 neglect of, 10, 114, 135, 139
 play, 2–3, 71, 97–8, 101–2, 106
 as property of father, 9, 46
 ‘public children’, 168–9
 and religion, 16–18, 31–42, 115,
 128–30, 133–4, 166–71
 siblings, caring for 8, 19, 75, 78
 slum, 168
 violence against, 9–10, 135, 139
 as ward of court, 33, 35–6

- child (*cont.*):
welfare, 10, 32, 135, 165–77
see also adoption, education, labour, protection
- childhood
‘Deity of Childhood’, 166
romantic idealization of, 16, 33, 108
- Children’s Aid Society, 168, 171
- Children’s Employment Commission, 114–15, 118–19
- Chinn, Carl, 122, 146
- Chitty, Susan, 57
- Christianity
and brotherhood, 18, 22, 130, 154, 162
and family, 4, 13, 16–19, 21, 31–9, 114–15, 126–37, 153, 161, 166–71
missionary, 153–64
muscular, 79, 140
- Christmas, 96–110
feminization of, 97, 107–8
- Church Missionary Society, 153
- citizenship, 3, 10–11, 14–15, 18–20, 23, 43–54, 115, 121, 131–3, 135
- Clark, Anna, 45, 113
- coal industry, 113–25
- Cobbe, Frances Power (1802–1904), 134
- Cobbett, William (1763–1835), 46–7
- colonialism, 3–4, 7, 22–3
colonizer–colonized relationship, 153–64, 178–87
see also imperialism, empire
- conduct literature, 6–7, 13, 21, 47, 132, 153, 166
- Contagious Diseases Act, 12, 132
- Cott, Nancy, 166
- Court of Chancery, 9, 33–7
- Cromby, Charles, 102, 104
- custody of children, 9, 10, 33–7, 171
- Custody of Infants Act, [1839] 9, [1873] 36
- Darwinism, 17, 60
- daughters
and fathers, 6, 12, 49, 55–7, 64–5, 71, 75, 78, 87, 90–3, 121, 126–37, 143–6, 166–9, 172–3, 182–3, 186–7
and mothers, 12, 35–7, 127, 143–4
without mothers, 35, 78, 87, 129, 133–4, 166–9, 172–3
and sexual danger, 35–7, 49
- Davidoff, Leonore, 16, 52, 153
- Dawson, Graham, 184–5
- death and bereavement, 19, 71–84, 87, 133, 138–49
- Dickens, Charles, (1812–70), 14, 62, 96, 102, 172
- divorce, 9, 34, 35, 37
- domestic
feminization of, 1, 6–7, 13, 145, 165–6
masculine ‘flight from’, 7–8, 107, 126, 135, 184
sphere, 4, 13, 16, 43, 50, 73, 78–80
violence, 9, 101
- domesticity, 1, 3–8, 13–17, 22, 32, 44, 50, 52, 94, 106–8, 153–4, 161–2, 165–75, 179, 184–5
and middle-class hegemony, 1, 7–8, 13–17, 44, 71–84, 168–71
working-class constructions, 3–5, 7–12, 15, 22, 44, 101, 113–14, 116, 121, 126–7, 131, 134–5, 146–7
see also separate spheres
- Doolittle, Megan, 6, 19
- Dupree, Marguerite, 117
- East India Company, 179, 180
- education, 4, 21, 32, 34, 55–67, 114, 126–37, 170, 172, 178–9, 182, 184
see also father, mother
- elections, 46
- Ellis, Sarah Stickney (1799–1872), 13–14, 132
- empire
and family, 4
‘of the father’, 1, 8, 12, 20, 23, 153
see also colonialism, imperialism
- employers, 14–16
of families, 113–14, 117–19
as foster fathers, 166–71
- Eurasians/Anglo-Indians, 179–82
- evangelicalism, 16, 97, 108, 129, 153, 157, 161, 166
- Faed, Thomas (1826–1900), 72, 75–80
- family
artistic representations of, 2–5, 49, 71–84
commercialization of, 21, 108
economy, 113, 122, 127–9, 134–5, 139–40, 142–3, 146–8

- firm, 15, 114
 ideology, 6–8, 11, 15, 75, 126–7,
 134–5, 142, 178–9, 182
 law, 1, 6, 8–12, 30, 33–7, 165, 171
 as metaphor for nation, 2–5
 middle-class and upper-class, 6–8,
 33–7, 90, 96–7, 99, 178–89
 and political representation, 3–5, 7–8,
 11, 20, 31, 43–54, 128–9, 131–5
 and poverty, 11–12, 32, 50, 75–6,
 135, 140, 146–7, 169
 shape, 1, 8, 19–20, 22
 working-class, 2–5, 6–8, 14–15, 32,
 37–9, 48, 72, 113–49
see also child, Christianity, daughter,
 domesticity, father, labour, mother,
 son
- Farningham, Marianne (1843–1909),
 132–5
- Fasick, Laura, 58–9, 62
- fathers
- absent, 4, 62, 66, 74, 91, 98, 142–3,
 174, 178–90
 - abusive, 5, 10, 32, 114
 - and accountability, 7, 20
 - adoptive, 10, 23, 165–77
 - affectionate, 47, 55, 74, 81, 130
 - American, 23, 25, 165–77
 - authority of, 3, 6–7, 9, 13, 15, 20, 22,
 31, 52, 62–3, 102
 - and childcare, 6, 12, 14, 18, 22, 75–6,
 78, 88, 126–35, 145
 - controlling 65
 - and daughters, 6, 12, 55, 90–2, 121,
 126–37
 - death of, 146
 - declining status of, 6–8, 13, 74, 117,
 126, 135, 166
 - deference to, 7, 126–7, 132–3, 135
 - and discipline, 4, 10, 18, 38–9, 56, 62,
 64–5, 89–90, 114–15, 119, 128,
 133, 153–4, 157
 - and domestic sphere, 4, 13, 73, 78, 80
 - and education, 4, 21, 32, 34, 55–67,
 114, 128–30, 133–4
 - and emotional sensibility, 4, 16, 22,
 86, 91, 100–1, 138–48, 174–5
 - ‘empire of the’, 1, 8, 12, 20, 23, 153
 - as family representative, 3, 20, 31,
 44–7, 128, 131–2, 135, 153
 - and ‘feminine’ side, 85, 87, 90, 94
 - fictional, 5–6, 13–16, 55–67, 85–95,
 165–77
 - forefathers, 48, 154
 - grandfather, 19, 127
 - and the law, 1, 6, 8–12, 33–5, 171
 - missionary, 153–62
 - as mother, 71–84, 90
 - and patriotism, 3
 - playful, 1, 2–4, 5, 75, 78, 88–9, 97–8,
 101, 106–8, 128–30, 145, 166
 - and marriage, 9–11, 21, 34, 39, 73
 - and remarriage 12, 129, 133
 - as replaceable, 146, 165
 - responsibilities of, 8–9, 11, 14, 16,
 129, 135
 - rights of, 5, 7, 9, 17–18, 33–57,
 132–5
 - sanctions against, 31
 - single, 12, 19, 22, 71–84, 87, 90–1,
 94, 129, 133, 144, 146–7
 - soldier as, 2–5, 12
 - step, 37, 87, 169
 - surrogate, 10, 165–8, 184–5
 - as symbolic figure, 5–6, 13, 31
 - unnatural, 39
 - ‘Victorian’, 1, 5, 19, 85, 94, 126
 - welfare of, 13, 132
 - see also* child, labour, mother, son,
 widower, working-class father
- fatherhood
- and breadwinner ‘ideal’, 4, 8, 11–12,
 15, 20–1, 32, 56, 75, 100, 108,
 113–14, 122, 127, 131–3, 135,
 146–8, 184
 - feminization of working-class, 74–6,
 78, 80
 - and franchise, 10, 43–54, 80, 101,
 115, 128, 131–3, 135
 - ‘of God’, 4, 16–19, 153, 166
 - and householder status, 6–9, 45–6, 73,
 128, 131–3
 - and independence, 10–11, 14, 32,
 45–6, 82, 126–7
 - moral responsibilities, 21, 31–2, 34,
 36, 114–15, 127–35, 167
 - protection, 3–4, 11, 18, 21, 31–9, 56,
 153
 - psychoanalytic models of, 5–6, 19,
 126
 - representation of father in, 5, 13–16,
 23, 59–61, 66, 85–95, 165–77

- fatherhood (*cont.*):
 and respectability, 3–6, 8, 12, 15, 23,
 44–5, 51, 76–8, 80–2, 101, 114–15,
 121, 127–8, 142
see also Christmas, domesticity, fiction,
 masculinity, paternalism, paternity,
 patriarch
- fertility, 19–20
- Fildes, Sir Luke (1843–1927), 71–82
- Foakes, Grace, 101
- Foley, Alice (1891–1974), 139
- Foley, Winifred (b.1914), 122
- fostering, 10, 165–6, 168–71
- Freud, Sigmund, 5, 19
- friendly societies, 141
- Frith, William Powell (1819–1909), 75
- Galsworthy, John (1867–1933), 5
- Gaskell, Elizabeth (1810–65), 14, 16
- gender
 historiography of, 6, 43–4, 52,
 113–14, 138, 141–2
 as a primary category of political
 inclusion and exclusion, 20
see also fatherhood, masculinity,
 motherhood
- Gillis, John, 7, 56, 96–7, 182
- Gittins, Diane, 142
- Goodrich, Samuel [‘Peter Parley’]
 (1793–1860), 60, 166
- Gosse, Edmund (1849–1928), 5, 56
- Gosse, Philip (1810–88), 56
- Gray, Robert, 15
- Hall, Catherine, 16, 18, 44, 52, 185
- Hamilton, Janet (1795–1873), 127–9,
 134–5
- Hardy, Frederick Daniel (1826–1911),
 2–5, 14, 23
- Hardy, Thomas (1752–1832), 48, 50
- Harris, Jose, 101
- Havelock, Major-General Sir Henry
 (1795–1857), 184–7
- Haweis, Thomas (c.1734–1820), 155
- Hawes, Christopher, 180–1
- Holt, Marilyn Irvin, 168
- home
 in afterlife, 17
 and Christmas, 97
 feminization of, 1, 6–7, 13, 145,
 165–6
 and work divide, 6–7, 13, 135
see also domestic, separate spheres
- Hosgood, Christopher, 106–7
- Hughes, Thomas (1822–96), 167
- illegitimacy, 11
- imperialism, 178–91
- India, 178–91
 ‘Mutiny’ (1857–8), 4, 181, 184
 and nationalism, 36, 186
- industrial society
 and anxieties about fatherhood, 8,
 12–16, 114–15
 and masculinity, 79
- Ittman, Karl, 138, 142
- Jalland, Pat, 139–40
- James, Henry (1843–1916), 94
- Kaye, Cecil (1868–1935), 178
- Kaye, Mary Margaret (b. 1909), 178,
 179, 187
- Kaye, William, 178, 187
- Keating, Peter, 76
- Kestner, Joseph, 73, 75, 78, 80
- Kingsley, Charles (1819–75), 21, 55–67
- Kingsley, Fanny (née Grenfell)
 (1814–91), 57–8
- Kingsley, Grenville, 55, 57, 59
- Kingsley, Mary (Lucas Malet)
 (1852–1931), 55–8
- Kingsley, Maurice, 55–8
- Kingsley, Rose, 55, 58
- kinship, 8–9, 19, 31, 35, 181
- Kipling, Rudyard (1865–1936), 182, 187
- Knibb, William (1803–45), 130
- labour
 biblical emphasis on, 155
 child, 3, 8, 11, 32, 113–25, 127, 129,
 134, 165–71
 family and division of, 2, 3, 6–8, 15,
 22, 113–39, 143, 146–8
 fathers and family recruitment, 3,
 117–22
 female, 8, 13, 116, 121–2, 126–37,
 146
 and the home, 6–8, 12–16
 and masculinity, 2–5, 12–16, 74–81, 97
 movement, 113
see also father, mother, provision

- law
 father and, 8–12, 33–5
 father as, 6
 Lewisohn, Adolph (1849–1938), 165, 166
 London Corresponding Society, 48
 London Missionary Society, 153, 155, 157–9
 Lord Lyndhurst's Act, 12
 Lovett Richard (1851–1904), 159–60
- Malthusianism, 86
 Mangnall, Richmal (1769–1820), 59
 Marcet, Jane Haldimand (1769–1858), 59–60
- marriage
 companionate, 130–1, 135, 175
 and fatherhood, 9, 10–11, 21, 34, 39, 73
 in India, 179
 and occupation, 120–1
 remarriage, 12, 129, 133
 of soldiers, 3, 12
 in South Pacific, 156–7
 and married women's property rights, 9, 135
- Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister [Lord Lyndhurst's Act] (1835), 12
 Martineau, Harriet (1802–76), 60
- masculinity
 and authority, 20, 167, 185
 and cars, 102–3
 and 'civilizing' discourse, 153–64
 and domesticity, 7, 45, 63, 73–4, 76, 81, 86, 107, 147, 153–64, 175
 and effeminization, 74–8, 80, 90, 185–6
 and emotion, 62, 85–95, 101, 107, 129, 138–49, 174–5
 evangelical, 7, 16–19, 129, 153, 157–8, 161, 166
 hegemonic, 3–8, 75–6, 79, 81
 historiography of, 1–2, 6–8, 43–6, 58, 107–8, 113–14, 174–5
 homosocial, 7, 35, 75, 107–8, 128
 hyper-masculinity, 49, 59
 imperial, 3–4, 7, 178–89
 languages of, 15, 18–19, 48, 153–4, 161–2
 and marriage, 9, 31–54, 73
 muscular, 79, 140
 and 'new man', 6, 89
 public, 43, 45, 48, 52
 and racial difference, 153–64, 179–2, 185–6
 sexuality, 45, 58–9, 155–7, 159–60
 and work, 6–7, 13–16, 74, 79, 113–25, 135, 138–52
see also fathers, fatherhood
- McClelland, Keith, 44, 80, 128
 migration, 116–17, 121–2, 131, 134, 166–71
- Mill, James (1773–1836), 56
 Mill, John Stuart (1806–73), 56, 132
- missions
 'civilizing' discourse, 153–4, 156, 159–61
 class relationships within, 154–8
 gendered construction, 18–19, 153–4, 161–2
 female missionaries, 154
see also colonialism, paternalism
- modernism, 126
- mother
 and child custody, 9, 31–7
 and childcare, 4, 7, 32, 55–67, 85–95, 165, 166
 as educator, 4, 21, 55–67, 127
 father as, 71–84
 and illegitimacy, 11, 127, 143
 inadequate, 168
 as irreplaceable, 133–4, 146, 165
 legal identity of, 1, 9, 34–37
 memoirs by, 126
 moral influence of, 1, 35–7, 74, 76, 114–15, 127–8, 133–4, 167–8
 neglectful, 114, 139
 rights of, 1, 9, 20, 57, 132
 stepmother, 12, 60, 129, 184–5
 widowed, 140, 165
see also child (motherless), daughter, father, motherhood, son
- motherhood
 craft of, 140
 and cult of domesticity, 1, 4, 74, 101, 165, 169
 historiography on, 6–7, 138, 142, 146, 169, 182
 social, 134
see also mother
- Motherless* (1883), 77
 Mutiny Act (1837), 12

- National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 10, 135
- Nead, Lynda, 76
- Nehru, Jawaharlal (1889–1964), 186–7
- Nelson, Claudia, 6, 13, 19, 62, 73
- Oliphant, Margaret (1828–97), 57
- orphans, 10, 17, 127, 168, 169, 181
- paterfamilias, 1, 5–7, 13–14, 16, 73, 75, 126, 169
- paternalism
and ‘Fatherhood of God’, 16–19
imperial, 22–3, 178–87
industrial (and class), 12–16, 18, 102, 113–14, 165–6, 169–71
missionary, 18–23, 153–64
paternal metaphor, 1, 8, 12–18, 153
in social movements, 11–12, 15, 132
- paternity (biological), 3, 8–9, 19–21
exemption from paternal duty, 12
and illegitimacy, 11
race and denial of paternity, 23, 180–2
rights of overridden, 10–11, 33–5, 169
- patriarch
authority of, 1, 7, 11, 43, 45–6, 52, 80, 82, 94, 96–7, 100, 108, 113, 128, 133–4, 142, 145, 154–5, 157–9, 161, 166–7, 185–6
- patriarchy, 7, 22, 36, 38, 43, 45, 52, 75, 80, 133, 145, 166–7
challenges to, 7
and colonial challenges, 154–5, 157–9, 161, 185–6
contradictions in, 7, 97, 108, 154
and ‘Fatherhood of God’, 16–19, 128, 133–4, 153, 166
and gift relationship, 96–7, 100, 108
and intimacy, 145
limits to 75
and respectability, 82
as rule of householder, 20, 36, 43, 45, 52
as rule of father, 52
in working class, 79, 113–14, 127–8, 133–4, 142
- patriotism, 3
- periodicals, 13, 126
- Pettigrew, Elsie (b. 1910), 147
- philanthropy, 32, 78, 98, 102, 106, 108, 114, 128, 130, 140, 153–4, 161
female, 18, 114
- political economy, 86
- politics, 3–6, 11–12, 20, 43–54, 80, 115, 128, 130–5
- Poor Laws, 11–12, 34–5, 140, 146
- Presbyterian, 127
- prostitution, 12, 132
- provision, 4, 8, 11, 15, 21, 32, 100, 113–14, 122, 127, 132, 135, 138, 140, 142, 146–7, 184
emotional element of, 138–44, 174–5
- race, 23, 44, 182, 185
- Rathbone, Eleanor (1872–1946), 139, 147
- realism, 72, 82
- Redgrave, Richard (1804–88), 72
The Sempstress (1844), 72
- Reform Act, [1832] 20, 44–6, 51–2; [1867] 44, 52, 80, 131, 135
- Rendall, Jane, 44
- residuum, 80
- Roberts, David, 98
- Roberts, Elizabeth, 142
- Roebuck, John Arthur (1802–79), 44
- Roper, Michael, 43
- Rose, Sonya, 15, 113
- Rosen, David, 58
- Rotundo, Anthony, 169
- Ruskin, Margaret (1781–1871), 57
- Seccombe, Wally, 8
- secularization, 2, 7, 17
- self-improvement, 126–9, 131–2
- self-interest, 12–13, 132
- Sennet, Richard, 174
- sentimentality, 66
- separate spheres, 13, 15, 21, 52, 73, 116
limitations of as a concept, 6, 21, 116
see also domesticity
- separation agreement, 35–6
- servants, 8, 122, 127, 185
- sexuality, 12, 37, 45, 58–9, 155–7, 159–60
- Shelley, Mary (1797–1851), 33
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe (1792–1822), 21, 33–9
- Smelser, Neil, 122
- Smiles, Samuel (1812–1904), 86

- Smith, Mary (1822–89), 129–32, 134–5
 Society for the Protection of Women and Children, 10
 soldiers, 2–5, 12, 50
 sons
 and fathers, 4, 6, 7, 15, 33, 35–6, 47, 50, 55–7, 59, 62–5, 75, 85, 87–9, 91–3, 113–25, 130, 145, 159–60, 178, 184, 186–7
 and mothers, 33, 35–6, 57, 59, 62, 64
 see also paternalism for father–son metaphor
 Stark, Herbert, 181
 Steedman, Carolyn, 123
 stepmothers, 87, 129, 133
 Stocks, Arthur (1846–89), 71–84
 Strachey, Richard (1817–1908), 19
 Stratton-Porter, Gene, 172–3
 Sunday schools, 17, 114–15, 132–4, 154
- Talbot, Adelbert, 183–4, 187
 Talbot, Guendolen, 183
 temperance, 9–10, 128, 131–2
 Tosh, John, 1, 7–8, 21, 35, 43, 56, 73, 79, 97, 99, 107, 126, 130, 166, 184
 Towey, Alice, 101
 trade unions, 114, 121–2, 141, 143
 Trevelyan, Sir George (1838–1928), 183–6
 The Competition Wallah (1864), 183, 186
 Trollope, Anthony (1815–82), 21, 23, 85–95
 Trowbridge, J.T., 169–71
 Tyerman, Daniel (1773–1828), 159, 160
- unitarian, 18
 utilitarianism, 86
- Vason, George (1772–1838), 154–8, 161–2
 Vincent, David, 141
 violence, 9–10, 101, 135
- wards of court, 35, 36
 Warner, Susan (1819–85), 166–7, 169, 173
 Wesleyans, 153
 Westbrook, Harriet (1795–1816), 33, 39
 widows, 139–40, 146, 165–6
 widowers, 12, 19, 22, 71–84, 87, 90–1, 94, 129, 133, 144, 146–7
 The Widower, 72
 Wiener, Martin, 10
 Wilkes, John (1725–97), 49
 Wilkes, Mary, known as Polly (b. 1750), 49
 Wilkie, David (1785–1841), 71–2
 Wodehouse, Thomas, 2nd Lord Newton (1857–1942), 98–9
 Wolf, Simon (1826–1923), 165–6
- women
 ‘new women’, 7
 as target for conduct literature, 7
 violence against, 9–10
 ‘woman’s mission’, 18, 162
 women’s rights, 7, 132–5
 see also daughter, labour, mother
- Wood, Charles, 1st Viscount Halifax (1800–85), 97–8
 Wood, Charles Lindley (1839–1934), 98
 Wood, Edward, 1st Earl of Halifax (1881–1959), 98
 Woolf, Virginia (1882–1941), 5
- working-class father
 constraints on, 75, 79, 127–8
 and class pride, 48, 114, 131, 142
 and criminal law, 9–10
 object of middle-class hegemony, 5, 9–10, 14, 73–82, 114, 126, 129
 and Poor Law, 11–12
 see also labour
- workhouse, 10, 11, 102, 147, 158
- Zelizer, Viviana, 173
 Zoffany, Johan Joseph (1733–1810), 49

