

THE FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

Linda A. Pollock

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1981

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/15411>

This item is protected by original copyright

THE FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

by

Linda A. Pollock

Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Arts

University of St Andrews

July, 1981



ProQuest Number: 10170804

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10170804

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 9697 (1)

VOLUME I

I allow unlimited access to this thesis at all times for consultation only. My permission must be obtained in writing if all or any part of this thesis is to be photocopied. I would also like a list kept of those who consult the thesis.

Linda A. Pollock

10th December, 1981

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate LINDA A. POLLOCK

Address London

Degree Doctor of Philosophy Date 14th July 1981

Title of Thesis "The Forgotten Children"

.....

The prevailing viewpoint on the history of childhood is that:

- (a) there was no concept of childhood prior to the 17th century;
- (b) children were cruelly disciplined;
- (c) there was a formal parent-child relationship.

The evidence presented to support the thesis is suspect and there is little systematic analysis of any source. Moreover, the thesis is not universally accepted - other authors have shown that there was a concept of childhood in the middle ages. In addition, the main writers have concentrated on discipline, to the virtual exclusion of all other childhood experiences.

This study, covering the period from the 16th to the 19th century inclusive, has attempted to provide a detailed analysis of primary sources of evidence (autobiographies and diaries) in order to reconstruct child life in the past. Newspaper reports on child abuse cases occurring before the prevention of cruelty to children act in 1889 have also been examined. The methodological problems inherent in the sources used have been considered.

The information provided by the texts suggests that parents did possess a concept of childhood, were not indifferent to their children and did not treat the latter cruelly. (With reference to the last point, the newspaper reports also reveal that child abuse was condemned before specific child protection legislation appeared). Although there was discord between parents and adolescent offspring, in the vast majority of families there was an affectionate parent-child relationship. Parents did not totally control their children's lives.

Moreover, the texts suggest that the basics of child life have changed very little. Children did pass through such developmental stages as teething and talking at a similar age to modern children, although the texts do disclose the considerable amount of individual variation. Children played and also received at least some education in every century studied.

Nonetheless there have been some changes in parental care and child life, as revealed in the texts: the concept of the innocence of childhood did not appear till the 18th century; there was an increase in thinking about the nature of childhood and the parental role in the abstract; there was a lessening of parental control in such areas as career and marriage through the centuries and there was an increase in the severity of the discipline meted out to children in the early 19th century.

List of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements

Declarations

Abstract

<u>Chapter One:</u>	<u>Past Children. A Review of the Literature on the History of Childhood</u>	1
1.0	The Early Works	1
2.0	The Ariès Thesis	11
2.1	The concept of childhood	11
2.1.1	The origins of the concept	11
2.1.2	The attitudes to children in the medieval period	14
2.1.3	The attitudes to children from the 15th to the 17th century	17
2.1.4	The attitudes to children from the 18th to the 20th century	22
2.2	The treatment of children	30
2.2.1	The relation between the concept of childhood and discipline	31
2.2.2	The treatment of children in the medieval period	33
2.2.3	The treatment of children from the 15th to the 17th century	34
2.2.4	The treatment of children from the 18th to the 20th century	37
2.3	The formal parent-child relationship	46
3.0	The Evidence for the Thesis	47
4.0	Why the Changes Occurred	55
<u>Chapter Two:</u>	<u>The Thesis Re-examined: A Criticism of the Literature</u>	64
1.0	The Evidence	64
1.1	Child advice literature	64
1.2	Paintings	69

	<u>Page</u>
1.3 Travellers' accounts	75
1.4 Child dress	77
1.5 The treatment of infants	78
1.6 Infant mortality	80
2.0 The Argument	82
2.1 The concept of childhood and adolescence	82
2.2 The arguments of specific authors	88
2.2.1 Ariès (1962)	88
2.2.2 Hunt (1972)	91
2.2.3 De Mause (1976)	93
2.3 Other problems with the literature	94
2.3.1 The linkage with historical developments	94
2.3.2 The inference of actualities from attitudes	95
2.3.3 The amount of change	96
3.0 Is a History of Childhood Possible?	97
<u>Chapter Three: The State as Protector</u>	105
1.0 Introduction	106
2.0 The Effects of Industrialisation	107
3.0 The Discovery of the Effects of Industrialisation	110
4.0 The Response to the Discovery of the Effects of Industrialisation	115
4.1 The 19th century reform movement	120
4.2 Changes in the concept of the law	124
4.3 Changes in the concept of poverty	127
4.4 The welfare state	128
5.0 Parental and Public Policy towards Children	131
6.0 Conclusion	136

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Chapter Four: Issues Concerning Evidence</u>	141
1.0 Introduction	142
2.0 Diaries	143
2.1 Representation	144
2.1.1 The reasons for diary writing	148
2.2 Censorship	154
2.2.1 The diarist	155
2.2.2 The editor	160
2.2.2.1 Comparison study	162
2.2.3 Ill-treatment did not occur	170
2.3 Generalisation	171
3.0 Autobiographies	173
4.0 Newspaper Reports	174
<u>Chapter Five: Attitudes to Children</u>	181
1.0 Introduction	181
1.1 A historical outline	183
1.1.1 Britain	183
1.1.2 America	185
2.0 The Concept of Childhood	187
2.1 How parents regarded their children	188
2.2 How parents regarded the parental role	210
3.0 Illness	230
4.0 Death	247
4.1 Parental attitudes to the death of children under 6	248
4.2 Parental attitudes to the death of children over 6	258
5.0 Conclusion	263
<u>Chapter Six: Discipline and Control</u>	267
1.0 Introduction	268
2.0 Methods of Discipline from 1500-1900	269

	<u>Page</u>
2.1 Discipline in the home	269
2.2 Discipline in school	341
3.0 Conclusion	358
<u>Chapter Seven: From Birth to Twelve</u>	365
1.0 Introduction	365
2.0 Birth	365
2.1 Were children wanted?	365
2.2 Why were children wanted?	373
3.0 Infancy	378
3.1 Feeding	379
3.1.1 Breast-feeding	380
3.1.2 Wet-nursing	384
3.2 Weaning	389
3.3 Teething	393
3.4 Crying	395
3.5 Walking	398
3.6 Talking	402
3.7 Sleeping	405
3.8 Inoculation	407
4.0 Childhood	413
4.1 Play	413
4.2 Education	419
4.2.1 Academic education	419
4.2.2 Religious education	434
4.3 The child diarists	444
5.0 Conclusion	452
<u>Chapter Eight: Adolescence and Beyond</u>	456
1.0 Introduction	457
2.0 Career	457
3.0 Marriage	471

Acknowledgements

I owe a great debt to John McShane for his painstaking and thoughtful supervision of this research. I am grateful to Keith Wrightson and Andy Whiten for their valuable comments on and discussion of parts of this work. Finally, I wish to thank my husband, Iain, for his patience and support throughout these three years and also my mother for her efficient approach to all the problems of typing what seemed to be a never-ending thesis.

I acknowledge permission granted by the following libraries to quote from manuscript material in their possession: The British Library, The Friends' Society Library, The Guildhall Library, The National Library of Scotland and Dr. Williams' Library.

I hereby declare that the conditions
of the Resolution and Regulations
governing the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy have been fulfilled.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "John McShane". The letters are fluid and connected, with a prominent loop at the end of the word "Shane".

Dr. J. McShane

I hereby declare that the thesis has been composed by myself, that the work of which it is a record has been done by myself, and that it has not been accepted in any previous application for a higher degree.

L. Pollock.

Linda A. Pollock
(admitted as a research
student in October, 1978)

Abstract

The prevailing viewpoint on the history of childhood is that:

- (a) there was no concept of childhood prior to the 17th century;
- (b) children were cruelly disciplined;
- (c) there was a formal parent-child relationship.

The evidence presented to support the thesis is suspect and there is little systematic analysis of any source. Moreover, the thesis is not universally accepted - other authors have shown that there was a concept of childhood in the middle ages. In addition, the main writers have concentrated on discipline, to the virtual exclusion of all other childhood experiences.

This study, covering the period from the 16th to the 19th century inclusive, has attempted to provide a detailed analysis of primary sources of evidence (autobiographies and diaries) in order to reconstruct child life in the past. Newspaper reports on child abuse cases occurring before the prevention of cruelty to children act in 1889 have also been examined. The methodological problems inherent in the sources used have been considered.

The information provided by the texts suggests that parents did possess a concept of childhood, were not indifferent to their children and did not treat the latter cruelly. (With reference to the last point, the newspaper reports also reveal that child abuse was condemned before specific child protection legislation appeared). Although there was discord between parents and adolescent offspring, in the vast majority of families there was an affectionate parent-child relationship. Parents did not totally control their children's lives.

Moreover, the texts suggest that the basics of child life have changed very little. Children did pass through such developmental stages as teething and talking at a similar age to modern children, although the texts do disclose the considerable amount

of individual variation. Children played and also received at least some education in every century studied.

Nonetheless there have been some changes in parental care and child life, as revealed in the texts: the concept of the innocence of childhood did not appear till the 18th century; there was an increase in thinking about the nature of childhood and the parental role in the abstract; there was a lessening of parental control in such areas as career and marriage through the centuries and there was an increase in the severity of the discipline meted out to children in the early 19th century.

CHAPTER ONE

PAST CHILDREN. A REVIEW OF THE
LITERATURE ON THE HISTORY OF
CHILDHOOD

It is only relatively recently that the history of childhood has been considered an area worthy of research. The picture painted so far by the vast majority of writers on the subject is surprisingly similar. They argue that there has been only a gradual realisation that children are different from adults and not merely smaller versions. Accompaniments of this realisation were a growing concern for children, at times a very strict discipline, and an increasingly closer parent-child relationship.

There are a few authors, however, who think differently. They believe that both childhood and adolescence were recognised in previous centuries, although children may not necessarily have been viewed in the same way as children today.

1.0

THE EARLY WORKS

Childhood today is a subject of intense interest to anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists among others. Children play a central role in most households and have rights protected by the state. Parents give up a great deal of their time and energy to rearing their children and would appear to enjoy doing so. But was this always the case? Historians looking at attitudes to and treatment of children in the past would insist it was not.

With an almost monotonous regularity the same idea appears again and again in the literature on the history of childhood: that there was no concept of childhood in the past (first explicitly stated by Ariès, 1962). Many authors argue that there was no appreciation of the needs of children and thus they were neglected - some authors would say systematically ill-treated - by both parents and the state. Most researchers in this area would appear to be

more concerned with finding additional evidence to support the argument than with critically appraising it.

Although Ariès' (1962) work was the first to attract a great deal of attention and interest to the history of childhood, there are, in fact, a number of earlier studies. These were concerned with how children were treated rather than how they were regarded and either believe that past children endured severe brutality or maintain that discipline in previous societies was not totally repressive. The proponents of the cruelty thesis will be considered first.

Findlay (1923) in his book on English children states that previously children were not treated kindly:

Speaking in general terms we can assert that children, until a hundred years ago, were not regarded as requiring the ministrations of tenderness except when they were sick (41).

In addition he would go further, anticipating the views of such authors as de Mause (1976):

Boys when they went to school expected to be scolded and beaten; but such treatment was the normal lot of childhood, when the boy grew up he would have his turn (52).

Findlay argues that life was harsh in the past and so brutal treatment was the norm for adults and children. Although parents may have wished to rear their children more gently, "social conventions led them to maintain a spartan attitude towards their children" (140). However, by the 20th century, social conventions had changed so that "our kindlier feelings towards the young" are allowed free expression and lead "us to allow our children all the enjoyment which is within their reach" (146). Findlay's conclusion is an example of the "happy ending syndrome" which is

continually reiterated in texts on the history of childhood. (Apart from Ariès, 1962, who arrives at precisely the opposite conclusion.)

Bayne-Powell (1939) agrees that English children were treated with "barbarity", but she does suggest that a "spirit of humanity" was in evidence by the 18th century so that children were dealt with more kindly, even to the point of extreme indulgence. She argues that "the old formality between parents and children was breaking down" during the 18th century and that evidence of this new kindlier attitude to children could be seen in the increased number of child portraits found in this era. Parents were, nevertheless, still unmoved at the death of their children:

No doubt the carelessness with regard to child life was partly induced by the immense families which were the usual things in those days (7).

Bayne-Powell seems to be implying that there was no concept of childhood prior to the 18th century, although she does not specifically state this.ⁱ For example, she argues that, while there was a "sense of responsibility" for children in the 18th century, previously:

When childhood was regarded as a tiresome stage, which it was hoped might pass as speedily as possible, boys and girls entered adult life very early (15).

But, even though by 1750:

Parents were almost beginning to consider their children as of the same flesh and blood as themselves (1).

i. Beales (1975) cites the work of Earle (1899) on American children. She appears to have been the first to suggest that colonial children were little adults: "as soon as a boy put on breeches he dressed precisely like his father - in miniature".

children:

were, as far as their appearance was concerned, miniature men and women (24).

Though Bayne-Powell does state that children were dressed as adults, she does not argue as do such authors as Ariès (1962), Demos (1970) and de Mause (1976) that they were therefore regarded and treated as adults.

Lynd (1942) follows a similar argument: "Children have been a much menaced part of humanity" but, although children have been badly treated in the past now "the story of English children . . . moves towards a happy ending" (8-9). Lynd believes that parents were largely indifferent to their children in the 16th century and thus, for example, babies were nursed out even though there was a very high mortality rate for infants so nursed. During the 17th century, due to the rise of Puritanism, a much stricter discipline was imposed on children and even during the 18th and 19th centuries due to the Industrial Revolution exploiting the poor and the refusal of many mothers to nurse their children (which Lynd sees as the cause for the continuing high infant mortality of the 19th century), life was still hard for English children. By 1850, though, things had changed:

It was thought possible to turn children into learned and well-behaved citizens without beating or frightening them. Children were discovered to be charming people (44).

Throughout the centuries of parental neglect, Lynd maintains that parents did always love their children but at times had strange ways of expressing that love. Fleming (1933) and Housden (1955) similarly argue that children were treated harshly in the past.

Though the above authors suggest different dates for the emergence of kind methods of child-rearing (this is also a feature

of later works), they all agree that previously children were subjected to brutality. However, there have been some alternative claims on the way children were regarded and treated in the past.

Godfrey's (1907) early work on English children is undoubtedly sentimental, but she does make some pertinent points. She does not regard children in the past as having been systematically ill-treated, stating that though there were cases of strict parents, there were many more of kind ones. She argues that, although childhood as a state may have been made less of than today, children were:

petted and made much of like the children of to-day; their little sayings recorded in family letters (163).

Godfrey distinguishes between theory and practice and argues that, even when contemporary theory or ideals were harsh, happy homes and children still existed and gives a number of examples of such homes. Godfrey is convinced that:

human nature, especially child nature, endures with much the same characteristics at bottom in the twentieth century as in the sixteenth century or the ninth (99).

She concludes:

While theorists wrangled, and the superior parent endeavoured to form himself and his offspring on the most approved models of the Encyclopedists, the children themselves played amongst the buttercups and daisies, and nature took care of her own (288).

Crump (1929) bases her study on child-rearing in 17th century France on Dr. Héroard's diary of Louis XIII's infancy. This diary was to be used many times in later works on the history of

childhood, generally to show that children were not seen in the same way as today and that they were strictly disciplined. Crump, on the other hand, reaches quite a different conclusion.

Crump does not assume that Louis' childhood was representative, stating that, as he was the first dauphin to be born for almost 80 years, this may well account for his extraordinary upbringing. Crump does not view Louis as a "chattel" (Hunt, 1972) arguing that the king was very fond of his children and interested in their development. For example, she gives the picture of the dauphin running up to his father, arms outstretched for a hug and then standing holding his father's hand while he discussed affairs of state. Another time Louis turned on the fountains and soaked the king - much to the latter's amusement. Crump admits that the queen was not very maternal; but she would gratify her children's wishes - when the dauphin wanted a puppet theatre, which his father regarded as too expensive, the queen said she would buy it.

Louis was physically punished as a child, receiving his first whipping at the age of 2. His father had requested his son to be whipped whenever he was naughty as: "At his age I was well whipt and I know I profited" (61); but Dr Heroard, the dauphin's tutor, disagreed:

We ought to lisp with little children, by which I mean we ought to accommodate ourselves to their weakness and teach them rather by gentleness and patience than by harshness and hastiness (66).

The queen also considered that whipping should be a last resort.

Though his father also wanted Louis to learn a wide range of subjects at an early age, he did possess some realisation of the capabilities of a child in that he insisted on short hours of tuition and plenty of time for play.

Despite the very coarse language used to the dauphin and the amount of sexual play involving him, Crump concludes:

No one can read Jean Héroard's journal without feeling how little child nature has changed in the three hundred years which have elapsed since the old doctor's death (213).

Morgan (1944) in his scholarly book on Puritans in America states that the Puritan upbringing was not strict or repressive. He argues that, although good Puritans were meant to control their affections in relation to their children, they were also meant to rear their children adequately and their laws reinforced this. Morgan gives the example of a case in the Essex County Court in 1660 in which parents were admonished for leaving their children alone at night in a lonely house far from neighbours - and a similar case was heard again in 1674. By law, too, parents had to see that their children were instructed "in some honest lawfull calling" and, although parents may guide their children's choice of work, they had also to pay "close attention to the boy's desires and abilities" (28, 35). Parents in theory had great authority over their children's choice of marriage partner, but in practice this authority was more limited as parents could not "neglect children's wishes and still be good Puritans" (42).

Morgan turns to the question of why Puritans sent their children away from home: sons as apprentices and daughters to another family to learn housekeeping. He suggests that it was not because Puritans did not place great importance on family relationships as contact was maintained between parents and the children away from home. He argues instead that:

Puritan parents did not trust themselves with their own children, that they were afraid of spoiling them by too great affection (38).

Puritans also thought that a child would learn better manners

away from home - as the Massachusetts's law of 1648 stated that a child could be taken from his parents if they allowed him to become "rude, stubborn or unruly", Puritan parents were probably anxious that their children should be well-behaved. (11). Morgan argues in addition that a child left home at an age when he is asserting his own independence and, as this is a period when friction usually arises between parents and children, separation would allow a parent to meet the child on the same level of affection and friendliness.

Morgan states that Puritans believed their children were born:

- (a) without knowledge
- (b) with a capacity to attain knowledge
- (c) evil

As they also assumed that evil could be overcome by education, this was begun as early as possible, the main aim of education being to prepare the children: "for conversion by teaching them the doctrines and moral precepts of christianity." (47). Morgan does believe that the Puritans were excessively concerned for the salvation of their children, to the extent that:

There was no question of developing the child's personality, of drawing out or nourishing any desirable inherent qualities which he might possess, for no child could by nature possess any desirable qualities (53).

Puritan children were well-prepared for death, not because their parents were cruel, but that early death and the fear of not being elected were to the Puritans:

unpleasant but inescapable facts, and the sooner children became aware of them the better. (42).

However, though Puritan parents may have regarded their children as evil, they did not necessarily subject them to a severe

discipline, as suggested by Demos (1970, 1973). Morgan argues: "It can hardly be doubted that the Puritans did frequently resort to bodily punishment " (57). Nonetheless he adds that, in spite of such advice from secondary sources as "Better Whipt than Damn'd":

there is no proof that seventeenth century parents employed the rod more freely than twentieth century parents. (57).

Using such advice literature as that of Anne Broadstreet, who stated that children should be treated according to their temperament, Morgan sums up the Puritan method of child rearing in a different manner from most later authors:

Here is no disposition to allow the unimpeded development of personality, but at least children were not subjected to a preconceived discipline without reference to their individual needs and capacities. Granted its purposes and assumptions, Puritan education was intelligently planned, and the relationship it envisaged between parent and child was not one of harshness and severity but of tenderness and sympathy. A parent in order to educate his children properly had to know them well, to understand their particular characters and to treat them accordingly. If in practice some parents failed to do so, they failed, by so much, to be good puritans, (61).

Lohead (1956) on Victorian children does not agree with the conventional image of a strictly disciplined, repressed 19th century childhood. Children, especially in wealthy homes, were kept apart and their nurse could vary from the autocratic to the benevolent. Though the nursery was "a strictly ruled kingdom", it was not "lacking in delights" (7). She argues that much of the discipline of the nursery was based on the Evangelical sense of sin - that all mankind was prone to evil and children should be withheld from temptation. But despite the fact that children were often given plain food, hard chairs to sit on, and the discipline of

early lessons, Lohead argues that children were not miserable or ill-treated. Children felt safe and secure, their parents were not always aloof and there were such pleasures as holidays in the country. Lohead concludes:

The Victorian parent like the modern was an individual not a type; and to maintain that Victorian childhood was uniformly miserable and repressed, or entirely merry and contented is to impose a particular memory as the general pattern.

Children were, then as now, happy or miserable according to circumstances and temperament (199).

Roe's (1959) work, again on Victorian children, is very similar to that of Lohead. He writes:

Allowing that home discipline was far stricter than it is nowadays, the idea that it was totally repressive of character and even happiness is as wrong as it is to suppose the tyrannical parent was mythical Certain it is that, though there were unhappy, over-drilled children, there were others living comfortably and happily according to the prevailing ideas (46).

Though parents were concerned with training their children, "youngsters were not always models of behaviour" (57).

Severe punishments may have been inflicted by some parents, but:

Such penalties as "sending to Coventry", locking in a dark cupboard, or perching a refractory infant on a table or high piece of furniture, where it dared not move, for fear of falling, were iniquities which most responsible parents and nurses rejected with the scorn they deserved . . . (58).

Roe concludes:

one must insist on it, not all Victorian mothers and fathers were harsh, far from it (60).

2.0

THE ARIÈS THESIS

Ariès' (1962) book is the most influential work in this field. Though his sources of evidence are mainly taken from French culture and society, it is clear that he believes his conclusions to be true also for the rest of Western society. Of particular importance is his finding that there was no concept of childhood during the middle ages. Ariès also suggests that, although there was no awareness of the nature of childhood in previous centuries, this does not mean that children were ill-treated in the past. In fact he argues that the realisation that children were different from adults was accompanied by a stricter method of rearing and severer punishments. These two facets of Ariès' argument: that there was no concept of childhood and that children have been subjected to severe discipline will be reviewed here. In addition, a theme which Ariès does not discuss, but which appears frequently in later literature - that of the formality of the parent-child relationship in past societies - will be considered.

2.1

The Concept of Childhood

2.1.1 The origins of the concept

Ariès argues that medieval society did not recognise childhood although ancient society had some so:

The age groups of Neolithic times, the Hellenistic paideia, presupposed a difference and a transition between the world of children and that of adults Medieval civilisation failed to perceive this difference (396).

However, he does not explain why adults stopped regarding children as children. Ariès deduces from paintings - a vital source of evidence in his work - that "there was no place for

childhood in the medieval world" and argues that so few pictures of children exist because:

No one thought of keeping a picture of a child if that child had either lived to grow to manhood or had died in infancy. In the first case childhood was simply an unimportant phase of which there was no need to keep any record; in the second case, that of the dead child, it was thought that the little thing which had disappeared so soon in life was not worthy of remembrance (38).

As soon as a child could do without the care of his mother or nurse, "not long after a tardy weaning (in other words, at about the age of 7)", he entered the adult world. (395).

Ariès suggests that in the 16th century adults were beginning to notice children as a "source of amusement and relaxation" (126). However, they were regarded only as the "playthings" of adults, there was still no awareness of childhood as a separate state from adulthood. During the 17th century, Ariès claims that, although people still enjoyed "coddling" their children, they were gradually realising that children were different from adults and not merely smaller versions. Children were now seen as being innocent but weak, particularly by the moralists of the period. Thus children had to be trained and their behaviour corrected - they were "fragile creatures of God who needed to be both safeguarded and reformed." (129). These two elements of a concept of childhood were also in evidence during the 18th century and in addition the physical health of children was also a matter of concern. By the mid-18th century the modern concept of childhood had emerged:

Not only the child's future but his presence and his very existence are of concern: the child has taken a central place in the family (130).

The concept of adolescence, Ariès argues, did not appear until the

end of the 19th century. Although Ariès does not provide any evidence on the actualitiesⁱⁱ of childhood in support of his thesis, such evidence has been presented by Demos (1970).

Demos researched into the 17th century Plymouth colony of Puritans. He was interested in reconstructing the actual experiences of a child (criticising Ariès, 1962 for not doing so) from such physical artifacts as house size, furniture, type of clothing, and from documents - wills, inventories and the official records of the colony. Despite the large difference in approach and theoretical orientation, Demos agrees with Ariès that there was no concept of childhood. He, in fact, believes that there was no such concept even in the 17th century (when Ariès suggests it emerged) because children were dressed as adults. Zuckerman (1970) agrees with Demos on this point. Demos does suggest that there may have been a recognition of infancy as children under the age of 7 were dressed differently from adults; but, even so:

Childhood as such was barely recognised in the period spanned by the Plymouth Colony, there was little sense that children might somehow be a special group, with their own needs and interests and capacities. Instead they were viewed largely as miniature adults: the boy was a little model of his father, likewise the girl of her mother (57).

In addition, Demos argues that there was no concept of adolescence. He claims that, as the term "adolescence" has only been used widely since the very end of the 19th century:

These semantic details point to a very substantial area of contrast in the developmental process as experienced then and now. (145).

ii. Ariès was mainly concerned with attitudes to children and so does not discuss the actual life-style of children.

Hoyles (1979) again believes that:

Both childhood and our present-day nuclear family are comparatively recent social inventions. (16).

He argues that:

Childhood is a social convention and not just a natural state Our present myth of childhood portrays children as apolitical, asexual, wholly dependent on adults, never engaged in serious activities such as work or culture. (1).

Hoyles quotes from Ariès (1962) to demonstrate that there was no concept of childhood in the past. Firestone (1971) and Illich (1973) similarly claim that there was no concept of childhood in past societies.

Other authors have been concerned not so much with the existence or non-existence of a concept of childhood as the attitudes to children through time. The majority do so from the standpoint that previously children were regarded as being at the very bottom of the social scale whereas now children are an integral part of society and family life. They thus describe changing attitudes to children (for the better) through the centuries and do so regardless of their research interest: to depict straight social history; to apply psychological theory (Demos, 1970, 1973; Hunt, 1972; de Mause and case studies, 1976 and Trumbach, 1978); to document the various child rearing theories (Cleverly and Philips, 1976; Newson and Newson, 1974; Sears, 1975 and Wishy, 1968); or to trace the development of public policy towards children (Bremner, 1970-73, and Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969).

2.1.2 The attitudes to children in the medieval period

As has been stated, Ariès (1962) argues that there was no concept of childhood in the middle ages; children "did not count".

Lyman (1976), studying the period 200-800 A.D., believes that up till the 8th century parents were ambivalent towards their children: viewing them as both a pleasure and an integral part of family life and as a "bother". He argues that the former was the ideal and the latter more the actuality and though parental love was often described as natural in the 7th century:

The continued need for legislation, as well as other scattered evidence, suggests, however, that the distance between ideals and actuality had closed rather little in half a millennium (95).

McLaughlin (1976) from her research on child rearing from the 9th to the 13th century also found that there was "conflict between destructive or rejecting and fostering attitudes" on the part of parents to children. However, towards the end of the period:

there are also clear signs, especially from the twelfth century onwards, of tenderness towards infants and small children, interest in the stages of their development, awareness of their need for love (117).

In direct contrast to Aries (1962), McLaughlin claims that, by the end of the 12th century, the notion of the child as only the property of his parents:

had also been joined by more favourable conceptions, by a sense of the child as a being in its own right, as a nature of "potential greatness", and by a sense of childhood as a distinctive and formative stage of life (140).

Both of the above studies contradict Aries' claim that the middle ages were unaware of the nature of childhood.

Shorter (1976) emphasises how our attitude to children has changed: they no longer belong to the lowest level of the social strata but are rather the subjects of our primary concern. Almost implicit in this viewpoint is that today our treatment of children is

perfect and bad parents are never found. Shorter writes:

Good mothering is an invention of modernization. In traditional society mothers viewed the development and happiness of infants younger than two with indifference. In modern society they place the welfare of their small children above all else (168).

He claims that children were not even regarded as being human, let alone being seen as different from adults:

Nor did these mothers often (some say "never") see their infants as human beings with the same joy and pain as they themselves (169).

Shorter does state that there has always been a "residual affection" between parent and child - the product of a "biological link", but he emphasises that there has been a change in the priority which the infant occupied in the mother's "rational hierarchy of values". This change appeared first in the upper classes of the 16th century.

De Mause (1976) is by far the most extreme of the writers in this field. He states he is proposing a "psychogenic theory of history" and that the central force for change is the "psychogenic" changes in personality occurring because of successive generations of parent-child interactions and in so doing reconstructs a horrifying dark world of childhood in the past. He argues that parents were attached to their children in the past but were unable to regard their offspring as separate beings:

It is, of course, not love which the parent of the past lacked, but rather the emotional maturity to see the child as a person separate from himself (17).

De Mause suggests that there has been a series of six historical modes of parent-child relations; the first three modes cover the period from antiquity to the 7th century. Up to the 13th century children were regarded as being "full of evil". Parents of the

earliest mode, the infanticidal, "routinely resolved their anxieties about taking care of children by killing them", but from the 4th century" parents began to accept the child as having a soul" and therefore were unable to kill them and resorted to abandonment instead (51). From the 14th to the 17th century, the child "was still a container for dangerous projections"; but "it was allowed to enter into the parents' emotional life", de Mause claiming that "enormous ambivalence marks this mode" (51).

2.1.3 The attitudes to children from the 15th to the 17th century

Tucker (1976), researching into 15th and 16th century England, claims that children were regarded as untrustworthy and at the "bottom of the social scale":

The medieval idea that children were not terribly important persisted into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries childhood was a state to be endured rather than enjoyed (229).

Tucker states that parents were ambivalent towards their offspring: they were unsure whether to regard them as good or evil and also when to include them in or exclude them from adult society. But, she argues, attitudes were changing during this period so that a "greater value" came to be put on the child and a "greater attempt is made to please him through attention to his physical welfare and happiness" (252). Tucker concludes that, by the end of the 16th century:

More and more children were being recognised as human beings with different developmental problems than adults (252).

Shorter (1976) and Stone (1977) would basically agree with Tucker's findings. Shorter, for example, also found that more interest was taken in children from the 16th century. Stone claims that during the period 1450-1630 the interests of the group took

priority over the individual and therefore children were largely ignored. Most upper and many middle and lower class parents fostered out their infants and parents in general were unmoved at the death of infants. Between 1540 and 1660 a greater interest was shown in childhood resulting in "a greater concern for the moral and academic training of children" (193).

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) and Bremner (1970-73) chart the development of public policy towards children; the former dealing with British children from Tudor times and the latter American children from 1600.

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) do not appear to distinguish between social and parental treatment of children, instead viewing parental care as being influenced by social attitudes and developing along much the same lines as public policy. They deal with changing social attitudes, documenting the rise of statutory protection for children.

They accept the view that children were regarded as unimportant in Tudor society:

Infancy was but a biologically necessary prelude to the sociologically all important business of the adult world (13).

Children were regarded merely as the "property of their parents" and as miniature adults:

Of course, the great majority of parents have always loved their children, but the interpretation of affection has varied from one generation to another. In the past, when life in general was rough and hard for all classes, little attempt was made to soften it for children They were, indeed, looked upon as little adults and therein lies the essence of the explanation of much otherwise inexplicable to us today (342).

Bremner (1970-73) specifically states he is reviewing the history of public policy towards children in America as opposed to parental policy. This is a valid distinction to make - and Bremner is one of the very few authors to make it - as there is no reason why public and private policy should develop along similar lines, although he does not always manage to keep to his intention. His work, in three massive volumes, covers the period 1600-1937 and traces the course of public policy towards children in such areas as: child labour, health, delinquency, children in care or in need of protection and the duties of parents. Bremner refers to his book as "a documentary history" with a connecting narrative. He believes that there has been a growing awareness of children since the 19th century; that children have risen in esteem and that there has been a growing sensitivity to the needs of children and the importance of youth. Though he does see attitudes to children changing during the centuries, he does not claim that previously children were ignored, pointing out as an example that the Puritans emigrated to New England for the benefit of their children's souls.

Hunt (1972) attempts to fuse history and psychology so as to provide keys to our understanding of French attitudes to childhood in the 17th century from psychoanalysis. Unlike Demos (1970), Hunt is more interested in concepts than actualities:

I am interested in the way people felt about the family the attitudes they seemed to hold with regard to the duties of parenthood (5).

His main source of evidence is Dr. Héroard's diary on the childhood of the dauphin of France 1601-10, the future Louis XIII, and Hunt uses statements from this diary to generalise to the rest of French society, despite the uniqueness of the dauphin's position.

Hunt argues that children were not valued very highly but were regarded as being inferior to adults. For example, despite what

Hunt terms "the efforts of doctors and moralists":

the process of child rearing was not valued very highly and did not bring the mother much in the way of prestige or honour. (102).

He states that the construction of the royal household told Louis that:

as a child he was something inferior, a chattel to be used in the elaborate dealings which adults had with one another. (99).

For young children, those under 7:

being the father's servant was the only role which society allowed them to assume. (152).

Hunt believes that an infant was seen to occupy some place between the animal and the adult world. Swaddling, for example, though it kept the child warm and out of harm's way, also:

operated on an even more general plane as a way of caring for infants and at the same time of binding up the anxiety which adults experience in dealing with the animality of small children. (130).

Hunt argues that mothers were reluctant to breast-feed because they regarded the child as being principally greedy, sucking a vital fluid from a mother's body already weakened by childbirth. Thus, despite the high mortality rate from such a practice, upper class French babies were sent out to nurse. According to Hunt, continuing the practice rested on "one fundamental assumption that the infant was dispensable" (102). As there was trouble getting the dauphin a suitable wet nurse, he was often hungry. Hunt deduces from this that nurses shared the same hostility towards infants as the mothers and this inhibited their flow of milk and therefore it was difficult in general for infants to get enough to

eat. Hunt also argues that wet-nursing reinforced the child's idea that he was unwanted as it told him his mother's breasts were forbidden to him and that his father did not want him around. He states that children entered the adult world early. From the age of 7 they were expected to behave as adults ceasing to be only a "consumer" and becoming a "contributor".

Hunt's interpretation of Dr. Héroard's diary is markedly different from that of Crump (1929) already discussed (see section 1.0). In addition, the findings of Marvick (1976) - who also studied 17th century France - are opposed to those of Hunt. She suggests that breast-feeding, by the mother where possible, was considered necessary for the survival of the infant and that parents were concerned about the survival of their children:

Survival to the age of one year was not something probable but rather an achievement reached - if at all - only by concerted and persistent efforts. And the establishment of a successful nursing relationship was almost the whole story (265).

Marvick does, however, claim that "birth alone did not qualify the infant for protection that would maximize its chances for survival" but that once "a bond between child and outside world had been forged the adults brought their powerful forces to bear on its behalf" (293).

Marvick suggests that swaddling, far from revealing the anxiety experienced by parents with reference to their infants, was a reasonable procedure given the beliefs and conditions of the time. For example, it ensured that the child's limbs were straight so that the infant would later assume a human posture; it protected his limbs from such damage as dislocation and it kept the child warm. She further argues that, although children were regarded as being "vexing and peevish", it was believed that training

and "manipulation" would ensure conformity.

Illick (1976), in contrast to Hunt (1972) argues that parents (English and American) were concerned about their offspring in the 17th century:

There is no denying that parents in seventeenth century England were interested in their children, but that interest took the form of controlling youngsters - just as adults restrained themselves - rather than allowing autonomous development (323).

American parents for the same period revealed great anxiety over illness and sorrow at the death of their children; but were also concerned with breaking the will of their children.

MacFarlane (1970) based his research on the diary of a 17th century Puritan clergyman, Ralph Josselin. MacFarlane states that it appears that children were eagerly welcomed by their parents and valued highly - both for the pleasure they afforded and the comfort they would later provide. In Josselin's diary there are numerous allusions to his love for his children - they were valued above "gold and jewels" - and not much evidence that he was interested in perpetuating the family line for its own sake.

MacFarlane argues that a child's physical development was of interest to parents: weaning, teething, walking and illness were all noted by Josselin - and also crying which gave the parents sleepless nights. In addition, Josselin was proud of his children's achievements at school.

2.1.4 The attitudes to children from the 18th to the 20th century

Researchers of these centuries generally agree that there was a marked change in attitudes to children in the 18th century. Children were becoming increasingly valued and the focus of parental concern and attention.

Plumb (1975) argues that up till the end of the 17th century there was an "autocratic, indeed ferocious" attitude to children as they were viewed as being full of "Original Sin", whereas, in the late 17th century "a new social attitude towards children began to strengthen" (65). Parents adopted a "gentle and more sensitive approach" to their offspring; they were no longer regarded as "sprigs of old Adam whose wills had to be broken" (70). Nonetheless, despite this new attitude to children, Plumb would not appear to be claiming that there was a concept of childhood in the 18th century. Children were regarded more as things than people:

Children in a sense had become luxury objects upon which their mothers and fathers were willing to spend larger and larger sums of money, not only for their education, but also for their entertainment and amusement. In a sense they had become superior pets (90).

Sears (1975) holds a similar point of view, though he dates the new attitude as occurring towards the end of the 18th century. By that date there had occurred "a clear increment in the empathic ethos of Western society" (3). This newly aroused empathic spirit "dictated a change from punitiveness and brutality to kindness and compassion" in methods of child-rearing. Trumbach (1978), as Sears, considers that the 18th century was characterised by an increase in the "importance of domesticity", resulting in parents, particularly mothers, becoming more attached to their offspring.

Eighteenth-century parents were just discovering childhood and learning to enjoy its innocence (262).

Unfortunately for their older offspring, though, parents "really wished that adolescence could be skipped" (262).

Stone (1977) also believes that, although parents up to the mid-17th century had been indifferent towards their offspring, during the period 1660-1800 there was a "remarkable change" in attitudes. The family became child-oriented, affectionate, with a permissive mode of rearing and recognised the uniqueness of each child. This type appeared first in the middle classes who were

neither so high as to be too preoccupied with pleasure or politics to bother with children, nor so low as to be too preoccupied with sheer survival to be able to afford the luxury of sentimental concern for them (405).

Shorter (1976) argues that the upper and middle classes were aware of the nature of childhood by this time, but the working classes remained indifferent to their children, at least until the end of the 18th century, and in some classes and regions considerably longer. Working-class mothers, Shorter suggests, ignored their children, leaving them alone for long periods and even when they were with their children did not play with them, sing or talk to them. Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) also agree that poor children were still treated badly, due they believe to the attitudes of their parents. For example, with child labour Pinchbeck and Hewitt argue that the indifference of parents and community to the suffering and exploitation of children in this way

was one of the greatest obstacles to be overcome by those seeking to establish their [children's] legal rights to protection (55).

Parents, according to Pinchbeck and Hewitt, were unmoved by their children's plight during the Industrial Revolution as they needed the wages and/or they had gone down the mines themselves as children.

Smith (1977) and Walzer (1976) both studied 18th century America. Smith would agree with the view that there was a more humane attitude to children in the 18th century: but only with reference to Chesapeake. He begins by stating:

Most parents in eighteenth century Virginia and Maryland were deeply attached to their children and they structured family life around them (32).

Smith then goes on to say that:

Such an assertion could not be confidently made about parental conduct in much of the pre-industrial West (32).

He does not appear to wonder why there is such a discrepancy in parental care between Virginia and the rest of Western society, but rather views the Chesapeake colony as being the fore-runner in new methods of child-rearing which the West would later adopt. Yet the discrepancy is easily explained once it is realised that Smith uses primary sources - mainly diaries and letters - for his own research; but relies on the arguments and conclusions of other historians (usually de Mause, 1976) to depict the rest of Western society. Smith is quite happy to do so even though de Mause uses mainly secondary sources of information, comes to quite the opposite conclusion regarding parental care in the 18th century and is regarded by Smith as being "obsessed with discovering child abuse or neglect in times past" (32).

In contrast to Europe, Smith argues, where children were not breast-fed by the mother because they were viewed as parasites who would drain the mother (taken from Hunt, 1972), maternal breast-feeding was probably the normal feeding method in Chesapeake. There was still, though, a high infant mortality rate. (This finding causes problems for those authors who claim that breast-feeding by the mother greatly reduced the infant

mortality rate.) Parents were anxious about their children, for example, revealing concern during such stages as weaning and teething. Smith also states that Chesapeake letters and diaries contained "a welter of evidence of parental tenderness and affection toward young children" (39). This, as he points out, is in opposition to the findings of Walzer (1976). Smith believes that childhood had become a distinctive period for 18th century Chesapeake - he considers 17th century children as unlikely to have enjoyed such a prominent place in society.

De Mause (1976) believes that there was a "great transition" in parent-child relations in the 18th century. The child was no longer "full of dangerous projections" and as he was so much less threatening "true empathy was possible and pediatrics was born" (52). Walzer (1976), on the other hand, would disagree; he states his chapter:

is based firmly on the notion that parents often entertain diametrically opposed attitudes toward their children and act on them at more or less the same time (351).

He claims, for example, that American parents were genuinely interested in their children but still sent them away to school or to live with relatives. Walzer believes that American attitudes to children of this period can be characterised by the parental wish to retain and at the same time reject offspring. Despite this, he would agree that there was a shift in parental attitudes during the 18th century so that children were regarded more as individuals and treated with indulgence.

Robertson (1976) argues that, by the 19th century, and in contradiction to previous centuries, European parents were now urged to find joy in child-rearing. This new development was due to Rousseau who, for the first time in history:

made a large group of people believe that childhood was worth the attention of intelligent

adults, encouraging an interest in the process of growing up rather than just the product. (407).

Public responsibility for children was also expanding, Robertson concluding:

At the very least, however, the nineteenth century was the time when public bodies began to think of children as children, with special needs because of their helplessness and vulnerability rather than as small adults with the right to hire themselves out for sixteen hours a day, or as the chattels of their parents (428).

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) believe that there was a harsh attitude to children up till the end of the 19th century. They state that both parliament and the national press until the late 19th century were largely unconcerned with the way in which parents treated their children:

regarding even the most barbarous cruelty as beyond comment and beyond intervention since children were not then regarded as citizens in their own right (61).

Stone (1977) argues that, after the benevolence of the 18th century, in the early 19th century children were again regarded as being in need of severe discipline owing to the rise of the Evangelical movement. However, during the mid-19th century humane attitudes had re-appeared. He therefore concludes that the evolution of the family has been one of fluctuating change, not linear development, but:

The only steady linear change over the last four hundred years seems to have been a growing concern for children, although their actual treatment has oscillated cyclically between the permissive and the repressive (683).

Bremner (1970-73) would agree with that statement. Volume one

of his work spans 1600-1865, volume two 1865-1932 and volume three 1933-37. He believes that the shorter time periods of his later volumes reflect:

the great expansion of interest in, and concern for, the rights and problems of children and youth during the past century (vii).

By the end of the 19th century, Bremner argues, it was "held that prolongation and protection of childhood was essential to human progress" (602).

Newson and Newson (1974), Cleverley and Philips (1976) and Wishy (1968) have reviewed the various theories on children and child-rearing. Newson and Newson document the main theories on child-rearing from the 18th to the 20th century and argue that there has been a great change in our attitudes towards children and hence our treatment of them. We have moved from only being concerned with their survival and moral growth to focusing on their mental health and social and economic adjustment.

Seen in historical and anthropological perspective, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the contemporary preoccupation with child rearing is that today we are self-consciously concerned with the possible psychological consequences of the methods which we use in bringing up our children (53).

Newson and Newson believe that in previous centuries and under-developed countries today, parents were/are so concerned with ensuring the survival of their children that there was/is little time left for attention to be paid to personal adjustment.

Newson and Newson claim that, during the 18th and 19th centuries the "religious morality" was prevalent and proponents of this theory insisted that a child's will should be broken. During the 1920s, the "medical morality" appeared: these theorists emphasised the importance of forming regular habits in infancy so

that a child learnt self-control. Attitudes continued to change and as the 20th century progressed, a basic interest in the child's natural intellectual and social development led to greater permissiveness in child rearing. Emphasis was placed on natural play and its functional status in child development.

At last the dirty, happy, noisy child
could be accepted as a good child (63).

Newson and Newson believe it was also accepted during this century that a baby's needs for pleasure should be gratified as well as his physical needs. Today the "fun morality" is predominant: advice is no longer authoritarian but paternalistic, children are to be cuddled and enjoyed.

Cleverley and Philips (1976) also review various theories on child rearing, dating from the 17th century. They do so from the standpoint:

that the patterns of child rearing and the educational practices within a society are influenced by the theories about children which happen to be current (vii).

They concentrate on a small number of what they consider to have been influential models of the child, arguing of earlier theorists:

They did not think of children the way we do now, and they did not see them in the same way (2).

(and they quote from Ariès to support this view). They believe that the writings of such theorists as Locke, Rousseau and Freud:

focused attention on facets of children that previously have been relatively neglected, children were seen in new ways, and as a result, new modes of treatment evolved (5).

Locke, for example, believed a child's mind was a blank slate to be filled by experience; Rousseau depicted the child as "an amoral

being coming to know good and evil with the later development of reason" (27) and Freud attacked the concept of the innocence of childhood.

Wishy (1968), reviewing child-rearing theories from 1830-1900, argues that:

notions of children's depravity gave way to assumptions of their essential innocence, or at least moral flexibility (i).

He believes that the emergence of modern views on childhood date from 1750 - that is, during the Enlightenment - and that by 1850 "there existed a less hostile and less repressive attitude towards the child's will" (23).

Though, in general, some disagreement exists over exactly when a more humane attitude to children emerged (McLaughlin, 1976 suggests the end of the 13th century; Lynd, 1942 the mid-19th. Most authors opt for some date in the 18th century.), the majority of authors would appear to be in general agreement that such an event did occur. However, despite their differences there is one common factor that unites the different views: it would seem that a change in attitude (for the better) to children is discovered towards the end of whatever time period is being studied, be it from 1500-1800 (Stone, 1977) or from 1399-1603 (Tucker, 1976). In addition, those authors who find children are valued in the early modern period, are those who researched into short time periods, such as MacFarlane (1970).

2.2

The Treatment of Children

Regardless of whether an author believes that the increased attention, which it is suggested had been paid to children from

about the 17th century on:

- (a) led to a severe discipline being imposed on children, or
- (b) led to a reduction in the brutality to which children had been subjected;

most insist that the majority of children were cruelly treated in the past.

2.2.1 The relation between the concept of childhood and discipline

Ariès (1962) does not maintain that, because there was no concept of childhood in the middle ages, children were therefore ill-treated. In fact, he distinguishes between the two themes:

The idea of childhood is not to be confused with the affection for children: it corresponds to an awareness of the particular nature of childhood, that particular nature which distinguishes the child from the adult, even the young adult (125).

He suggests that the increased concern for children seen in the 17th century was accompanied by an increasing strictness of discipline and also constant supervision. This increased strictness was especially in evidence in the schools because, as Ariès suggests, parents believed it was necessary for a good education. (As education was not compulsory and free, but chosen voluntarily and paid for by parents, they had more influence over the type of school they regarded as appropriate.) Pupils were encouraged to spy for the master and "the whip takes on a degradingly brutal character and becomes increasingly common" (247). By the 18th century this system was declining due to "a new orientation in the concept of childhood" (253). Children were no longer regarded as weak and so in need of humiliation, but rather they were to be prepared for adult life.

This preparation could not be carried out brutally, and at one stroke. It called for careful gradual conditioning (253).

That is, the child was to be moulded into shape. Ariès then does not claim that the increased concern for children and the growing awareness of the special nature of childhood necessarily created a better world for children, in fact he argues the opposite: that the development of the concept of childhood was accompanied by more severe methods of rearing children. He concludes:

Family and school together removed the child from adult society The solicitude of family, church, moralists and administrators deprived the child of the freedom he had hitherto enjoyed among adults. It inflicted on him the birch, the prison cell - in a word, the punishments usually reserved for convicts from the lowest strata by society. But this severity was the expression of a very different feeling from the old indifference: an obsessive love which was to dominate society from the eighteenth century on (397).

Stone (1977) argues that in the 15th and 16th centuries children were subject to strict discipline and obedience was often enforced with brutality. Towards the end of the 16th and during the 17th century the severity of the punishment meted out to children increased. Stone claims that this increase was due to the first results of a greater interest in children and also the doctrine of Original Sin. He insists that there is a great deal of evidence revealing the wish to break the will of the child, especially among the Puritans and that corporal punishment was the main method used to do so.

There can be no doubt whatever that severe flogging was a normal and daily occurrence in the sixteenth and seventeenth century grammar school (164).

In addition, Stone states:

Whipping was the normal method of discipline in a sixteenth or seventeenth century home, mitigated and compensated for, no doubt, by a

good deal of fondling when the child was docile and obedient. Breaking the will of the child was the prime aim, and physical punishment the standard method (167).

Parents decided their son's career, and higher up the social scale, also their children's marriage. Stone dogmatically concludes for this period that:

This picture of a severe repression of the will of the child, extending to his or her choice of a spouse, is supported by a sufficient range of evidence to be beyond possibility of challenge. This should not be taken to mean, however, that parents were not attached to their children. Indeed it is the argument of this chapter that the repression was itself a by-product of a greater concern for the moral and academic training of children and, therefore, a function of greater attention being paid to them (193).

Hoyles (1979) similarly argues that, after the appearance of the idea of the weakness of childhood accompanied by the concept of the moral responsibility of the teachers, dating from the 17th century:

It is clear that the concept of childhood was becoming linked with the idea of subservience or dependence (25).

He believes that, even in this century, children are an "oppressed" group in society.

Other authors have found ill-treatment of children in whatever century they have studied.

2.2.2 The treatment of children in the medieval period

Lyman (1976) argues that children were often beaten, sold and abandoned during the early medieval period and that infanticide was also common. McLaughlin (1976) refers to "the neglect, abuse and

abandonment of children" during the 9th to 13th centuries (123). In her research McLaughlin found two types of child-rearing advice. One in which proponents urged that children should not be beaten, emphasising the sensitive nature of the child. The other view stressed the importance of discipline and physical correction and McLaughlin believes this may "provide a closer reflection of the actual practice of parents" (138).

De Mause (1976) similarly believes that cruelty to children was the accepted mode of rearing during this period.

2.2.2 The treatment of children from the 15th to the 17th century

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1962), Stone (1977) and Tucker (1976) maintain that strict discipline was the norm in 15th and 16th century England. Pinchbeck and Hewitt claim, though, that Tudor state policies towards poor and parent-less children were paternalistic; a child was to be educated according to his capabilities. However, during the 17th century, due to the rise of the Puritan religion, poverty was regarded as a disgrace and the condition of poor children deteriorated; but, by 1911, Pinchbeck and Hewitt argue, the state was coming back to the Tudor way of thinking.

Illick (1976) claims the same (that strict discipline was the norm) for 17th century England and America - American parents were particularly concerned with "breaking the will of the child" (331). Cleverley and Philips (1976) argue that the Puritan educators of the 17th and 18th centuries, with their emphasis on "man's inherent sinfulness" and strict discipline created the "unfree child" (22). Plumb (1975) states that "harsh discipline was the child's lot, and they were often terrorised deliberately, and, not infrequently, sexually abused" during the 17th century (66).

Demos (1970) argues that Puritan babies of the 17th century were gently treated: warm, breast-fed and not clothed in restrictive garments, so that

for his first year or so a baby had a relatively tranquil and comfortable time (134).

However, after weaning, during the second year of life as a child was beginning to assert his own will, there was a radical turn towards severe discipline. Demos argues that aggression was an emotion which aroused concern, confusion and conflict among Puritans and thus a child asserting his own will would seem to sincere Puritans as "a clear manifestation of original sin such being the case, the only appropriate response from parents was a repressive one" (136). This lack of toleration for any assertions of autonomy in the child, Demos believes, would lead in turn to a preoccupation with shame by the child in later life. This, Demos states, was an essential feature of the Puritan character. This idea is taken further in a later paper by Demos (1973), in which he views the Puritan method of child rearing as being functionally appropriate to the wider Puritan culture. For example:

Shaming was employed as a disciplinary technique, to an extent that directly enhanced the early sensitivities in this area (136).

Puritan children who had endured such a harsh system of discipline, as adults would be:

conditioned to respond to those cues which would ensure their practical welfare (137)

in Puritan society.

Demos (1970) believes that the Puritan system of child-rearing was a repressive but not an abusive method. He takes evidence from the laws of the colony to show that parents were prevented

from ill-treating their children. If a child was very disobedient and unruly, parents were meant to take him or her before the magistrates in court. Demos believes this was not intended to be harsh; but instead was to prevent a parent taking matters completely into his own hands and to allow both sides to have their say in court. Demos argues that the parent-child relationship was seen as reciprocal: the child owed his parents unceasing obedience and respect; but the parents had to accept:

responsibility for certain basic needs of his children - for their physical health and welfare, for their education (understood in the broadest sense), and for the property they would require in order one day to "be for themselves" (104).

and there were legal provisions for those parents who defaulted in their obligations.

Hunt (1972) states that the beating of children was also common, especially in schools. As a child's emerging autonomy was regarded with hostility, attempts were made to break the will of the child. Hunt argues that adults felt threatened by any show of independence, believing that if this was not stopped a child would then exert control over his elders. Hunt's book leaves the distinct impression that children were an unwanted, disturbing element in an adult's life.

MacFarlane (1970), basing his study on Josselin's diary, is one of the very few authors writing after Ariès who does not claim that parents exerted total control over their offspring. For example, in sermons to his children:

Josselin's plea was based on the idea of reciprocity, rather than a natural superiority and authority of the parents (125).

Though Josselin may have upheld the principle of parents arranging the marriages of their offspring, in practice Josselin's children chose their own partners. MacFarlane argues that:

If Josselin is typical, Puritan fathers were less austere and less able to exert control over their children than some historians would have us believe (125).

MacFarlane is also opposed to the idea that fathers regarded their sons as rivals; using Josselin's example, he states:

.... there is evidence that fathers were prepared to dote upon their sons, to cherish hopes and devote much time and work to raising them higher in the social order than themselves, and that in return sons were often very fond of their fathers (118).

MacFarlane believes that historians have depicted:

the ideal of deference and humility on the part of the child, strictness amounting to absolute authority on the parent's side, but we know surprisingly little about how the actual situation corresponded to it (111).

2.2.4 The treatment of children from the 18th to the 20th century

In contrast to most authors, Walzer (1976) claims that children were subjected to harsh discipline in 18th century America. He argues that children were to be disciplined early and their wills subdued:

Every opportunity must be taken to curb their wilfulness and teach them to respect and obey (367).

He states that shaming, plus the playing on a child's fears, were the modes of discipline, although some advances in rearing had been made as the punishment was to be adjusted to the child.

Walzer's findings are directly opposed to those of Bremner (1970-73) and Smith (1977). Bremner states that, for the mid-18th century, children were to be disciplined from an early age, so that when they were past the age for punishment they would still obey their

parents. However, they were not to be chastised too severely; the will was not to be broken as it was feared that children would then lose all their vigour and industry. After the American Revolution, the treatment of children did alter as men throughout the country tried to create new patterns in education appropriate for the people of an independent and republican nation. Thus, Bremner claims, in the 19th century children were even being spoilt too much.

Smith states that child-rearing in 18th century Chesapeake bore "a closer resemblance to that in modern society than past times" (32). Parents were very pleased at the birth of a child and surrounded their offspring with a warm affectionate environment. He further argues that the sources used by him indicate that children "were not treated as depraved beings whose wilfulness and sense of autonomy had to be quashed by age two or three" (39). Parents and relatives were fond of children, often indulged them and granted them considerable freedom. There was a close relationship between parents and children and Smith believes that most Chesapeake parents expected their children:

to give pleasure and comfort in return
for parental tenderness and nurture (42).

Smith believes that the parents wanted to develop in their children:

powers of self-discipline which, parents
believed, would produce self-reliant,
independent adults (45).

They accepted the advice of such people as Locke to a certain extent, for example, allowing their children plenty of outside play; but they placed more emphasis on developing a child's freedom of movement and sense of personal autonomy, particularly in sons, than in instilling respect and obedience for parental authority.

The parents tried not to crush their children's wills; instead disciplining their children more by negotiation and bargaining than by a show of authority" (50). Fathers also were clearly attached to their young children, and vice versa. Smith sees this affectionate nurturant atmosphere provided by 18th century Chesapeake parents and a "supporting web of kin", as helping to produce strong-willed, self-reliant children with a strong sense of emotional security and a clear self-identity (5).

The majority of authors would agree that the 18th century saw a transformation in the accepted mode of child-rearing, at least in Britain. For example, Sears (1975) believed that up till the 18th century children were "subjected to indignities now hard to believe". Although Locke in 1690 had already expressed the idea that children should not be treated harshly, Sears claims that this point of view still had to be "made popular for parents". Plumb (1975) similarly argues that up till the end of the 17th century there was a harsh attitude to children. He states that children were viewed as being full of Original Sin and therefore the "common lot [of children] was fierce parental discipline" (65). Though Plumb does admit that there were exceptions, that some children were well-treated by their parents, he claims that these were a minority.

He maintains that a new social attitude towards children was appearing from the 17th century on. A "new world" was opening up for children during the 18th century: books, games, clothes especially designed for children and more entertainment in the form of museums, zoos and exhibitions all appeared and educational establishments were increasing. (Plumb omits to mention that a "new world" was opening up for adults too. Adults had not been sampling such delights as exhibitions, zoos and novels in previous centuries to the exclusion of children; they did not come into existence until the 18th century.)

Plumb, like Ariès, does not regard this new world he depicts for children in the 18th century as being all beneficial. Children lost as well as gained: for example, sex now became a "world of terror for children"; their private lives became even more rigorously disciplined and supervised as society's image of the ideal child was one who was good and sweet, not dirty and noisy. Plumb ends, however, more optimistically than Ariès, claiming (rather in contradiction to the rest of his paper):

Fortunately the images that society creates for children rarely reflect the truth of actual life (93).ⁱⁱⁱ

He concludes that, as children had more to stimulate the ear and eye in the 18th century, they had indeed "entered a far richer world". (93).

Shorter (1976) and Stone (1977) also claim that the 18th century marked the transition from cruel to kind methods of child rearing. Stone claims that from the mid-18th century on a "permissive" mode of child rearing was adopted. He argues that there was an intermediate stage between the severity of the 17th century and the permissiveness of the mid to late 18th:

when parents became affectionate towards their children, but still retained very tight control over them, now by psychological rather than physical means (433).

Stone suggests that, for this period, parents were to set their children an example rather than crush them with beatings.

By the late 18th century Stone states that there were some exceedingly indulgent parents who reared their children with an

iii. The method of inferring the actual experience of children from attitudes which is so much a feature of this literature will be discussed in Chapter Two.

"injudicious fondness". This extremely permissive mode of child-rearing aroused public protests:

There is an extraordinary contrast between these reiterated warnings in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries about excessive maternal influence and domestic affection, and the complaints in the late seventeenth century about excessive parental indifference and severity. It is a contrast that clearly had a firm base in reality (439).

Stone believes there have been major changes in child-rearing practices during the period 1500-1800 (for him, the crucial change is the transition from "distance, deference and patriarchy" to "affective individualism", p.4.). Yet, even in the 18th century, Stone argues parents still appeared to control their son's choice of career and daughters were expected to conform to the ideal image of femininity: frail, pale, slim and straight, and thus they were subjected to purges, spare diets and blackboards with iron collars.

Despite the general swing to permissiveness which occurred in the 18th century, Stone finds definite class differences in the methods of rearing children during this period. These differences are:

- (a) Higher court aristocracy: these showed a negligent mode with the care of children given to nurses and teachers.
- (b) Upper classes: these cared for their children but believed in physical punishment.
- (c) Professional and landed classes: these showed a permissiveness and very affectionate mode of rearing.
- (d) Puritans, non-conformist bourgeoisie and upper artisans: these showed concern and love for their children, substituting prayers, moralising and threats of damnation for beatings.
- (e) Lower artisans: these did want their children to have a sound education; but treated them brutally.

(f) Poor: these were brutal, exploitative and indifferent towards their offspring.

It is unclear how much these class trends conformed to actual practice. Stone, for example, merely assumes that the poor, because they were poor, were therefore cruel to their children. (For a criticism of Stone in regard to this point, see Gillis, 1979 and Scott, 1979).

Trumbach (1978) argues that, while aristocratic parents were more attached to their children in the 18th century, discipline was still strict. The child's will "was to be broken, and he was to be made obedient to his parents" (244) but the use of whipping as a punishment declined after 1750. Trumbach states that parents were concerned about spoiling their children and that the aim of their discipline was to prepare children for the disappointments of the adult world.

De Mause (1976) also agrees there was an increase in empathy during the 18th century. He maintains that children in the past were systematically ill-treated:

The further back in history one goes the lower the level of child care, and the more likely children are to be killed, abandoned, beaten, terrorised and sexually abused (1).

In fact he states that, up till the 18th century when parents were more in favour of shutting children in dark cupboards than beating them, "Century after century of battered children grew up and in turn battered their own children" (41).

De Mause argues that parent-child interaction oscillated between "projection" and "reversal". Parents project all their unacceptable feelings into the child and so therefore feel that severe measures must be taken to keep the child under control. Role-reversal, in which the child was meant to "mother" his parents,

was also common:

One receives the impression that the perfect child would be one who literally breast-feeds the parent (19)

De Mause views "the continuous shift between projection and reversal between the child as devil and as adult" as producing a "double image" and believes that this is responsible for much of the "bizarre" quality of childhood in the past. (21). He argues that this shift was a precondition for ill-treating children as parents were frightened of their own mothers and that it was also

the projective and reversal reactions which make guilt impossible in the severe beatings which we so often encounter in the past (8).

Because parents lacked the maturity to see their children as separate beings, they ill-treated them:

The child was only an incidental victim, a measure of the part it played in the defense system of the adult (43).

De Mause believes that there have been six modes of parent-child relations, leading to more empathy between parent and child:

generation after generation of parents slowly overcame their anxieties and began to develop the capacity to identify and satisfy the needs of their children (51).

These modes are:

- (a) Infanticidal mode, up till the 4th century: parents coped with their anxiety by killing their children and later sexually abusing those that did survive.
- (b) Abandonment mode, 4th to the 13th century: parents accepted the child had a soul and so to "escape the dangers of their own projections" abandoned their children.
- (c) Ambivalent mode, 4th to 17th century: the parents' task was to

mould the child into shape.

- (d) Intrusive mode, the 18th century: the child was seen as less threatening and so empathy was possible. Parents tried to totally control their children.
- (e) Socialisation mode, 19th to mid-20th century: the child to be trained, not conquered, guided into the proper paths and taught to conform.
- (f) Helping mode, mid-20th century on: the child knows better than the parent what it needs at each stage of life. The child is not disciplined, struck or scolded and the parent plays with the child "continually responding to it being its servant rather than the other way around" (52).

Exceedingly dubiously, de Mause believes that children reared by the last mode will be "gentle, sincere and never depressed".

It appears from the literature that the 18th century was unusually enlightened - harsh discipline was again to be the preferred mode of child-rearing in the 19th century. Sears (1975) describes the Calvinistic approach to child-rearing in the early 19th century. The aim of rearing was to break wilfulness in a child and create a respect for authority. This was to be done not by using physical punishment as a means of control, but by withholding love from the child. Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) argue that the first prevention of cruelty to children act was not passed until 1889 because:

of the continuing social acceptance of violence which, as far as children were concerned, was as much a feature of their parents as it was of their teachers (302).

They consider parent and state to be equally harsh and that statutory protection for children was gained only after a "long and bitter struggle".

Robertson (1976) argues that "it was late in the nineteenth century before birching at home was abandoned by the most enlightened parents" and believes that whippings were the favourite method of punishment (418). Robertson states that there was a controversy over whether children should be severely disciplined or not: some advice literature insisted on harsh whippings, other types that a child's will was to be curbed not broken, and yet others urged English mothers to make a child feel that home is the happiest place in the world. Robertson believes that, at least for England, the last was only ideal and the first two were more likely to be observed in practice. Stone (1977) also found that at the end of the 18th century and during the 19th, due to the rise of the Evangelical movement, there was a renewed formality in parent-child relationships and again intense supervision of children with severe punishment. Stone finds that this time beatings were less common; food deprivation and locking in cupboards being the preferred modes of discipline. Permissiveness, Stone states, was again spreading by the late 19th century.

Even by the 20th century, the world was still not a completely happy place for children. In the 1920s the "medical morality" was prevalent (Newson and Newson, 1976) which believed that children should learn self-control. The theorists of this period stated that children were never to be hugged or kissed and Newson and Newson believe that both mother and child suffered from such harsh systems of rearing. However, it is generally agreed that we have now reached "maturity" in our dealings with children. De Mause (1976) suggests that we cater to our children's every need, Stone (1977) that we "lavish profound affection" on our children and Sears (1975) that, apart from showing concern for the physical welfare of our offspring, we now also recognise two other needs:

One is the right of all children to the opportunity for optimal development not only in the physical realm but in the intellectual, emotional and social ones as well. The other is the right to be treated with the same dignity and equality of respect for feelings that adults receive (62).

2.3 The Formal Parent-Child Relationship

Those authors who referred to the nature of the relationship between parents and children, described it as "formal": parents were distant, unapproachable beings and children were inferior objects whose demands need not be considered, let alone met. It is suggested that, through the centuries, this relationship has become progressively closer.

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) state that parents kept their distance from their children. Children were regarded as the property of their parents and so their labour was exploited by the poor and their marriages contrived by the rich, both to the economic and social advantage of the parents. Thompson (1974) emphasises the formal parent-child relationship in 17th-century England. This was particularly the case in wealthy families where, he states, children, often even when adult, knelt when addressing their parents. Thompson believes this distant parent-child relationship was due to "the ancient tradition of boarding-out school children in other households" which was "hardly calculated to encourage intimacy between parents and adolescent children" (155). Plumb (1975) states that "children and parents shared few pursuits together in the seventeenth century" (67). De Mause (1976) believes that "the history of childhood is a series of closer approaches between adult and child" (3). Stone (1977) claims that distance was to be maintained between parents and children of the

16th and 17th centuries, giving examples of the "extraordinary deference" shown to parents by their children. Bremner (1970-73) argues that the closer parent-child relationship which developed in America arose out of democracy:

I think that in proportion as manners and laws became more democratic, the relation of father and son becomes more intimate and more affectionate; rules and authority are less talked of, confidence and tenderness are often increased and it would seem that the natural bond is drawn closer in proportion as the social bond is loosened (349).

MacFarlane (1976) would disagree, however, with the above authors. He points out that there is no evidence for a formal parent-child relationship in Josselin's diary. Josselin was prepared to help solve his children's problems and once his offspring had left home, they kept in constant contact with their parents.

3.0 THE EVIDENCE FOR THE THESIS

The sources used for the history of childhood are overwhelmingly secondary: moral and medical tracts, religious sermons and the views of contemporary "experts", particularly that of Locke. For example, Tucker (1976) writes:

The sources used are primarily early printed books which deal with children, education, pediatrics and parental attitudes.

De Mause (1976), when studying discipline, used 200 advice statements on child-rearing for the 18th century and Stone (1977) lists several hundred such sources of evidence. The picture given by

the above sources is mainly supplemented by evidence from paintings (notably used by Ariès, 1962); fictional literature (for example: Godfrey, 1907; Lyman, 1976); travellers' accounts (for example: Marvick, 1976; Shorter, 1976); newspaper reports (for example: Bremner, 1970-73; Stone, 1977); biographies (for example: de Mause, 1976; McLaughlin, 1976); legislation (for example: Demos, 1970; Morgan, 1944), and such primary sources as diaries, memoirs and letters. When primary sources of evidence are used as the main source of information, for example as by: Crump (1929), Lohead (1956), MacFarlane (1970), Smith (1977) and Trumbach (1978), a much less repressive picture of childhood is presented. Hunt (1972) is the one exception and this is probably due to the strangeness of Dr. Héroard's diary.^{iv}

Admittedly, the century studied by Smith and Trumbach - the 18th - is one which most authors regard as being more humane in attitudes to and treatment of children; however, MacFarlane's findings for the previous century are in direct opposition to the conclusions of other historians. Those authors who have used such sources as diaries and autobiographies as a supplement, have done so selectively and anecdotally. They have tended to present the evidence contained in secondary sources and then illustrated this by referring to one or two diaries or autobiographies - or rather to parts of one or two such sources.

The evidence presented for the thesis that there was no concept of childhood in the past and that parents were, at best, indifferent to their offspring and, at worst, cruel to them, is varied. That there was no concept of childhood is argued from the depiction of children in paintings, children's dress, the referring to children

iv. See Marvick (1974): "The Character of Louis XIII: the role of his physician in its formation".

as 'it', family structure and from the fact that dead children's names were given to later offspring. The indifference and cruelty of parents is derived from the practice of such behaviours as infanticide, abandonment, wet-nursing, swaddling, and the sending of children away on apprenticeships. The educative system, family structure, the concept of Original Sin, state policies and the high infant mortality rate are also believed to have led to emotional detachment on the part of the parents and also to a repressive system of discipline.

As has already been stated, Ariès (1962) argues that medieval art before the 12th century "did not attempt to portray" childhood because there "was no place for childhood in the medieval world". Demos (1970) and Zuckerman (1970) claim that children after 7 were dressed as their parents and treated as "miniature adults". Ariès states that, in the medieval period, as soon as infants were removed from their swaddling bonds, they were dressed as adults; but due to the emergence of a concept of childhood, they wore different clothes from adults from the 17th century on.

Lyman (1976), de Mause (1976), McLaughlin (1976) and Tucker (1976) all state that infanticide and the abandonment of children was frequent in the past and is evidence of the neglect shown to children in the past. De Mause claims that infanticide was "an accepted, everyday occurrence" in ancient times (25) and Lyman and McLaughlin maintain that it was still common in the medieval period. De Mause further believes that:

once parents began to accept the child as having a soul, the only way they could escape the dangers of their own projections was by abandonment (51).

Shorter (1976) also includes abandonment in his list of evidence for the indifference which parents felt towards their children during the 17th century. However, he does concede that, for some

parents poverty was the cause of abandonment and that the separation was painful. Hunt (1972), de Mause (1976), Shorter (1976) and Stone (1977) regard wet-nursing as a way for parents to rid themselves of their children - particularly as there was a high mortality rate for infants so nursed. The swaddling of infants has also been put forward as evidence of neglect. Hunt believes it was a way for parents to restrain the "animality" of young children; de Mause claims that "its convenience to adults was enormous - they rarely had to pay any attention to infants once they were tied up" (37) and Shorter views swaddling as a means of preventing interaction with the child because the infant cannot wave his hands and feet or grasp an object. Marvick (1976) is one of the few authors to point out that swaddling kept a child warm and out of harm's way.

One explanation for the neglect of children in the past appears more frequently in the literature than any other: the high infant mortality rate. (The authors would appear to regard children under the age of 5 or 6 as infants.) Because so many children died, parents found it too distressing to become emotionally attached to their offspring and therefore remained detached. Ariès (1962) wrote:

Nobody thought, as we ordinarily think today, that every child contained a man's personality. Too many of them had died. It was simply not worthwhile for parents to emotionally invest in a child to any great extent when it was more than probable that child was going to die (37).

Ariès feels that we should be surprised at "the earliness of the idea of childhood" as infants up till the 19th century had a slender chance of survival. (He does not appear to have considered that this fact may negate his argument. If the high infant mortality rate explained the indifference of parents to their offspring, why

did this indifference not continue for as long as the high infant mortality rate continued?)

Hunt (1972) concludes that the repudiation of children in French society was:

prompted by the nagging awareness, that they, the parents were not able to fathom the secrets of this stage of life and were conspicuously unsuccessful in keeping children alive as well (185).

Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) believe that the high infant mortality rate was due to the carelessness of the nurse which:

was often matched by an indifference on the part of parents, an attitude almost inevitably induced at a time when parents had so many children that they ceased to take an interest in them individually (301).

In fact they claim that a large number of child deaths was due to "culpable neglect and cruelty". Stone (1977) would again regard the high infant mortality rate as a crucial factor: "the omnipresence of death coloured affective relations" at all levels of society and reduced the amount of emotional capital available for prudent investment in any single individual, especially infants (477). Therefore, Stone argues, parents neglected their infants and this in turn reduced their chance of survival. Stone believes that the reduction in the infant death rate - from 60% (as a percentage of baptisms) of infants under 2 dying during the period 1730-49 to 23% for the period 1810-29 - was unlikely to be due solely to medical improvements such as inoculation or such nutritional improvements as the availability of cow's milk, but instead reflects a "change in attitude towards children" involving a greater concern for the preservation of infant life (477). He concludes that, during the 20th century, as young children no longer die so frequently:

it is worthwhile to lavish profound affection upon them and to invest heavily in their education, while their numbers have necessarily to be restricted by contraception (681).

Shorter (1976) and Trumbach (1978), like Stone, regard the lack of maternal love and care as being the cause of the high infant death rate. Trumbach argues, convincingly, that such innovations as maternal breast-feeding and inoculation occurred after the fall in the aristocratic infant death rate in the 18th century.

Ariès (1962) argues that it was the rise of an education system; Plumb (1975), Sears (1975) and Stone (1977) that it was the concept of Original Sin and Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) that it was state policies which led to a strict discipline being imposed on children. The educators (and parents) believed children needed to be beaten in order to be trained. The concept of Original Sin ensured that a child would be treated harshly in order to "cure" him of his inherent sinfulness. As children up to the end of the 19th century were subject to the full force of the law and were not protected from exploitation in such areas as employment, parental care was similarly harsh according to Pinchbeck and Hewitt. Ariès and Stone also relate strict discipline to family structure, although in different ways. Ariès argues that the extended "sociable" family of the middle ages allowed children a great deal of freedom, but in the transition to the closed, nuclear family a child became more constrained and disciplined. Stone, however, believes that the extended family, which placed loyalty to ancestors above all else, treated children harshly, whereas the modern nuclear family emphasises humane methods of child-rearing. Thompson (1974) believes that the system of apprenticeship by which young children - from the age of 7 onwards - left home for other households, led to a formal parent-child relationship and de Mause (1976) argues that the system was also evidence of the neglect which

children experienced. MacFarlane (1970) and Morgan (1944) would however disagree. MacFarlane found that Josselin's children left home between the ages of 10½ to 15 years and contact was maintained with their parents. MacFarlane suggests the children were sent away as a means of broadening their experience; and also as a means of removing friction and the possibility of incest in overcrowded homes. Morgan (1944) also points out that parents and offspring did keep in contact while the latter was kept home. He argues they were sent away because parents feared spoiling their children. Cleverley and Philips (1976), de Mause (1976), Newson and Newson (1974) and Wishy (1968) assert that it was the child-rearing theories of the time, particularly those of the Calvinist doctrine, which ensured a harsh disciplinary system for all children. Shorter (1976) claims that the referring to a child as 'it', the non-attendance of parents at their children's funerals and the giving of a dead child's name to a later sibling are all evidence for the indifference which he states parents felt in regard to their children.

Ariès (1962) argues that the emergence of a concept of childhood could be seen in such things as:

- (a) children being given special clothes, distinct from those worn by adults.
- (b) children having their own toys and games.
- (c) a growing tendency to express in art the personality children were seen to possess.

Stone (1977) lists such evidence for the increased attention paid to children as: the appearance of amusing children's books and toy shops in the mid-18th century; the appearance of portraits of children sitting in their mother's laps, which Stone believes indicates a friendly association with their parents, and the decline in the infant death rate. Shorter (1976) and Trumbach (1978) also argue that the infant death rate declined because mothers were

more concerned for their offspring.

Most of the evidence is used for the purpose of relating social history but, in a few cases (Demos, 1970, 1973; Hunt, 1972; de Mause, 1976 and Trumbach, 1978) it has been linked to psychological theory. In the case of the first three authors, psychoanalytic theory has been used to explain their results: Demos and Hunt have relied on Erikson's (1963) theory and de Mause on Freudian theory. Trumbach has applied Bowlby's (1966) theory on attachment to his findings.

Demos, Hunt and de Mause wished to relate childhood experience to the formation of adult personality. As Demos (1973) explicitly states, he was attempting:

to find certain underlying themes in the experience of children in a given culture or period in order to throw some light on the formation of later personality (128)

However, there are grave methodological problems with psychoanalytic theory. The above authors' conclusions are based on the dubious assumption that there is a close correlation between childhood experience and adult character; that adult personality reflects any interference by adults with the unfolding development of the child. Thus they ignore the influence of developmental periods later than early childhood, and the interaction of these with culture (Shore, 1979). In addition, Clarke and Clarke (1976) provide details of a number of studies which challenge "the notion of irreversibility of effects induced by early experience" and also the belief that "early experiences exercise a disproportionate influence upon later development".

4.0

WHY THE CHANGES OCCURRED

Where authors have attempted to explain why the modern concept of childhood emerged, why cruelty to children diminished, and why the parent-child relationship became less formal, they have done so with reference to:

- (a) the emergence of an education system (Ariès, 1962; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969)
- (b) changes in family structure (Ariès, 1962; Shorter, 1976 and Stone, 1977)
- (c) the rise of capitalism (Hoyles, 1979; Shorter, 1976 and Stone, 1977)
- (d) the increasing maturity of parents (de Mause, 1976)
- (e) the emergence of a spirit of benevolence (Sears, 1975; Shorter, 1976, Stone, 1977 and Trumbach, 1978).

- (a) According to Ariès (1962), the change in attitude towards children from one in which children "did not count" to one in which they were "an indispensable element of every-day life" was due to a "revival" of interest in education and also to the development of the family. He argues that medieval society lacked the "idea of education"; it "had forgotten the paideia of the ancients and knew nothing as yet of modern education" (395). Nevertheless a small group of people in the 17th century: "churchmen, lawyers and scholars", were interested in the moral reform of society and recognised the importance of education in bringing this about. Ariès believes that it was this group of people who were responsible for the segregation of children from adults. He claims that schools too were an important vehicle in this change by removing children from adult society and also by extending the period of childhood - in effect creating a separate world of childhood. Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) agree with Ariès that the emergence of a

system of education was mainly responsible for the emergence of our concept of childhood:

the institutional development and acceptance of formal education in schools with the consequent isolation of the child from adult society was a prerequisite of the emergence of modern sociological and psychological concepts of childhood (306).

- (b) Ariès' conclusions are based on a particular interpretation of medieval life - that of its sociability. He argues that the development of the family from the 17th century form of being "open to the obtrusive world of friends, clients and servants" to the nuclear form of today where parents and children are "happy in their solitude and indifferent to the rest of society" had important implications for the development of a concept of childhood. The modern family:

cuts itself off from the world and apposes to society the isolated group of parents and children. All the energy of the group is expended on helping the children to rise in the world, individually and without any collective ambition: the children rather than the family (390).

Ariès insists that it is impossible to separate the concept of childhood from the concept of the family:

The interest taken in childhood is only one form, one particular expression of this more general concept - that of the family (341).

Shorter (1976) sees the traditional family "as a mechanism for transmitting property and position from generation to generation" and thus was not concerned with individual welfare (5). It was "much more a productive and reproductive unit than an emotional unit" (5). However, due to a "surge of sentiment" (undefined) in three areas, the traditional family became less concerned with financial status, its ties with the

outside world were weakened and the ties binding family members together reinforced. Shorter believes that the "surge of sentiment" in the following three areas was crucial to the making of the modern family, taking place in the 18th and 19th centuries:

1. Courtship: romantic love superceded material considerations for marriage.
2. Mother-infant relationship: infant welfare became the most important consideration.
3. The family: a bounding line developed between it and the community and affection and love took the place of "instrumental considerations in regulating the dealings of the family members with one another" (5).

Shorter is nevertheless unsure whether or not these changes were caused by the "surge of sentiment" or vice versa.

Stone (1977) would also relate attitudes to childhood to the development of the family. He associates different methods of child-rearing with different types of family, which he labels as:

Type a: 1450-1630: the open lineage family

Type b: 1550-1700: the restricted patriarchal nuclear family

Type c: 1640-1800: the closed domesticated nuclear family

Family type "a", Stone argues, places loyalty to ancestors and living kin uppermost and the interests of the group take priority over those of the individual. Therefore the relations between husband and wife, parents and children, were not very close. Children tended not to live with their parents for long: they were first nursed out, then had nurses and tutors and finally at an early age left home for school or work. Younger sons and especially daughters were often unwanted as they were regarded as a drain on economic resources. Obedience was

often forced with brutality.

Family type "b" was more closed off from external influences and the power of the husband over his wife and children was stronger. For this form of the family, Stone states that there is a great deal of evidence revealing the wish to break the will of the child.

Stone regards family type "c" as being the product of "affective individualism" (Shorter's "surge of sentiment"?). This family type practised a permissive style of child-rearing.

- (c) Hoyles (1979) argues that "the invention of childhood as a separate state corresponds with the transition from feudalism to capitalism" (about the 16th century) (3). In addition, the wish of the rising bourgeoisie to have their sons educated in a particular way in order to prepare them for their adult work and to enable them to challenge the power of the aristocracy, led to the development of schooling and the modern concept of childhood. Here Hoyles is disagreeing with Ariès (1962) that it was the views of a small minority of priests, moralists and lawyers which were responsible for the change. He believes that it was the rising bourgeoisie and the new Protestant thinkers (living in a capitalist society, which needed educated workers) who were the agents of change.

Shorter agrees that capitalism, although this time for the 19th century, increased the value of children:

What I am arguing is that the transformation of child care within the family came about as a direct result of the economic growth that nineteenth century capitalism produced (265).

Stone states that the rise of "affective individualism" (which led to the formation of the closed domesticated nuclear family) was made possible due to the growth and spread of

commercial capitalism and also the emergence of a large and "self-confident middle class".

- (d) De Mause (1976) argues that there was a continuous sequence of modes of child-rearing ranging from the infanticidal to the helping mode. In the latter mode, the parents show true empathic care - they are able to realise and meet the needs of their children. These modes evolved "as generation after generation of parents overcame their anxieties and began to develop the capacity to identify and satisfy the needs of their children" (51).
- (e) Shorter's "surge of sentiment" and Stone's "affective individualism" have already been referred to. They would appear to be examples of some indefinable spirit of humanity which appeared in society in the 18th century according to Shorter, but in the 17th according to Stone. Sears (1975) also suggests that, by the end of the 18th century, there had occurred "a clear increment in the empathic ethos of Western society" (3). This newly aroused empathic spirit "dictated a change from punitiveness and brutality to kindness and compassion" in methods of child rearing. Trumbach (1978) believes that the increase in domesticity occurring in the aristocratic 18th century was brought about by the egalitarian movement - that all men were equal. The ideal of domesticity encouraged both parents to take more interest in their children. Trumbach would disagree with Stone that affectionate relationships were only possible in nuclear families.

REFERENCES

- Ariès, Philippe (1962): Centuries of Childhood; Jonathan Cape, London.
- Bayne-Powell, Rosamund (1939): The English Child in the Eighteenth Century; John Murray, London.
- Bowlby, John (1966): Maternal Care and Mental Health and Deprivation of Maternal Care; Schocken Books, New York.
- Bremner, Robert, ed. (1970-73): Children and Youth in America; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Cleverley, J. and Philips, I. (1976): From Locke to Spock; Melbourne University Press.
- Crump, Lucy (1929): Nursery Life 300 Years Ago; George Routledge & Sons Ltd., London.
- Demos, John (1970): Family Life in a Plymouth Colony; Oxford University Press.
- Demos, John (1973): "Developmental perspectives on the history of childhood"; in Rabb, T. and Rotberg, R. eds., The Family in History; Harper and Row, New York & London, pp.127-140.
- Earle, Alice (1899): Child Life in Colonial Days; MacMillan, New York.
- Erikson, Eric (1963): Childhood and Society; W.W. Norton & Co.,
- Findlay, J. (1923): The Children of England; Methuen & Co., London.
- Firestone, Shillamith (1971): The Dialectic of Sex; Jonathan Cape, London.
- Fleming, Sandford (1933): Children and Puritanism: The Place of Children in the Life and Thought of the New England Churches, 1620-1847; Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Gillis, John (1979): "Affective individualism and the English poor"; in Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. x, no. 11, pp. 121-128.
- Godfrey, Elizabeth (1907): English Children in the Olden Time; Methuen & Co., London.

Housden, Leslie (1955): The Prevention of Cruelty to Children; Jonathan Cape, London.

Hoyles, Martin (1979): "Childhood in historical perspective"; in Hoyles, Martin, ed. Changing Childhood; Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative, London, pp.16-29.

Hunt, David (1972): Parents and Children in History; Harper and Row, New York.

Illich, Ivan (1973): Deschooling Society; Penguin Books, Middlesex.

Illick, Joseph (1976): "Child-rearing in seventeenth century England and America"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed.: The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.303-350.

Lothead, Marion (1956): Their First Ten Years; John Murray, London.

Lyman, Richard (1976): "Barbarism and religion: late Roman and early medieval childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.75-100.

Lynd, S. (1942): English Children; William Collins, London.

MacFarlane, Alan (1970): The Family Life of Ralph Josselin; Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, Mary (1976): "Survivors and surrogates: children and parents from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.101-182.

Marvick, Elizabeth (1974): "The character of Louis XIII: the role of his physician"; in The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 4, no. 3, pp.347-374.

Marvick, Elizabeth (1976): "Nature versus nurture: patterns and trends in seventeenth-century French child-rearing"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.254-302.

de Mause, Lloyd, ed. (1976): "The evolution of childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.1-74.

- Morgan, Edmund (1944): The Puritan Family; Trustees of the Public Library, Boston.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1974): "Cultural aspects of child rearing in the English speaking world"; in Richards, M., ed. The Integration of a Child into a Social World; Cambridge University Press, pp.53-83.
- Pinchbeck, I. and Hewitt, M. (1969): Children in English Society; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Plumb, J. (1975): "The new world of children in eighteenth century England"; in Past and Present, vol. 67, pp.64-93.
- Robertson, Priscilla (1976): "Home as a nest: middle class childhood in nineteenth-century Europe"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 407-431.
- Roe, F. Gordon (1959): The Victorian Child; Phoenix House Ltd., London.
- Scott, John (1979): "The history of the family as an affective unit"; in Social History, vol. 4, no. 3, pp.509-516.
- Sears, R. (1975): Your Ancients Revisited. A History of Childhood Development; University of Chicago Press.
- Shore, Miles (1979): "The psychogenic theory of history"; in Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 9, no. 3, pp.517-523.
- Shorter, Edward (1976): The Making of the Modern Family; Collins, London.
- Smith, Daniel (1977): "Autonomy and affection: parents and children in eighteenth-century Chesapeake families"; in The Psychohistorical Review, vol. 6, pp.32-51.
- Stone, Lawrence (1977): The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Thompson, R. (1974): Women in Stuart England and America; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pp.145-161.
- Trumbach, Randolph (1978): The Rise of the Egalitarian Family; Academic Press, New York & London.

Tucker, M.J. (1976): "The child as beginning and end: fifteenth and sixteenth century English childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 229-258.

Walzer, John (1976): "A period of ambivalence: eighteenth century American childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.351-382.

Wishy, Bernard (1968): The Child and The Republic. The Dawn of Modern American Child Nurture; University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Zuckerman, Michael (1970): Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century; Random House, New York.

CHAPTER TWO

THE THESIS RE-EXAMINED: A CRITICISM
OF THE LITERATURE

Despite the lack of agreement over when changes in the treatment of children occurred and whether the emergence of a concept of childhood increased or reduced the severity of discipline imposed on children, the overall picture presented by researchers in the history of childhood is very similar. It is suggested, with only a few exceptions, that parents regarded their children with indifference, that there was no appreciation of childhood as a separate state from adulthood and that harsh treatment was the normal lot for children. However, there are numerous problems with this thesis; both with regard to the evidence used to support it and the argument itself.

1.0

THE EVIDENCE

Research into the history of childhood involves relying on very problematic sources of evidence, but accounts so far of attitudes to and treatment of children in the past reveal little, if any, awareness of these problems. Child advice literature, paintings, travellers' accounts, child dress and such treatment of infants as infanticide, abandonment, sending to a wet nurse and swaddling have all been utilised as sources of evidence and will be considered here.

1.1

Child Advice Literature

Child advice literature is the main source of evidence used in accounts of childhood in previous societies (excluding Ariès (1962) who concentrated mainly on paintings) - only a few authors have relied on primary sources such as autobiographies and diaries to

any great extent. Quotations are taken from the contemporary books, sermons and moral tracts of the time and used, not only to demonstrate what the current theories about children were, but also to infer actual parental practice. Mechling (1975) has studied the question of whether or not parents do pay attention to child-rearing literature. She notes that the findings of several surveys in America on early 20th century advice literature (see the Berkeley Growth Study, "an ongoing longitudinal study of child development", and Bronfenbrenner, 1958, for a review of such studies) showed that such advice is not heeded by mothers. She then turns to the problem of using this type of literature in historical research and considers four methodological problems with its use as a source for inferring parental behaviour: the meaning and the class bias of the advice, the extent to which parents learn to be parents from reading advice books and the theoretical link between behaviour and values.

Mechling claims that there are two main types of advice literature: that which "reflects" current practice and that which is the "vanguard" of change (46). She criticises historians for not differentiating between the two types of evidence because this causes problems in determining what the advice means in its context. Murphey (1965) believes that advice manuals are "not descriptions of actual practice, but prescriptions of what practice ought to be" (150). Brobeck (1976) points out that such manuals are written by people who may not have been parents themselves and who may not have perceived behavioural and cultural patterns accurately. He also believes that, as many of the theorists are surely attempting to reform behaviour, they may recommend methods of child-rearing contrary to what actually prevailed. Both Mechling and Murphey state that the manuals are heavily biased in favour of the middle and upper classes - the literate sections of the population in past societies and also those who could afford

to buy such books. Thus it is risky to generalise from them to the population as a whole.

Mechling further criticises historians for assuming that parents learn to be parents by reading advice books. She suggests instead four processes by which parents learn the art of parenting: identification, imitation, instruction and invention. She believes that people:

learn the role of parent and the entire constellation of childrearing customs associated with that role primarily through interaction with their parents. (49).

Children identify with their own parents when they later become parents. Some features of the parental role can also be acquired by the process of imitation. Mechling argues that learning the parental role through imitation has some of the "primary socialization characteristics" of role learning through interaction, whereas role learning by direct instruction, as from advice manuals, is "almost exclusively secondary socialization" (49). Mechling believes that no child-rearing advice book would ever threaten the "originally internalized parent role" (50). Finally, the ability to "invent" a response to a novel child-rearing situation also contributes to the learning and modification of the parental role. Thus advice literature plays a relatively minor part in the learning process.

Mechling then points out that the link between behaviour and values is more complex than historians have realised. She cites studies (Allport, 1935; Kluckhohn et al., 1951 and Rokeach, 1968) which show that different values can produce the same behaviour and that the same values can produce different behaviour in different circumstances. Thus it is impossible to infer actual behaviour from the views expressed in advice literature. Mechling in fact

contends that "childrearing manuals are the consequents not of childrearing values but of childrearing manual-writing values" and therefore even an adequate model of inference from behaviour to values will not help those historians who use child-rearing manuals as evidence of child-rearing values (53).

Mechling concludes that, at best, child-rearing manuals reflect but do not change child-rearing behaviour, and that even asserting that the manuals reflect behaviour depends on independent evidence of actual child-rearing behaviour. She believes that "the historian should make problematic the very existence of such manuals" - i. e. attempt to explain their existence without "any thought whatsoever that they are "about" the childrearing behaviour or values of a historical American culture" (56).

In Britain Newson and Newson (1965), in a study of Nottingham parents with 1-year-old children, found that "contemporary baby books are a rather poor indication of what actually happens in the home" (235). From their study of 4-year-olds, Newson and Newson (1968) also conclude:

We do not have the impression that mothers in Britain are strongly expert-oriented so far as child-rearing is concerned, nevertheless the majority expect to be able to find fun in parent-hood, if necessary rejecting more authoritarian advice in order to do so (556).

The advice literature quoted from is generally of the authoritarian type; in fact most of the authors give the impression that there was no other. However, not all child-rearing theories were harsh. McLaughlin (1976) found two types of advice literature, one emphasizing the importance of strict discipline and the other that children should not be beaten. (She believes that the former type was the one put into practice by parents.) Bremner (1970-73) gives the example of two different kinds of advice for the early 19th

century - one advocating the child's will should be broken - the Calvinistic approach - and the other advocating a more gentle method of child rearing. Murphey (1965) found the same two types of advice for the 19th century and also advice theories which were mid-way between the two: those influenced by Locke (1699) who believed a child was to be reared strictly so that he would not be corrupted by society. Murphey argues that the Calvinistic approach to child rearing would only be put into practice by those parents of the Calvinistic denomination; there is no reason to suppose it was accepted by others. He further points out that there were also Calvinistic theorists who advocated an approach not unlike the gentle method of rearing. Therefore harsh theories on child rearing were not as widespread as most authors would seem to assume.ⁱ

Newson and Newson (1974) found that those mothers who did put into practice the advice of such 20th century theorists as Watson (1928) and King (1937) that children were not to be hugged or kissed and that regular habits should be formed early on, found the method distressing. Newson and Newson argue that such theories did not pay enough attention to the parents' own needs and that both parents and children suffered from such harsh rearing modes.

Most writers on the history of childhood accept the views expressed in child rearing literature as being representative of that society and accepted by parents. They concentrate on those books and sermons which recommend harsh discipline and ignore any alternative advice. As it has been found that the majority of

i. There has been little systematic analysis of child rearing advice literature - indeed of any source of evidence. What is needed is a comparison of the prevalence of varying types of advice literature through centuries. This could then be compared with similar analyses of other sources of evidence such as diaries, as it is possible that parallels of change could be found.

parents in the 20th century ignore advice literature, and that those who did follow the advice for a strict method of rearing children found it too upsetting to continue, any conclusions based on child advice literature must be suspect. Most historians seem to assume that parents are empty vessels, ready to be filled up with whatever theory on child-rearing happens to be current. However, parents bring their own views, expectations and experience to the task of rearing their children. They sometimes do, and sometimes do not, act in ways consistent with the advice literature - and because some sections of the advice may be put into practice, it is not safe to assume, as some writers have done, that the rest is. It is impossible to infer parenting behaviour from advice in manuals.

1.2

Paintings

The use of paintings as an index of child treatment is similarly problematical. Ariès (1962), in particular, has relied on paintings in his study of childhood in the past - although other authors such as Demos (1970), Plumb (1975) and Shorter (1976) have also referred to them. Ariès regards paintings as revealing the different attitudes to children and also as depicting the growing awareness of childhood. He claims that up till the 12th century there was no awareness of childhood; children were depicted as adults on a smaller scale, even possessing an adult musculature. This, he argues, was not because of an inability to paint children, but because there was no place for childhood in the medieval world. In the 13th century the infant Jesus appeared in paintings and this theme of Holy Childhood was developed in the 14th and 15th centuries. By the 15th century there were further developments in the depiction of children: lay childhood began to be portrayed, and the naked child. By the 16th century dead children were also

painted and finally in the 17th century children were painted alone.

There are problems with Ariès' interpretation. For example, how far do paintings represent reality? - there is no reason why there should be any connection between the representation and that which is represented. There must have been technical improvements through the centuries so that, for example, painters learnt how to paint in three dimensions and also how to depict such things as the proportions of a child's body. The different types of childhood portrayed in paintings through the centuries may have more to do with changes in art rather than changes in the way children were seen. Ariès' conclusions from his study of paintings have also been criticised by Brobeck (1976), Cohen (n.d.) and Fuller (1979).

Brobeck (1976) studied American portrait paintings for the period 1730-1860. He suggests that there are more adult portraits than children's, not because childhood was regarded as too unimportant a phase to be recorded, but because it is difficult to get children to stay still long enough and because adults wanted themselves and their children to be remembered by future generations as adults.

From his study he found that young children are dressed the same - in feminine attire - until about the age of 5. After the age of 5 boys are usually depicted in masculine dress. Before 1790 they are dressed the same as their fathers; but after this date much more informally. Brobeck suggests that rather than this implying that children were regarded as miniature adults, it was more likely that children were dressed more formally for portraits than they would be normally. However, as boys' attire in portraits did become more informal, he concludes:

Perhaps society, even though it did differentiate between youth and adulthood even in the seventeenth

century, increasingly placed fewer adult demands on its children and more willingly accepted behaviours deviating from adult norms (91).

Cohen (n.d.) looked at the period 1670-1860 in America. He agrees that early paintings of children do appear stiff and two-dimensional and so tend to support the idea that the Puritans regarded children as miniature adults; but argues that "much of these paintings' significance hides under their stylised, planar surfaces" (2). He believes that the fact that Puritans painted children at all was important - and some of the children were painted alone. Cohen suggests that, although 17th century Americans had little notion of age-graded groups, they did distinguish between people of different ages.

Cohen states that, superficially, colonial portraits do show children as little adults; but the painters employed certain techniques, revealing that they did recognise childhood:

A painter who could not deal with three dimensions and who sought to portray a "typical" yet individual human might be forced to rely on some kind of literal symbol to supply the information his visual technique failed to convey (2).

Thus, early painters noted the sitter's age, often to the month. Other devices used to indicate that the painting was of a child - and these are significant differences between child and adult

paintingsⁱⁱ - are:

1. The child stands by a chair, which would give an estimate of his real height.
2. The child had bare feet.

ii. Cohen used a child sample of 158 portraits and an adult sample of 379. Two of his tables are reproduced to show his results*.

Table 1: Total Child and Adult Samples Compared by Lengths

	Length		
	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	full
Children	39	23	96
Adults	291	42	46

($p < 0.001$, 2 d. of f.)

Table 2: Total Child and Adult Samples Compared by Animals (Sic)

	With	Without
Children	56	102
Adults	20	359

($p < 0.001$, 1 d. of f.) (after Cohen, n. d., pp. 8 & 11).

* I presume that Cohen tested the hypotheses that adults and children occurred in paintings with equal frequency at $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$ and full length and that adults and children would be depicted with or without animals with equal frequency. He does state he used the chi-square test; but gives no more details. The differences between children and adults yield the following values:
 $\chi^2 = 148.9$ for Table 1 and $\chi^2 = 86.0$ for Table 2.

3. The child was painted full length.
4. The child was portrayed with animals.
5. From the 19th century on the child was painted with toys or playing.

Cohen concludes from this that: "Americans from the first recognised the distinctiveness of child-hood" (13), although he did discover some changes in attitudes towards children. By the late 18th century children now look their age, partly due to improved techniques and partly due to the need now to show the child as a child. Thus, Cohen argues, children were depicted with toys and/or playing - things which adults do not normally have or do. He states that, also by the end of the 18th century, as seen in portraits, Americans began to distinguish older and younger children. Nevertheless, Cohen does not agree that previous to this Americans did not recognise adolescence:

American consciousness of adolescence as a social phenomenon arose as society began to define the age grades; the world of childhood appeared simultaneously with that of adolescence, but adolescence as a physical phenomenon, always existed, and was caught by the artist's sensitive eyes and hands (20).

Cohen finds several qualities which distinguish the portraits of teenagers from those of children throughout the period he covers. For example:

The range and intensity of adolescent emotions in pictures sets youths apart from the calmer, less vivid portraits of children (21).

Some adolescents were depicted as dreaming, others ready and willing to undertake adult tasks; some communicate extreme self-possession and confidence while others are more unsure. Cohen concludes that the:

examination of paintings has indicated that the earlier colonists thought children different from

adults even as they considered childhood the beginning of a continuous progression to adulthood (26).

Fuller (1979) also studied how childhood was depicted in art, in Europe. He argues against the idea that childhood is a product of history, that past centuries did not regard children as distinct from adults. He explains that many of the "miniature adult" type of children's portrait were used as "bargaining factors in the negotiation of political marriages" and so would depict the child in the jewels and dress appropriate to his state. Even when they had some other function, "the portraits were designed to express what the parents of the child hoped he or she would become" (78). Fuller points out that today children are still depicted as miniature adults, for example, in greeting cards. Fuller believes that:

In Renaissance art, when the child was not the principal subject of the picture, the reproduction of his or her appearance did not have to be done in a way which would immediately please specific adults. The perceptive painter often placed pictorially contingent children within the space of childhood (80).

He gives such examples as:

- (a) A detail from a Crivelli painting of the 15th century in which a little girl is dressed as an adult but with the physical proportions and facial characteristics of a child.
- (b) A portrait of Prince Philip Prosper, aged 2, by Velazques in the 17th century. The child is again dressed as an adult; but the shape of the child's head and its proportion in relation to the body, are that of a 2-year old and the softness of a child's hair and skin have been stressed.
- (c) Artists' paintings of their own children which do not depict them as little adults.

Fuller argues that the upper classes suppressed childhood "but as a condition it was not unknown" (85). He also wonders:

how could it be that the child centred family was such a persistent, ubiquitous and all pervading image throughout those long centuries (85)

when, according to the evidence gathered by Ariès, the idea of childhood did not exist. Fuller finds it difficult to accept that in a civilisation in which the Christian ethic was dominant - one which:

has as its very centre the idea of the specialness of an ordinary child, of his separateness and difference from the adults who surround him (85)

- there was "no perception of children as distinct from adults" (86).

He believes that it was "not childhood, as such, which was transformed through history"; but instead there were profound transformations in the social conditions in which childhood was lived (92). He does agree that there has been an increasing "awareness and recognition of childhood" which he thinks was due to the "19th century bourgeois understanding of nature" - 'Man' and 'Woman' were no longer believed to have been brought intact into the world by God (97).

1.3

Travellers' Accounts

The descriptions of child rearing practices provided by various travellers have been used by a number of authors (for example, see Ariès, 1962; Hoyles, 1979; Hunt, 1972; Marvick, 1976, Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969; Robertson, 1976; Shorter, 1976; Stone, 1977; Thompson, 1974 and Tucker, 1976). The following account, from a late 15th century Italian traveller to England, is used by Ariès, Hoyles, Pinchbeck and Hewitt, Shorter and Tucker among others

usually to show the indifference to children.

The want of affection in the English is strongly manifested towards their children, for after having kept them at home till they arrive at the age of seven or nine years at the utmost, they put them out, both males and females, to hard service in the houses of other people for another seven or nine years. And these are called apprentices, and during that time they perform all the most menial offices; and few are born who are exempted from this fate, for everyone, however rich he may be, sends away his children into the houses of others, whilst he, in return, receives those of strangers into his own.

Ariès does, however, state that it was probable that the children were sent away in order that they might learn better manners.

Accounts of travellers visiting America are also often used, generally to show the indulgence of American parents and the precociousness of the American child from the 18th century on. For example, Thompson (1974) cites an English school teacher who bewailed "the excessive indulgence of American parents and the great difficulty of keeping up a proper discipline" in 1772 (146). Marvick (1976), Robertson (1976) and Stone (1977) quote from accounts of English travellers to France and Robertson also from French and German visitors to Britain. For example, Robertson states that foreign observers found "middle-class French children spoiled" in the 19th century, while in England at the same time a French visitor "did not find in England the irreverence and lack of constraint he was accustomed to at home" and a German traveller "felt there was no intimacy in an English home" (418, 425).

Travellers' accounts may be more descriptive than advice literature of actual practices but they are also biased by cultural differences. As Brobeck (1976) points out:

Judgements as to whether American children act autonomously and aggressively, for example,

reflect the definitions of autonomy and aggression by the culture of the visitors (94).

Murphey (1965) criticises the class bias of the reports: travellers "chiefly saw the urban upper classes and saw them at best fleetingly" (150).

1.4

Child Dress

The way in which children have been dressed - both with reference to their depiction in paintings (for example, Ariès, 1962 and Shorter, 1976) and their actual clothes (for example, Demos, 1970 and Zuckerman, 1970) - has been used as evidence that children were viewed as little adults. For Ariès, the type of dress worn by children in paintings was only one strand in his tapestry of evidence, whereas other authors have used this evidence by itself to demonstrate that children were not seen as children in the past. Demos (1970) claims that: "the fact that children were dressed like little adults does seem to imply a whole attitude of mind" and Zuckerman (1970) writes: "if clothes do not make the man, they do mark social differentiations". Stannard (1974) agrees that children were dressed in a similar manner to adults; but he does not believe this means they were therefore viewed as adults:

to argue in isolation of other data that the absence of a distinctive mode of dress for children is a mark of their being viewed as miniature adults is historical presentation at its very best; one might argue with equal force - in isolation of other facts - that the absence of beards on men in a particular culture, or the presence of short hair as a fashion shared by men and women, is a mark of that culture's failure to distinguish between men and women (457).

Children of both sexes up to about the age of 7 wore a long loose gown open down the front. After 7 they adopted adult

styles of dress. This does not necessarily mean they entered the adult world or that they were viewed as little adults. Hanawalt (1977) states that the accident pattern for children aged 7, taken from coroners' rolls, indicates that the children were engaged in play rather than work. MacFarlane (1970) argues that perhaps children were dressed differently from the age of 7 as that was the age when sexual differentiation was appropriate. Stone (1977) would also argue that dress for children depended more on whims and fashions than on: "deep seated psychological shifts in the attitude towards children" (410). Brobeck (1976) suggests that children were depicted in adult dress in paintings as they would be more formally dressed for portraits than school or play. Fuller (1979) believes that children were shown as adults in paintings because it was intended to depict the adult the child would one day be.

1.5

The Treatment of Infants

De Mause (1976), among others, claims that infanticide, the abandonment, sending to wet nurse and swaddling of infants are all indications of the neglect of, and the indifference to, children in the past. De Mause states that infanticide during antiquity was "an accepted everyday occurrence" and that by the 18th century "there was high incidence of infanticide in every country in Europe" (25, 29). Tucker (1976) writes that in 15th and 16th century England "infanticide was woefully common" (244). On the other hand, Hanawalt (1977) and Helmholtz (1975) have demonstrated that infanticide appears to have been a relatively rare occurrence. In addition, the fact that infanticide was practised does not lead to the conclusion that surviving children were therefore neglected.ⁱⁱⁱ

iii. Anthropological studies such as Konnor (1977) show that, even when infanticide is practised, surviving children are well cared for. Cross-cultural studies are considered more fully in Appendix A.

Infanticide, and abandonment "may have been actions taken regretfully by parents to limit family size, at a time soon after birth before attachments bonds had strongly developed" (Smith, 1980). They were last resort methods of coping with too large a family at a time when both efficient contraception and a welfare state were lacking.^{iv}

Sending infants to wet-nurse is also believed to reveal the widespread neglect of children (Hunt, 1972; de Mause, 1976; Shorter, 1976; Stone, 1977, among others). However, it is unlikely that wet-nursing was practised on a large scale. It was generally confined to the upper classes who could afford to pay for wet-nurses. The main reason for wet-nursing seems to have been pressure from husbands to resume sexual relations with their wives - it was believed that these would curdle a mother's milk and therefore should not occur while breast-feeding. In the upper classes with their need for heirs to inherit property, and the lack of alternative foods for infants, the mothers had little choice but to send their offspring to wet-nurses. Again, the fact that some parents sent their offspring to a wet-nurse cannot be used to claim that children in general were neglected and ill-treated.

De Mause (1976) argues that swaddling also reveals the indifference to infants as parents could ignore the child once it was swaddled. Hunt (1972) and Shorter (1976) concede that swaddling protected a child but the former believes it was also a way of containing the "animality of young children" and the latter that it prevented parent-child interaction. Marvick (1976) argues that swaddling was intended to keep an infant's limbs straight, protect

iv. Effective contraceptive measures became widespread and acceptable in the 19th century; the welfare state was not fully into existence until the mid-20th century.

it from harm and also keep it warm. Trumbach (1978) suggests that the prevalence of swaddling can be explained by the prevalence of rickets which was one of the greatest causes of infant mortality up to the 19th century. It was believed that rickets resulted from weak bones and that swaddling an infant would prevent the bones from bending. Thus it appears that swaddling was more an indicator of concern rather than neglect.

1.6 Infant Mortality

The majority of authors agree that the high infant mortality rate was the crucial factor in explaining parental indifference to children. Parents were unwilling to show affection towards their children because too many of them died. A few authors go further and claim that the reduction of the infant mortality rate seen in the 18th century was due to the increased attention paid to children. For example, Stone (1977) states that the decline in the death rate of children under two years of age (from 60% during 1730-49 to 23% during 1810-29) was unlikely to be due solely to medical improvements such as inoculation or nutritional improvements such as the availability of cow's milk; but instead reflects "a change in attitude towards children", involving a greater concern for the preservation of infant lives. Trumbach (1978) argues that by 1750:

aristocratic mothers were more successfully attaching their infants to themselves as sole mother figures, and that it was this rather than immunity to disease or better nutrition that was probably responsible for the fall in the death rate after 1750 (224).

Trumbach's argument is contradicted by the findings of others such as Smith (1977) that, even where mothers were child-centred and maternal breast-feeding was prevalent, the infant mortality

rate was still high. In addition, Wrigley (1968) studying mortality in an English parish 1538-1837, has demonstrated that infant and adult mortality rates are subject to great fluctuation:

It would be as unwise to assume that mortality rates in pre-industrial times were invariably high as to make the same assumption about fertility rates^v (546).

Table 3 contains his results for infant mortality over three centuries.

Table 3: Revised Infant Mortality Rates (per 1000 infants)

Period	Infant Mortality Rate
1538-99	120-140
1600-49	126-158
1650-99	118-147
1700-49	162-203
1750-1837	122-153

(after Wrigley, 1968, p.570)

His results show that there was a fall in infant mortality after 1750, but only in comparison with the period immediately before. In fact, in comparison with other periods such as 1650-99, the period after 1750 shows a slight rise in the infant mortality rate.

v. See Wrigley (1966) for a study of fluctuating fertility rates.

2.0

THE ARGUMENT

The sources upon which the thesis is based are obviously suspect - and are certainly not a sound enough base to warrant the grand theories which have been derived from them. Aspects of the thesis, particularly the assertion that there was no concept of childhood, have also been criticised.

2.1

The Concept of Childhood and Adolescence

Kroll (1977) is opposed to the view that the nature of childhood was not recognised in the middle ages and believes:

It is more likely that children then were viewed differently than children now, but still viewed as children (324)

Kroll deals with attitudes to and about children rather than the actualities of life and does feel that attitudes to children were different - as they were to relationships in general:

One major difference is that relationships today are based upon and defined by personal feelings, whereas in the Middle Ages relationships were defined by rules, obligations and expectations. The relationship between parent and child was well-defined by rules that followed social class distinctions: closeness and attachment, the hallmarks of the twentieth century, were not ordinary components of this relationship, although we may presume it occurred between some parents and their children (385).

Using evidence from documents from the areas of medicine, law and the church, Kroll demonstrates that:

there was a realisation and accommodation to the specialness of childhood, derived from and consistent with their [medieval people] world-views ... (385).

He finds that medical teachings did recognise the specialness of newborns and young children, emphasising their vulnerability and fragility which necessitated tender care. The law also recognised the minority status of children and laid down specific provisions to protect the lives, property and well-being of children, particularly in those areas where the crown was strong. The concepts too of adult premeditation and responsibility did not apply to children.

Kroll argues:

If the law did not protect the life and well-being of children as well as we judge it should have, the reasons lie in the poorly developed concepts of the rights of individuals in general, the impotence of a central government to assert its will and enforce its law over hundreds of miles of loosely bound feudal territory, and in the high infant and child mortality rates which lent an air of pessimism to all considerations of childhood (389).

Church writings also contain evidence of an awareness of childhood. Kroll gives the example of the rules by Lanfranc in the 11th century for the regulation of monastery life. These contained special provision for children: they should be sent to the refectory early if they could not wait until after Vespers to eat, they should not be picked to administer punishment or to wash/dress the body of a dead brother. Kroll agrees that the church was ambivalent about children: regarding them both as innocent and bearing the burden of Original Sin. He concludes that, though there were no theories about the development of individuality in the child, nor elaborate developmental periods:

However, at the pragmatic level, there was an awareness of the smallness, vulnerability, irrationality, limited responsibility, medical frailty, and potentiality of the child that clearly designated the uniqueness and specialness of childhood (391).

Stannard (1974) takes up the idea that the Puritans regarded their offspring as miniature adults in the 17th century and argues that there was:

no confusion or ambiguity in the mind of the adult Puritan as to the differences between his children and himself (457).

He states that there is a wealth of evidence to support this - for example, the law definitely discriminated between acceptable behaviour and appropriate punishment for children, post-adolescent youths and adults. He believes however that, although the New Englanders of the 17th century did have a concept of childhood, it was different from that of 20th century parents. His paper is concerned with death and the Puritan child; he believes that:

the Puritan child's actual and anticipated confrontation with death is but one of many ways in which the extent of that difference from today's children can be seen (458).

Puritan parents were intensely concerned for the salvation of their children - even though it was impossible to know who had been elected and who had not. Both adults and children were considered to be polluted and faced with the alternative of educating their children for salvation or accepting them as depraved, sinful creatures, doomed to burn in hell:

it is hardly surprising that Puritan parents urged on their offspring a religious precocity that some historians have interpreted as tantamount to premature adulthood (461).

Death for the Puritans was "an ever present menace - and a menace that struck with a particular vengeance at the children of the community" (463). The parents played on a child's fear of separation from his parents - the ultimate separation being death - if the child did not strive for conversion along with his parent, he was warned of the consequences of such behaviour: child and

parent would not be re-united after death:

When the Puritan parent urged on his children what he would consider a painfully early awareness of sin and death, it was because the well-being of the child and the community required such an early recognition of these matters (475).

However, Puritan parents were genuinely concerned for their children - they may have been polluted beings; but they were also "Lambs in the Fold" and deeply loved. Stannard argues that the children were expected to be frightened of death and adults sympathised with rather than ridiculed their fears.

Beales (1975), using sources from colonial New England, attacks Demos' (1970) claim that Puritans did not possess a concept of childhood:

While this essay does not suggest that colonial Americans treated their children as we treat ours, it does conclude that notions of "miniature adulthood" and the absence of adolescence in Colonial New England are, at best, exaggerations (379).

Beales states that language, law, religious thought and practice, all suggest that New Englanders recognised the immaturity of children. For example, they possessed the concept of the "ages of man" and these ages included old age, middle age, youth, childhood and sometimes infancy. Beales argues also that there were different ages of legal responsibility.

These concepts abounded in religious thought and practice. Beales states that the Puritans realised it was difficult for children to understand the intricacies of their religion. Thus, for catechism in a church, the children were separated according to age; for males this meant groups from 7 to 12 years and 13 to 28 years. Preachers were to take pains to convey the 'Truth' in such a manner that the children could understand it. Beales also

found that the Puritans did not believe that children had a sufficient degree of knowledge to receive communion; there was no fixed age but the child had to be deemed to have reached a sufficient level of maturity and in practice this would be about the age of 14.

Beales believes adolescence was also recognised. The system of apprenticeship ensured that even though an individual made an early choice of career "his actual economic independence was delayed seven years while he learned the basic skills of his calling" (393). Adolescence was viewed by the New Englanders as a "chusing time": a youth was to choose his career, master and marriage partner. Beales argues that accounts of youthful behaviour such as:

night walking, frolicking, company-keeping,
merry-meeting, dancing and singing (396).

suggest that there were elements of a separate youth culture, at least in 18th century New England.

Beales concludes that the idea of "miniature adulthood" must be seen

not as a description of social reality, but
as a minor chapter in the history of social
thought (398).

He believes that it was a mistaken belief which may have arisen due to the submergence of adolescent sexuality in the 19th century. This may have paved the way for a "discovery" of adolescence in the late 19th century and also for the idea that previous generations had treated their children as small adults.

Davis (1971) argues that the youth groups of 16th century France refute the assertion of Ariès (1962) that Europeans made no distinction between childhood and adolescence before the end of the 18th century. She states:

these youth groups played certain of the functions which we attribute to adolescence. They gave the youth rituals to help control their sexual instincts and also allowed them some limited sphere of jurisdiction or 'autonomy' in the interval before they were married (55).

and argues that these groups can be found throughout rural Europe.

The functions of the youth groups include carnival misrule, charivaris - "a noisy masked demonstration to humiliate some wrongdoer in the community" (42) - and the organisation of religious festivals. These festive roles were assigned primarily to the organisation of the young unmarried men in the village, giving the youths enormous scope for mockery and derision, a rule over others and perhaps a brotherhood among themselves.

Smith (1973) studied the activities of 17th century London apprentices. He believes that:

The activities and attitudes of the apprentices of London during the seventeenth century, when they were well known for their political activism, tend to support Professor Davis' assumption that adolescence is a constant feature of history and, at the same time to modify her view that youth groups lost their importance in urban settlements (149).

Smith asserts that the London apprentices showed many of the characteristics which have been ascribed to 20th century youth. He argues that the apprentices were adolescents - apprenticeship was "a way of life between childhood and adulthood" (157) - in that apprentices were away from home but still dependent. There were rituals and ceremonies to mark entry into and exit from apprenticeship and the apprentices also showed role experimentation and a fraternity.

The existence of a large and diverse body of literature about and for apprentices, the evidence

of their having met together formally as well as informally and the frequency with which apprentices acted in concert during the Puritan Revolution to petition the government and to demonstrate in the streets indicate that apprentices thought of themselves and were thought of as a separate order or subculture (157).

2.2 The Arguments of Specific Authors

2.2.1 Ariès (1962)

Ariès' work raises a number of problems, for example:

- (a) his assumption that the medieval household was extended;
- (b) his belief that children became economically productive at the age of 7;
- (c) his disregard of child-rearing before the age of 7.

Hanawalt (1977) has studied the above three problems.

Hanawalt used coroners' rolls as a source of evidence because they contain information about the lower classes - most sources of evidence only relate to the middle and upper classes. She found that, although the extended family form did exist, the nuclear family was the most common in the middle ages. Laslett (1972) also emphasises the predominance of the nuclear family. Thus Ariès' assumption that the extended family was the normal type is only partially correct at best. As Ariès' interpretation of his evidence is based on his belief in the sociability of medieval life - that the family was extended and open to the outside world and therefore children mixed with the adult world from an early age - the finding that the nuclear family was the most common type casts doubt on his whole thesis. In addition, the coroners' rolls revealed that children did not become productive at the age of

7 - "their accident pattern indicates that they were doing little work" (18). Hanawalt suggests that children between the ages of 8 and 12 were being trained for the work they would eventually perform as adults and that they were still living at home. (Ariès claims that children left their homes for another household at this age.) The coroners' rolls also provided some information on the life of children under the age of 7.

Hanawalt argues that the evidence from the coroners' rolls on the accidents of children shows that:

the children growing up in the medieval household went through developmental stages, closely compatible with those described by Erikson (19)

In the first two years most accidents happened to children in their cradle, especially being burnt from the fire. Between the ages of 2 and 3 the children enter the second phase of development - "reception to outside stimulus" - and the accident pattern indicates that the children were exploring their environment - wells become more of a hazard than cradle fires (15). Between the ages of 4 and 7 the number of accidents drop sharply due, Hanawalt believes, to the fact that children were now sufficiently mobile to be with adults. From the age of 8 to 12 children were independent from adults and had their own tasks to perform.

Hanawalt argues that the inquests also give some evidence about "the emotional climate in the home" (19). The rolls indicate "that parents did not hate their children enough to kill them, except in rare cases, and that they often loved them enough to risk their own lives for them" (21). However, as the rolls do not include any "parents' lament" on their child's death:

They do not indicate one way or another a sentimental attachment to the state of childhood, which Ariès would find essential for the modern family (21).

Ariès' main research interest lay in the field of education and therefore he virtually ignored children under the age of 7. It seems highly unlikely that a child could be regarded with total indifference by society for as long as seven years, as Ariès maintains, or that children were not weaned until the age of 7. If parents really ignored their young children, they would die; human infants are all too obviously dependent on adult care and protection. Hunt (1972) criticises Ariès for failing to take into account the "realities of biological growth": that it is impossible for the helpless dependence of an infant to last as long as seven years and that a child can communicate and sustain a complicated relationship with adults long before the age of 7. Because of Ariès' interest in education and therefore his concern with children over the age of 7, his conclusions with regard to infants are suspect. He has only assumed that young children were regarded with indifference instead of looking for evidence on how they were actually regarded.

Hunt also point out various inconsistencies in Ariès' argument. Ariès claims that the young child was separated from the adult world as he "did not count" and was thus ignored. He then goes on to argue that, owing to changing attitudes towards children, the child became separated from the adult world. However, following the lines of Ariès' argument, it would seem more logical for the changing attitudes which Ariès claims did occur to have increased the integration of the child into the adult world rather than to have increased his separation from it - the latter implies that the child would "count" even less. Further on Ariès maintains that there was a growing awareness of childhood and a greater concern for children from the 17th century on; but at the same time he states that these children were also sent to school and Ariès regards schools in a very unfavourable light. Hunt believes that the only possible conclusion from the above two points is that Ariès regards

both the greater solicitude shown to children and the rise of schools as unfortunate, clearly preferring the presumed "gay indifference of the medieval society".

2.2.2 Hunt (1972)

Hunt's study was concerned with child-rearing in 17th century France and is based on one main source of evidence - the diary of Dr. Héroard, doctor and mentor to the dauphin of France. Hunt does state that Héroard's journal is not representative of the whole of society; but then goes on to argue that it is possible to generalise from Louis' upbringing to all parents and children in the 17th century. Thus he uses one example as evidence for the rest of society. For instance, there was a problem in finding a suitable wet-nurse for Louis and so he had trouble getting enough food.

Hunt claims:

Here, as elsewhere, the experience of the most precious child in the kingdom enables us to imagine the even more sombre circumstances of his less fortunate peers (116)

and goes on to assert that infants in general lacked sufficient food.

Hunt states that mothers were reluctant to breast-feed because they were hostile to and afraid of their offspring. This hostility and fear was passed on to the wet-nurses and led to a reduction in the flow of milk. This viewpoint is challenged by van de Walle (1973) who argues that mothers did not breast-feed because they were afraid of their infants; but "because it was widely accepted that a breast-feeding woman should not have sexual intercourse". In the case of nurses, most had already weaned their own child and it was this rather than their psychological inhibitions which caused the "decrease in their flow of milk".

The dauphin was whipped as a child and Hunt generalises from this that "whipping was an almost universal custom" and that there

was an emphatic and "unanimous insistence on the obedience of children as indispensable to the survival of society". Again, van de Walle would disagree, pointing out that there have been accounts of a more gentle and flexible method rearing for the same period.

Marvick (1974) criticises both Hunt and Ariès for "de-emphasizing" the dauphin's special situation. He was the first legitimate heir for almost 80 years and was also the first heir of a new dynasty and thus was "the embodiment of the Bourbon dynasty's future". For example, the exaggerated interest shown in Louis' sexual development was due to the fact "that his potential sexual performance was literally a question of state" and not, as Ariès and Hunt have suggested, the norm for society as a whole.

Hunt claims that Louis was kept in a separate household because 17th century fathers were jealous of a potentially close mother-son relationship. Marvick argues that he was nursed out because of political necessity. His mother was the king's second wife, the first having already been divorced for infertility. The queen's position was in jeopardy until she had proved her ability to have heirs and, with the prevailing belief that breast-feeding mothers should not resume sexual relations, Louis had to be sent to a wet-nurse.

Marvick also regards the diary as an exceedingly biased document. Dr. Héroard was very ambitious and had a political as well as medical role to play, seeking to undermine the king's influence through friendship with the dauphin and queen. He was in constant and prolonged contact with Louis and Marvick suggests he greatly influenced the dauphin, shaping his character and ensuring the dauphin's future dependence on him. Héroard's journal is therefore not an account of the normal methods of rearing children in the 17th century; it is instead the story of a child being brought up in unusual circumstances and manipulated by a politically

motivated mentor.

2.2.3 De Mause (1976)

De Mause is the most extreme of all the authors. He appears to be writing a history of child abuse not childhood. Some of the reasons he lists for the ill-treatment of children in the past, such as role reversal and the parents' projection of their unacceptable feelings to their children, are characteristics of child abusers today (see Martin, H., 1976; Martin, J., 1978), a point which de Mause himself notes, but then ignores. De Mause appears to be indefatigable in his zeal to provide evidence for his argument but he (like many other authors) provides no systematic analysis of his sources. Laslett (1977) especially criticises de Mause for his:

evident anxiety to derive from the recalcitrant and miscellaneous mass of facts, half-facts and non facts (misreports, misrepresentations) a connected and dramatic historical study about childhood and the way in which it has changed over time. This is done with little or no discussion on the part of the editor that literature is itself subject to fashion and change (94).

De Mause postulates a series of modes of parent-child relations ranging from the infanticidal to the helping mode - this last one de Mause argues appears from the mid-20th century on. De Mause states that parents belonging to the helping mode work to fulfil a child's expanding needs; make no attempt to discipline a child and continually respond to their child, "being its servant rather than the other way around". Children who have been reared by this mode will be, according to de Mause,

gentle, sincere, never depressed, never imitative or group-oriented, strong-willed and unintimidated by authority (54).

However, according to Shore (1979), they are more likely to be:

narcissistic monsters with precariously regulated self-esteem, relationships with others based on narcissistic entitlement, and poor capacity to deal with the manifold frustrations of reality (522).

De Mause is one of the many authors who appear to be claiming that parents have matured at last and are now capable of treating their offspring with love and kindness rather than brutality, but life is not quite so perfect; not all 20th century children receive gentle treatment from their parents. (Any report from the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children provides more than adequate evidence for the horrifying abuse still meted out to children by their parents.) It is as much a mistake to claim a "happy ending" (Lynd, 1942) for the history of childhood as it is to claim that the beginning of the story was a "nightmare" (de Mause, 1976).

2.3 Other Problems with the Literature

2.3.1 The linkage with historical developments

Most authors have tried to relate the history of childhood to the history and development of other trends in society: for example, Ariès (1962) links it with education; Bremner (1970-73) with democracy and Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969) with public policy towards children. As Saveth (1969) puts it:

Grand theory about the American family is centered in the assumption that family structure is a variable of some larger conditioning circumstance - political, social or economic (316).

Parental treatment of children, though, is not necessarily related to social trends; public policy towards children in the early and mid-20th century, to give one instance, may bear no relation at all

to the way parents of the same period reared their children.^{vi}

Bremner (1970-73) in his account of childhood in the past assumes that there was a match between society and the family in which the family reflects without distortion that triumph of the freedom of democracy which transformed other institutions. In other words, the story of the child is the story of liberation. However, Bremner has over-simplified, as Rothman (1973) points out - there must have been losses as well as gains. Rothman believes that Bremner should pay more attention to "the dysfunctional elements, to the conflict of interests, and to the tensions in the story". He also suggests that there is evidence pointing to conflict between the community and young "which contradicts any simple notion of a neat fit between the child and the state".

It seems from the literature that those authors who have related the history of childhood to other trends have not studied how far parents are influenced by other historical developments. They have merely assumed that, if society itself changed over the centuries, then attitudes to and treatment of children also changed in accordance with those trends. It is at least equally likely (if not more probable) that parents, to varying extents, are influenced by and adapt to, differing social circumstances, but not to the extent that they drastically change their basic child-rearing methods.

2.3.2 The inference of actualities from attitudes

The most serious criticism of the various authors in this area is that they have used attitudes towards children (mainly those expressed in religious sermons and child advice literature) to infer

vi. This point will be gone into more fully in Chapter Three.

the actual treatment which children received. Plumb (1975) does state that the images which society creates for children rarely reflects reality; but still deduces from the view of such theorists as Locke (1699) how children were treated in past times. As Rothman (1973) points out: the concepts of childhood and adolescence may have changed; but this does not indicate that the actual experience of the young has changed. The views of theorists on children and methods of child-rearing do change over time; but, as it has already been shown, parents do not pay a great deal of attention to the advice of 'experts' and there is no reason to suppose that their methods of child-rearing change as drastically as has been suggested.

2.3.3 The amount of change

Most of the authors have looked for changes in attitudes to children; but they have not kept a sense of proportion. They have not related the amount of change they have found to the amount that has remained unchanged; seeming to forget Ariès' comment that:

within the great family types, monogamous and polygamous, historical differences are of little importance in comparison with the huge mass of what remains unchanged (9).

The work so far on the history of childhood leaves the distinct impression that everything has changed: the way in which children are viewed and reared varies according to the time period in which the children live: changes are obviously important; but "over-emphasis upon the phenomenon of change neglects what remains permanent in family structure" (Saveth, 1969). Are not the similarities, what has remained unchanged over the centuries, worth studying too?

Despite their preoccupation with changes in the attitudes to children, the writers do little to explain such changes. Such

gnomic utterances as Shorter's (1976) "surge of sentiment" or Stone's (1977) "rise of affective individualism" do little to elucidate those changes which the authors state have occurred. The authors argue that we have changed from viewing children with "indifference" and as "chattels" to being preoccupied with their welfare and regarding them with affection. (There is general disagreement over when these changes occurred.) Such a thesis can only be valid if it can be shown why parents and society regarded children with indifference - could it be that infants looked different in the past? - and why their attitudes changed - relating supposed changes in child-rearing to changes in society, and sprinkling the literature with various nominalistic terms is not sufficient explanation. The different types of parents that the authors have found for different time periods may have always been in existence; people do vary in their methods of child-rearing.

3.0 IS A HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD POSSIBLE?

Some writers feel that the sources which are available for the history of childhood are so problematic that the subject can not be studied. Laslett (1977), for example, decided to concentrate on the size and composition of past households rather than the actualities of child life as:

it is well known how intractable the analysis of any body of documents of this kind can be, [advice literature, letters, diaries, autobiographies] so untidy is it, so variable, so contradictory in its dogmas and doctrines, so capricious in what it preserves and what it must leave out (96).

Brobeck (1976) also considers that personal documents such as letters and diaries are relatively unhelpful:

they tend to dwell on affairs of business or state, neglecting the most intimate details of family life or those which might prove to be embarrassing; in many cases they deliberately attempt to create a favourable image of the author's own family (94).

Stone (1977) would agree. He believes that interpretation of diaries and autobiographies is a problem as the information they contain can rarely be checked from an independent source and they are also affected by the personality of the writer. He concludes that "they must be examined in bulk" a laudable aim if only Stone had put it into practice!

Where an author has used personal documents in his research into the history of childhood, it is usually only in an anecdotal sense, to illustrate a point from the advice literature (apart from those authors such as MacFarlane, 1970; Smith, 1977 and Trumbach, 1978 who concentrated on primary sources). However, with no analysis of a whole document, such as a diary, it is impossible to ascertain whether or not that particular action, statement or attitude was typical of the person concerned. Parent-child interaction is a continuing process, not a series of isolated events - despite the preoccupation of the literature with punishment. To take one example of this anecdotal and selective use: Sewall's statement that he "whipped" his son Joseph "pretty smartly" is often used to illustrate the strict discipline of the 17th century; but, in the whole of Sewall's long detailed diary, that is the only occasion he mentions physically punishing that son. If the circumstances leading up to the incident are examined, the whipping appears even less the action of a strict disciplinarian and more the response of an exasperated father. Joseph had been

playing during prayers, eating at "return thanks" - both activities were bound to annoy a Puritan father - and finally threw a lump of brass at his sister, bruising and cutting her forehead. The passage in the diary recording these events gives the impression that Joseph had been irritating his father all day and the throwing of the brass was the last straw; Sewall lost his temper.

This selective use of material is not confined to personal documents but is applied to all the sources of evidence. A point is made by an author and then illustrated by reference to a miscellany of sources. Such a method merely reveals that some people at some point agreed with the author's statement; it does not mean that everyone thought the same way. There is no allowance for individual differences and little systematic analysis of the various sources of evidence. If, for example, all the sources of evidence which are available were analysed separately (with full awareness of the problems pertaining to each source) and in bulk, then the prevalence of various attitudes to children and various child-rearing methods through the centuries would be revealed. Once this had been done, all the sources could be looked at together and that way a more accurate history of childhood could be written than has been achieved hitherto. As it is, we still know little about how parents actually reared their children.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon (1935): "Attitudes"; in Murchison, C., ed. Handbook of Social Psychology; Clark University Press, Worcester, Mass., pp.798-884.
- Ariès, Philippe (1962): Centuries of Childhood; Jonathan Cape, London.
- Beales, Ross (1975): "In search of the historical child: miniature adulthood and youth in colonial New England"; in American Quarterly, no. 27, pp.379-398.
- Bremner, Robert, ed. (1970-73): Children and Youth in America; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Brobeck, Stephen (1976): "Images of the family: portrait paintings as indices of American family culture, structure and behaviour, 1730-1860"; in Journal of Psychohistory, vol. 5, pp.81-106.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie (1958): "Socialisation and social class through time and space"; in Maccoby, E., Newcomb, T. and Hartley, E., eds. Readings in Social Psychology; Methuen & Co., London, pp.400-425.
- Cohen, Charles (n.d.): Palatable Children: White American Attitudes toward Childhood in Paintings 1670-1860; Unpublished paper, University of California.
- Davis, Natalie (1971): "The reasons of misrule: youth groups and charivaris in sixteenth century France"; in Past and Present, no. 50, pp.41-75.
- Demos, John (1970): Family Life in a Plymouth Colony; Oxford University Press.
- Fuller, Peter (1979): "Uncovering childhood"; in Hoyles, Martin, ed. Changing Childhood; Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative, London, pp.71-108.
- Hanawalt, Barbara (1977): "Childrearing among the lower classes of late medieval England"; in Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 8, no. 1, pp.1-22.
- Helmholtz, R. H. (1975): "Infanticide in the province of Canterbury during the fifteenth century"; in History of Childhood Quarterly, vol. 2, pp.379-390.

- Hoyles, Martin (1979): "Childhood in historical perspective"; in Hoyles, Martin, ed. Changing Childhood; Writers and Readers Cooperative, London, pp.16-29.
- Hunt, David (1972): Parents and Children in History; Harper and Row, New York.
- King, Truby (1937): Feeding and Care of Baby; Oxford University Press, London.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde et al. (1951): "Values and value orientations in the theory of action: an exploration in definition and classification"; in Parsons, T. and Shils, E., eds. Toward a General Theory of Action; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp.388-433.
- Kroll, Jerome (1977): "The concept of childhood in the middle ages"; in Journal of the History of Behavioural Sciences, vol. 13, no. 4, pp.384-393.
- Laslett, Peter, ed. (1972): Household and Family in Past Time; Cambridge University Press.
- Laslett, Peter (1977): Family Life and Illicit Love in Former Generations; Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, John (1699): Some Thoughts concerning Education; A. & J. Churchill, London.
- Lynd, S. (1942): English Children; William Collins, London.
- MacFarlane, Alan (1970): The Family Life of Ralph Josselin; Cambridge University Press.
- McLaughlin, Mary (1976): "Survivors and surrogates: children and parents from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.101-182.
- Martin, Harold, ed. (1976): The Abused Child; Bullinger Publishing Company, Cambridge, Mass.
- Martin, J.P., ed. (1978): Violence and the Family; John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Marvick, Elizabeth (1974): "The character of Louis XIII: the role of his physician"; in The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 4, no. 3, pp.347-374.

- Marvick, Elizabeth (1976): "Nature versus nurture: patterns and trends in seventeenth-century French child-rearing; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.259-302.
- de Mause, Lloyd, ed. (1976): "The evolution of childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.1-74.
- Mechling, Jay (1975): "Advice to historians on advice to mothers"; in Journal of Social History, vol. 9, pp.44-63.
- Murphey, Murray (1965): "An approach to the historical study of national character"; in Spiro, Melford, ed. Context and Meaning in Cultural Anthropology; The Free Press, New York, pp.144-163.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1965): Patterns of Infant Care in an Urban Community; Penguin Books, Middlesex.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1968): Four Years Old in an Urban Community; Penguin Books, Middlesex.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1974): "Cultural aspects of child rearing in the English speaking world"; in Richards, M., ed. The Integration of a Child into a Social World; Cambridge University Press, pp.53-83.
- Pinchbeck, I. and Hewitt, M. (1969): Children in English Society; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Plumb, J. (1975): "The new world of children in eighteenth century England; in Past and Present, vol. 67, pp.64-93.
- Robertson, Priscilla (1976): "Home as a nest: middle class childhood in nineteenth-century Europe"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 407-431.
- Rokeach, Milton (1968): Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change; Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Rothman, David (1973): "Documents in search of a historian: toward a history of childhood and youth in America"; in Rabb, T. and Rotberg, R., eds. The Family in History; Harper and Row, New York & London.

- Saveth, Edward (1969): "The problem of American family history"; in American Quarterly, no. 21, part 2, pp.311-329.
- Shore, Miles (1979): "The psychogenic theory of history"; in Journal of Interdisciplinary History, vol. 9, no. 3, pp.517-523.
- Shorter, Edward (1976): The Making of the Modern Family; Collins, London.
- Smith, Daniel (1977): "Autonomy and affection: parents and children in eighteenth-century Chesapeake families"; in The Psychohistorical Review, vol. 6, pp.32-51.
- Smith, Peter (1980): Biological, Psychological and Historical Aspects of Reproduction and Child-Care; Paper presented to the D. C. P. Conference on the Psychology of Human Reproduction, Leicester.
- Smith, Stephen (1973): "Communication. The London apprentices as seventeenth-century adolescents"; in Past and Present, no. 61, pp.149-161.
- Stannard, David (1974): "Death and the puritan child"; in American Quarterly, no. 26, pp.456-476.
- Stone, Lawrence (1977): The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Thompson, R. (1974): Women in Stuart England and America; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Trumbach, Randolph (1978): The Rise of the Egalitarian Family; Academic Press, New York & London.
- Tucker, M. J. (1976): "The child as beginning and end: fifteenth and sixteenth century English childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 229-258.
- van de Walle, Etienne (1973): "Recent approaches to past childhoods"; in Rabb, T. and Rotberg, R., eds. The Family in History; Harper and Row, New York & London.
- Watson, John (1928): Psychological Care of Infant and Child; Allen and Unwin, London.

Wrigley, E.A. (1966): "Family limitations in pre-industrial England"; in The Economic History Review, 2nd series, vol. 19, no. 1, pp.82-109.

Wrigley, E.A. (1968): "Mortality in pre-industrial England: the example of Colyton, Devon, over three centuries"; in Daedalus, vol. 97, no. 2, pp.546-580.

Zuckerman, Michael (1970): Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century; Random House, New York.

CHAPTER THREE

THE STATE AS PROTECTOR

To parental neglect, the children could add
in their sum of misery, neglect by the state

....

The general attitude of adults towards children
was reflected by the treatment of child-paupers
in the workhouses. The 'care' of Local
Authorities was often worse than prison.

(Housden, 1955)

The harshness of the parent was paralleled by
the harshness of the state.

(Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1962)

At the very least, however, the nineteenth
century was the time when public bodies
began to think of children as children, with
special needs because of their helplessness
and vulnerability rather than as small adults
with the right to hire themselves out for
sixteen hours a day, or as the chattels of
their parents.

(Robertson, 1976)

INTRODUCTION

The generally accepted thesis on the way children were seen in the past is that they were viewed as miniature adults. Hence no allowance was made for their needs and they were neglected and subjected to exploitation by both parents and state. However, it is argued, from the 17th century onwards the "concept" of childhood made its appearance: children were now regarded as being distinct from adults, treated better and, with the appearance of child welfare laws in the 19th century, protected from abuse by legislation. There are two assumptions in this argument: that parental and social treatment of children are connected and both have developed along similar lines and that the appearance of child welfare legislation is an example of the increasing awareness of children and their special needs.

Though parental care of and public policy towards children are two different entities, they have rarely been clearly differentiated in works on the history of childhood. However, though the state may not have statutes and laws for the protection of children, and though it may even at times sanction such things as child employment, this does not necessarily mean that parents will also abuse and exploit their children. It is as absurd to claim that as it would be to claim that, once the rights of children are safeguarded by law, they will be no longer ill-treated. Before the 19th century, what child protection legislation there was, was concerned with the pauper, orphan or illegitimate child and designed to find them some means of livelihood; but the fact that there were fewer laws to protect children from specific forms of abuse till the 19th century, does not have to imply that children were undervalued by their parents and society and therefore they were little regarded. It is more probable that society before the 19th century, due to its

structure and system of government, did not consider the legal regulation of family life appropriate - and certainly there was little possibility of enforcing such laws. The absence of child protection legislation was due, not to a disregard for children, but to the organisation of a predominantly rural society. The Industrial Revolution, beginning about 1750, caused society to rethink its basic forms of legal and administrative organisation in order to cope with the changes produced by industrialisation. It also brought increasing affluence, making all kinds of humanitarian legislation affordable (Birch, 1974; Briggs, 1959; Perkin, 1969; Roebuck, 1973; Ryder and Silver, 1970). Children were merely one particular case in this general scenario.

2.0 THE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIALISATION

Children must be seen in their context; it is a mistake to isolate them from the rest of society. They were/are always children of their place, class and time, subject to the same living conditions as the adults of their society. The Industrial Revolution, in the short term, brought great misery to working-class adults and children in certain industries. It was their exploitation that the protection legislation was designed to prevent.ⁱ Children of the poor have always worked; but industrialisation introduced very different working conditions. Prior to the

i. The Industrial Revolution was not all black. There were mills and factories run on, for that time, more humanitarian lines. For example, in the Quarry Bank Mill of 1784, though the children worked a 12 hour day, they were well fed, clothed, educated, given medical treatment and their individuality was recognised. Children and women were not always employed in the mines underground (Heywood, 1978; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969).

Industrial Revolution, for example on farms, children contributed to the work; boys helped the men with ploughing, hedging and the heavy skilled work of the harvest while girls helped the women keep house, make butter, cheese, bread and beer, look after the cattle and take the fruit to market. Young children were used to scare away birds or watch sheep (Laslett, 1971). In the traditional or domestic industry the family was also an economic unit - parents and children working together. It was the father who dictated the pace and he may not always have been a lenient task-master (Marshall, 1973). Nevertheless, though the farmer or craftsman may have been poor and even tied to an employer "at least the petty details of his life were under his control" (Marshall, 1973, p. 99). He could have time off for holy days and feast days; take breaks when he wanted, talk to his neighbours and at least had the illusion of independence. In the factories of the late 18th and 19th centuries things were very different; both adults and children found it hard to endure the discipline and confinement such employment entailed. They had to adapt to long hours in a close, often hot and steamy atmosphere, to the remorseless monotony of machines and to the awful regularity of time keeping - the gates of the factory were shut at the time work started and so, even if an employee was only a few minutes late, he could not get in and lost wages. . Factory discipline was strict; the workers were not allowed a drink of water or even to go to the toilet when they wanted; meals were only to be eaten at fixed times and breaks were short. Thus, though the children of the lower classes had always worked, the Industrial Revolution brought a crucial difference in the type of work: with the coming of machines their work was often synonymous with slavery (Helfer and Kempe, 1968).

Industrialisation also brought new roles for children in certain industries. The increased technology which the Industrial Revolution produced reduced and even removed, in some cases, the

differential in strength between the adult and child (McKendrick, 1974). For example, during the 18th century coal was transported underground by means of sledges which were too heavy for children to pull. The introduction of the wheeled corf and the tramway lightened the task and brought it within the powers of young children. Improvements in ventilation also extended the demand for child labour - young children of 5 or 6 years of age could be employed to open and shut the doors used to control the air supply (Ashton and Sykes, 1964). Ashton and Sykes explicitly state: "It is important to observe that it was in the coalfields where technical progress was most marked that this extension of child labour was the greatest" (73-74). Thus not only did the Industrial Revolution transform the working environment of the child; but it also created new types of employment for him.

Adults, during the Industrial Revolution, lost control of the labouring process - not only their own; but also that of their children. As has been said, the pre-industrial family was an economic unit, but the introduction of power looms during the period 1825-35 increased the pressure on weavers to work in factories. Families were split up as the team necessary to man the looms did not permit the parental supervision of children at work. It was during these years that the question of child labour became critical due to the changing social environment of the child. The factory workers themselves contributed a great deal to the factory reform agitation of the 1830s and 1840s precisely because they disliked the break up of family life which the factory system produced (Perkin, 1969; Smelser, 1974).

In addition, industrialisation with its factories and mills and rapid urban expansion concentrated the misery of the poor. When steam power was introduced, the factories could move from mills on country streams to the crowded centres of the population

Smelser, 1974). The factories and workshops during the early 19th century increasingly clamoured for labour and people flocked to where the work was. Housing, much of it hurriedly constructed, was built near the factories causing great industrial crowding. During the period 1801-51 the population of Great Britain doubled - from almost nine million to almost 18 million (Birch, 1974; Bruce, 1968; Ryder and Silver, 1970). All of these people needed homes and work, so contributing to the great wave of industrial urban growth. There were no real precedents for such widespread and rapid urban development. Therefore there was little effective planning and conditions were often appalling (Bruce, 1968; Roebuck, 1973).

3.0 THE DISCOVERY OF THE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIALISATION

The towns and cities concealed the evidence of poverty and injustice from the rest of society. In the small villages, the squire, though hardly on familiar terms with the villagers, would at least have some contact with them and would have some knowledge of the conditions in which they lived. However, the increasing class segregation and social differentiation brought about by industrialisation, ensured that many of the middle and upper classes were wholly unfamiliar with the lives of the poor (and also liable to misinterpret what they saw). When the existence of such squalor became known - through the work of such determined investigators as Chadwick and Engels, and the publication of the parliamentary blue books in the 1830s which revealed the terrible working class conditions - the suddenness of the discovery made the shock even

more acute. In addition, the transfer of workers from their homes or farms into factories brought the terrible conditions of labour, particularly child labour into view - it was possible to see more human misery and suffering in one visit to one factory than in a tour round the countryside (Altick, 1973; Briggs, 1972; Bruce, 1968; Perkin, 1969).

The suffering and misery was so concentrated and of such a magnitude that private philanthropy could not do enough. History itself offered no help as the conditions to be remedied were the result of novel causes and thus the state had to organise itself effectively to solve the new problems. Most reforms of this period were a response to the great social and economic changes of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. There was a major upheaval in all areas of society: its structure, legislation, administration and powers of government, in order to try to cope with the vastly different society produced by industrialisation (Beales, 1969; Fraser, 1973). Children were simply caught up in this movement; once material conditions had been improved, then life became better for all, adult and child alike.

The enormously rapid growth of the new industrial towns created new social problems and expanded the scale of the old ones. There was the new problem of insecurity created by a fluctuation in employment amongst concentrated masses of wage-earners without natural protectors to turn to in distress and also a vast increase in crime and prostitution (Perkin, 1969). The early industrial towns saw, in addition, a high death rate and high incidence of epidemic disease. The government was forced to take action in the areas of town planning and public health, areas it had not regulated before. For example, the first Public Health Act was passed in 1848 - the start to all subsequent government action in clearing up the slums (Roebuck, 1973).

The poor child in the Industrial Revolution was the victim of the circumstances of social and economic change. Society had yet to learn to cope with industrialisation - it happened so quickly and on such a large scale that the state had no time to adapt. For example, it was not realised that consumers are as necessary to successful industry as producers: technical advances and improvements outpaced the demand for manufactured goods, leading to a fall in profits and thus wages and the number employed. Children began to be used more and more in the factories because they were paid less. The Poor Law system was designed to protect the rate-payers and thus an unemployed father was often refused parish relief if he had children who could workⁱⁱ (Heywood, 1978). The children were left in the appalling conditions of the mines, mills and factories as these were private concerns and no

ii. The old Poor Law relied on the parish as a unit of government and therefore on unpaid, non-professional administrators. Each parish was to be responsible for its own poor and gave relief in the form of supplements to wages. From 1795 the amount was determined by the price of bread and number of dependents - the Speenhamland System. However, as the parishes were independent, there was great geographic variation and by the 19th century the system was in chaos and the cost of the poor rates, especially after the Napoleonic Wars and the agricultural depression of 1815, became very high (Brundage, 1978; Marshall, 1968).

A new Poor Law was devised in 1834, aimed at keeping the cost of relief down while encouraging the unemployed to work. It was vitally important in maintaining the economic ascendancy of the peers and gentry and aroused a great deal of opposition from the lower classes. Outdoor relief was to be stopped and workhouses set up instead. If anyone was to receive relief, his situation was to be worse than the situation of the independent labourer of the lowest class. Workhouses were intended to be warnings for the idle (Rodgers, 1968). In order to cut relief to those parents with a number of children, it was explicitly stated that relief given for the child should be regarded as relief given to the parent (Marshall, 1973).

person had the authority to force an entry for an inspection of the premises (Heywood, 1978). The first factory acts to regulate employment and conditions were passed in 1802, 1812 and 1819; but the state was so unused to coping with these new situations that no system of inspection was implemented and the acts were ineffective. Once it was realised - in 1833 - that inspection was necessary, the owners of the factory or mill were notified of the impending visit and so, of course, the place was cleaned and tidied up and the children sent home to change into their good clothes in readiness for the visit. It was not until inspection was random and unnotified that the true situation became apparent and effective steps were taken to remedy this (Ryder and Silver, 1970). The use and abuse of children in factories, mills and mines arose through economic necessity and occurred before public conscience was aware of the problem or able to take steps to see that the conditions in which they lived and worked were brought to an endurable standard (Heywood, 1978). The ignorance of, and in some cases indifference to, the condition of some of the children in society, is not confined to the 19th century; but can also be seen in the 20th. For example, the evacuation of city children in 1940 made a large number of people aware of the poor health and bad living conditions of the lower working class (Bruce, 1968; Ryder and Silver, 1970). In addition, Spitz (1945) brought to light the appalling conditions of the institutions in which orphaned children were reared and its effect on their development. What is particularly interesting about the former example is that, by 1940, the state thought it had helped the working-class child: school meals had been introduced in 1906 and free milk in 1921. However, the evacuation made society realise that the pre-school child also needed help. Thus infant welfare legislation was introduced, such as the system of Family Allowances in 1945; not

because there was a sudden acquisition of the concept of "infancy"; but because the state recognised that some sections of society had a special need of its intervention and help.

It should also be remembered that it was the working-class, adults and children, who had to endure such misery during the Industrial Revolution. The factories could produce more and cheaper goods than the small cottage industries and thus the working-class were forced into working there. It was also widely believed that, if the working-classes were helped, they would only become lazier, and/or spend the extra money on drink; that working-class parents wished to abandon their children for someone else to bring up and that it would interfere with family ties if a wife and children were not financially dependent on the husband or father. It was assumed that the poor were bad parents, that poverty was a moral and individual rather than a social and economic problem and therefore there was little appreciation of the bonds binding this type of family, or of the great strains imposed upon it (Middleton, 1971; Perkin, 1969). The landed classes of the early 19th century were very concerned with keeping the working-classes at the bottom of society - recollections of the French Revolution of 1789 were still very much in their minds (Fraser, 1973). For example, there was a great deal of debate on the subject of education for the lower classes: some believing that it would only increase discontent and teach the people to aspire beyond their stations; others that a little education which enabled children to read their scriptures and to learn the rules of social obedience was a necessary form of social self-protection (Ryder and Silver, 1970). Neither side intended to help the lower classes find better employment and move up the social scale.

4.0 THE RESPONSE TO THE DISCOVERY OF
THE EFFECTS OF INDUSTRIALISATION

Once the social consequences of industrialisation were realised, the government was forced to intervene in order to improve the situation. The social legislation of this period laid the foundation for the British welfare state.ⁱⁱⁱ The rise of the welfare state is in fact seen as:

an erratic and pragmatic response of government and people to the practical, individual and community problems of an industrialised society (Fraser, 1973, p.1).

(See Tables 4 and 5 for the main social and welfare legislation of the 19th and 20th centuries.) The problems created by the Industrial Revolution were on such a scale that government intervention was necessary. Once the principle of state intervention was accepted, the state was then prepared to regulate areas which it had previously considered as being outwith its control, such as the family. The history of social reform is a long and complex process, and here it is only intended to give the main points in order to set the context for the emergence of child protection legislation. The 19th century reform movement will be considered, followed by a discussion on the changes in the concept of the law and poverty, both of which affected child welfare legislation. Finally, as social reform is a continuing process, the rise of the welfare state will be considered.

iii. America does not have a welfare state. However, the north did industrialise during the 19th century and it was then that the government stepped in to regulate and finally abolish child labour, following the lines of the British legislation. From the mid-19th century many states made child education compulsory and, in 1890, the first Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act appeared (Abbott, 1938).

Table 4: The Main Social Legislation

Date	Act	Main points
1807	Abolition of Slave Trade Act	Slave trade abolished in Britain.
1822	Protection of Animals Act	Cruelty to animals now a criminal offence.
1824	Prison Act	First attempt to produce a national policy for prisons; some improvements in prison conditions made.
1828	Madhouses Act	Created the first inspectors in London for mental asylums.
1832	Reform Act	Middle class given the right to vote.
1834	New Poor Law Amendment Act	Protected rate-payers from excessive demands for poor relief, erected workhouses on a large scale, differentiated between "deserving" and "undeserving" poor.
1835	Prison Act	Set up a national system of prison inspection.
1836	Registration of Births and Deaths Act	First national registration system.
1839	Infant's Custody Act	First reduction in paternal authority.
1842	Mines Act	Prohibited employment of females and children under the age of 10 underground.
1845	Lunatic's Act	Mentally ill now protected by law. All asylums to be inspected.
1847	Ten Hours Act	A 10 hour day for women and young persons established.
1848	Public Health Act	Set up a general board of health.
1851	City of London Sewers Act	Compulsory clearance of slums and the start of all subsequent legislation for the improvement of housing.

Table 4 contd.

Date	Act	Main points
1867	Reform Act	Working-class given the right to vote.
1897	Worker's Compensation Act	Employers became liable for damages to employees.
1905	Unemployed Workmen Act	First attempt to tackle unemployment as a national problem.
1908	Coal Mines Regulation Act	Male labour now regulated.
1908	Old Age Pensions Act	Pensions to be paid as a right, financed by taxation.
1911	National Insurance Act	Began social insurance in Britain.
1919	Housing and Town Planning Act	Local authorities to make good any deficiencies in housing.
1928	Equal Franchise Act	Women given the right to vote.
1945	Family Allowances Act	State accepted the responsibility for contributing to the cost of raising children.
1946	National Health Service Act	Set up a free medical service, financed by taxation.
1946	National Insurance Act	Provided benefit for unemployment, sickness, maternity, retirement and death.
1948	National Assistance Act	Provided relief for anyone whose resources did not meet his requirements.

Table 5: The Main Child Welfare Legislation

Date	Act	Main points
1833	Factory Act	First effective act and first provision for education. Children under 13 limited to 9 hours work a day; 13-18 to 12 hours work a day. All to have 2 hours of education a day.
1840	Protection of Chimney Sweeps Act	First of many acts to protect boy chimney sweeps.
1854	Youthful Offenders Act	Young offenders to go to reformatories, not prisons.
1868	Poor Law Amendment Act	Offence for parents to wilfully neglect to provide adequate food, clothing, medical treatment or lodging for children under 14 years.
1870	Education Act	First national act, setting up a system of elementary education.
1872	Infant Life Protection Act	Infant minders to be registered and to inform coroner of deaths (for children under 2 years).
1875	Chimney Sweeps Act	Boy chimney sweeps abolished.
1876	Education Act	Elementary education made compulsory.
1889	Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act	All ill-treatment and neglect of children became a statutory offence.
1891	Education Act	Elementary education now free.
1897	Infant Life Protection Act	Extended provisions of 1872 Act to children up to the age of 5.
1902	Education Act	Established secondary education.
1906	Education (Provision of Meals) Act	Meals provided for needy children.

Table 5 contd.

Date	Act	Main points
1908	Children Act	Extended provision of infant life protection acts up to the age of 7. Abolished imprisonment for children. Children forbidden to beg or smoke.
1912	Education Act	First real beginning of a school medical service, provided grants to make medical treatment possible.
1918	Education Act	School-leaving age raised to 14. Restricted employment of children to little more than newspaper deliveries.
1933	Children and Young Persons Act	Extended state responsibility for children up to the age of 17. Emphasis of Act on education and rehabilitation of those in care.
1944	Education Act	Comprehensive education provided for all.
1948	Children and Young Persons Act	Provided for a unified system of child care, under the authority of one ministry staffed by trained social workers.
1969	Children and Young Persons Act	Children in trouble regarded as being in need of care, not punishment.

4.1 The 19th Century Reform Movement

One of the characteristic developments of the 19th century was a greater concern for helpless living things: animals, children, slaves and prisoners - for example, in 1822 the first act for the protection of animals was passed (see Tables 4 and 5). Beginning in 1802 a whole series of acts were passed to regulate child employment and, in 1889, the first prevention of cruelty to children act was passed; 1807 saw the abolition of the slave trade and there was great mitigation of penal law (Altick, 1973; Beales, 1969). In the social sphere this urge to attack injustice, abuse and inhumanity had many different origins and for any one reform it is difficult to separate and isolate the strands of motive and inspiration (Briggs, 1959). However, the two main reforming sects were the Evangelicals and the Benthamites, aided by protests and petitions from the factory workers themselves and also the activity of the press (Marshall, 1973).

The French and Industrial Revolutions had resulted in increased anxiety about the state of society and this anxiety was assuaged by a religious revival led by the Evangelicals. The term "Evangelical" embraces a broad movement of opinion involving all the dissenting sects and some low church Anglians, and included in their numbers such prominent 19th century politicians as Lord Ashley (the 7th Earl of Shaftesbury) and Wilberforce. The Evangelicals were less concerned with doctrine and the forms of worship than with the way men should live, seeing life as a preparation for eternity. Thus they lent a moral tone to society, the essence of which was respectability; instituting such concerns as the Society for the Suppression of Vice. Their ideas answered a sufficiently widely felt need in society to find support among the middle and upper classes - so much so, indeed, that it has been suggested that they contributed to a profound shift in national

character.

Between 1780 and 1850 the English ceased to be one of the most aggressive, brutal, rowdy, outspoken, cruel and bloodthirsty nations in the world and became one of the most inhibited, polite, orderly, tender-minded, prudish and hypocritical (Perkin, 1969, p.280).

Perkin's claim is obviously exaggerated, but there had clearly been some significant changes in at least the outward tone of society - Chaucer and Shakespeare are vastly different from Austen, Dickens and Kingsley. (There is also general agreement among authors that such a change had occurred, see Altick, 1973; Harris, 1963; Houghton, 1957; Marshall, 1973; Quinlan, 1941). The Evangelicals were deeply conscious of what they considered to be the sinfulness of their times and so wished all children to be educated in order that they could study the Bible and appreciate the Christian truths. They were appalled at the long hours which children worked in factories; because of the inhumanity and because there was no time left for education and moral training. The Evangelicals became an important force in the reform of society (although they were fundamentally conservative on social issues) and, apart from improving the working conditions of children, achieved a number of reforms which mitigated the brutality of the law and social custom inherited from the 18th century, such as suppressing many cruel sports and games, improving the conditions in prisons and the abolition of transportation (Altick, 1973).

Benthamism or utilitarianism refers to the entrepreneurial ideal held by the Victorian middle class: "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" - Perkin (1969) describes the Benthamites as "secular Evangelicals". They added a new dimension to the moral revolution because they were concerned not only with

reforming the individual but with reforming society itself. They included in their numbers such eminent politicians who later came to be associated with 19th century reform as Chadwick (responsible for the Public Health Act of 1848) and Smith. These Victorians were firmly convinced they were living in an age of change: the French Revolution had overthrown the Ancien Regime and the Industrial Revolution was transforming society. They were thus deeply conscious that a new society was in the making and wished to ensure it would be a good one for all (Dicey, 1905).

Bentham hated suffering and injustice and was hostile to anything past or present which would place a check on individual freedom. He believed that the proper end of every law was the greatest happiness of the greatest number; tacitly assuming that each man, if left to himself would, in the long run, act for his own true interests and that the general welfare was sufficiently secured if each man were left free to pursue his own happiness in his own way. Thus his legislation was aimed at the removal of abuses by:

- (a) the transference of political power - the Reform Act of 1832 gave the middle-classes the right to vote.
- (b) The protection of human beings from unnecessary pain and suffering - the mitigation of the criminal code; a whole series of acts for the protection of the mentally ill and various enactments for the protection of children such as the prohibition of the employment of boy chimney sweeps in 1840.
- (c) The extension of individual liberty and adequate protection of rights - in 1846 and 1849 the navigation laws, which had restricted free action, were repealed (Dicey, 1905).

Bentham's policy was basically of the laissez-faire type. Although he had been prepared to intervene in the sphere of education and also the regulation of child and female labour in factories,

the idea of state intervention was repugnant to him. This eventually brought him into conflict with the rising forces of collectivism.

If two acts are looked at, the Factory Act of 1833 and the Mines Act of 1842, it is possible to see how the Evangelicals, Benthamites, workers and the press, together achieved the reforms.

The publication in the Leeds Mercury newspaper in 1830 of Oastler's letter, "Slavery in Yorkshire", which revealed the terrible working conditions in the factories, directed public attention to the factories and particularly to the employment of children. Another Evangelical, Lord Ashley, took up the demand for reform in parliament. The factory workers themselves presented petitions and the press spread the knowledge of the conditions. Parliament was forced to respond and set up three commissions to investigate the working conditions in the factories - an investigation was needed before any action could be taken because it was a new situation. Two of the commissions were composed of Benthamites, notably Smith and Chadwick, and the investigators were directed to:

inquire into the actual State and Condition of
Such Children, as to the Effects of Such
Employment, both with regard to their
Morals and bodily Health (Children's Employment
Commission 1831-32, p.1.)

The committee discovered that children worked exceedingly long hours and were, at times, treated cruelly. They concluded:

The effects of factory labour on children are immediate and remote: the immediate effects are fatigue, sleepiness, and pain; the remote effects, such at least as are usually conceived to result from it, are, deterioration of the physical constitution, deformity, disease, and

deficient mental instruction and moral culture (Children's Employment Commission 1831-32, p.25 .)

These results led to the Factory Act of 1833 - the first effective factory act and also the first act to insist on some education for children. The Evangelicals with their desire to give moral training to the young had imparted the impulse to the factory reform movement whereas the Benthamites had defined the form of the actual response (Roberts, 1969).

The 1833 Act only related to factories but, in 1842, a commission was set up to investigate the working conditions of children in the mines and other manufactories not covered by the Factory Act - Lord Ashley had again demanded this new investigation. The committee found that, for the women and children who worked underground, there was "evidence of the serious moral injury to which such employment exposes them" (Children's Employment Commission 1842, p.31). It was discovered that, owing to the hot, confined conditions, males generally worked totally naked underground and females naked to the waist. This shocked the new moral respectability of society and was sufficient to speedily bring about the Mines Act of 1842 which prohibited the employment of all women and children under the age of 10 underground.

4.2 Changes in the Concept of the Law

The increasing public outcry against social injustice put pressure on parliament to intervene in order to remedy the situation. The government was helped in its reforms by a change in the concept of the law, appearing towards the end of the 18th century.

Far from having a universal character, law was now looked on as a set of rules arising out of the special circumstances of each society and adapted to its particular needs (Stein and Shand, 1974, p.13.)

There was a gradual realisation that law was a tool which could be used when necessary to solve problems (the instrumental theory of the law). An industrialised society is far removed from the world of ox crafts and handicrafts; pressures from the outside world were generating demands on the legal system, and the law, struggling to regulate the vast machinery of economic life, developed in all directions (Friedman, 1977). The law of every major country during the 19th century underwent a massive change in order to cope with the new technology and social conditions.

Before 1800 the law was primarily concerned with the regulation and protection of property - the ruling elite of Britain was a landed aristocracy (Friedmann, 1959). However, as the 19th century progressed, the power of the landed classes was greatly diminished - the conditions created by the Industrial Revolution led to growing demands for political power from the middle and lower classes. After the extension of the franchise, parliament had to listen to, and usually agree to, their wishes, which were concerned not with property, but with the alleviation of distress.

The law was changed in accordance with the public opinion of the 19th century and as a result of the burgeoning concepts that individuals had rights. For example, the law had to change in the 19th century in order to keep punishments in agreement with the new social attitudes. There was growing acceptance of the belief that moderate policies strictly enforced were preferable to extreme penalties erratically enforced - juries were reluctant to find people guilty of such crimes as stealing if it meant the death penalty and thus they often valued stolen goods at less than the

amount required for a capital offence to have been committed. In addition, the first prevention of cruelty to children act appeared in 1889 because there had been important legal changes which enabled the necessary evidence to be put before the court. A spouse became a competent, though not compellable, witness and the evidence of a young child could now be heard in court.

There were also important changes in the way children who broke the law were dealt with. Prior to the Industrial Revolution delinquent children were regarded as their parents' responsibility. However, with the massive movement of the population into the towns, these children became a social problem. The children were usually poor and the most common crime was stealing. This was regarded as morally wicked and would be punished as such in the courts. In the 19th century there were nearly 200 offences for which children could be punished by death. In practice, however, this penalty was imposed relatively rarely and was regularly commuted to transportation (Berlins and Wansell, 1974). During the 19th century there was a growing band of reformers trying to improve prisons and the penal code (the Benthamites and the Evangelicals) and this began to have an effect on the treatment of children in trouble. By the late 19th century children were seen as being the victims of society and poverty rather than as the perpetrators of evil actions.

In 1908, the liberal government as part of its programme of reform, abolished the imprisonment of children and established juvenile courts and, by 1927, the government had accepted that there was no real difference between the neglected and the delinquent child; that neglect actually leads to delinquency (Berlins and Wansell, 1974). It seems quite horrific today that children could be shut up in prisons or transported for relatively minor crimes; but before the 19th century the fact that the child

was a thief was of more importance than the fact that the child was a child. There was no realisation of the causes that led to stealing and no concern for criminals in general prior to the 19th century. When these beliefs were added to the negative view of the working-class held by the middle and upper classes, they ensured that the establishment of separate criminal procedures for children would be regarded as unthinkable.

Child legislation has continued to develop, from the concern in the 19th century with the exploited and abused child, to the concern in the 20th century with the social welfare of the neglected child as a person (see Table 5). This development can be seen in the Children and Young Persons Act of 1933 in which the child's welfare and not the judgement of society was paramount, again in the Children Act of 1948 in which concern was focused on what was henceforth to be known as the "deprived" child and in the Children Act of 1969, which tried to ensure that every child in trouble was treated as being in need of care and protection rather than in need of punishment (Berlins and Wansell, 1974; Bruce, 1968; James, 1962).

4.3 Changes in the Concept of Poverty

As has already been said, the middle and upper classes possessed a very prejudiced view of the working classes. The latter were believed to be idle, to spend all their wages on drink, and were also regarded as a drain on the state's resources. The New Poor Law Act of 1834 embodied the feeling that poverty was the fault of the individual - workhouses were intended as deterrents to those who were foolhardy enough to need poor relief (Marshall, 1973). By the end of the 19th century, however, a

significant change began to take place in the social attitudes towards the depressed groups of society. The scientific studies of Booth in the 1880s and Rowntree in 1901 gave a new precision to the concept of poverty. They showed how widely prevalent poverty was, and that much of it was due to causes beyond the individual's control. These studies led to demands for a state policy to prevent the causes of poverty arising; punitive policies were no longer acceptable and it was argued that relief should be given as a right (Heywood, 1978; Thane, 1978).

These discoveries had an effect on child labour and it began to be regarded as unacceptable as the 19th century progressed. Previously it was believed that lower-class children should work from an early age so that they would become used to working and therefore be industrious as adults rather than additional burden for the rate-payers. With the realisation of the causes of poverty, accompanied by the wish of the Evangelicals that children should be educated, the public began to reappraise child employment. The ideas and experience of those factory owners who dispensed with child labour and shortened the hours of adults also helped, as they showed it was possible to run a profitable business without resorting to such means (Heywood, 1978; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969). As the state became more affluent, it could also afford to dispense with child labour.

4.4

The Welfare State

Social reform is a continuing development. The reforms of the 19th century only laid the foundations for the British Welfare State. The problems involved in such major economic, technical and social changes as were produced by the Industrial Revolution

drew the government into more and more sections of national life until the government itself became a major agent of social change (Roebuck, 1973). The growth of government was important for the formation of welfare law: people began to expect and want more from the state. Government power and functions increased to cope with this increased demand: it was prepared to intervene in areas previously considered outwith its control and accepted that the state was responsible for the welfare of its subjects.

The first tentative beginnings of the welfare state were seen in the 1860s when there was growing opposition to Bentham's policy of non-intervention (he did not wish to regulate labour by state decrees). The socialists wanted the government to regulate the hours and conditions of the factories and their influence spread during the second half of the 19th century. In 1876 school attendance was made compulsory and, in 1891, elementary education was made free. These were in accordance with the socialist principle of the equalisation of advantages and, of course, removed children from the labour force (Dicey, 1905). These further advances in the state policy towards children appeared with other socialist legislation: for example, in 1897 employers became liable for damages to employees and, in the 1870s, trade unions received legal recognition and protection (see Tables 4 and 5). The introduction of compulsory education brought the poor physical health of the working-class children to public attention and ushered in more reforms: school meals were provided for needy children in 1906; school medical inspection was begun in 1907 and grants were available to make medical treatment possible in 1912. This was the real beginning of a school medical service and a revolution had soon occurred in the public care and attention given to children (Bruce, 1968). In 1908, the neglect of a child's health by his parents also became a legal offence. The working-class, towards

the end of the 19th century, had begun to experience some of the benefits of industrialisation. Real wages had increased, diet had improved, literacy rates had risen and the franchise widened. Socialism was also growing in strength so, by the first decade of the 20th century, the lower classes had the power and self-confidence to bring enough pressure on the government to usher in a new era of social reform (Roebuck, 1973).

The social reforms of the 19th century were a response to new problems and new conditions. The same effect can be seen in the crises of the 20th century - the first and second world wars - when the government also responded with increasing welfare legislation. The first world war accelerated the stirrings for change: for better medical treatment, new homes and schools. It was slowly realised that to give assistance did not put a stop to the family effort (as the Victorians had believed); but increased its capacity for self-help (Middleton, 1971). The 1919 Housing and Town Planning Act required the local authorities to make good their deficiencies of housing and provide the necessary assistance for this to be done. The 1918 Education Act set the school leaving age at 14 and restricted the employment of children to little more than newspaper delivery. In 1921 school milk was provided for needy children - after the second world war, this was free to all. The 1933 Children and Young Persons Act extended the responsibility of society to children up to the age of 17 and the Act also emphasised the education and rehabilitation of those in care (Bruce, 1968).

The second world war was the decisive event in the evolution of the welfare state. The labour party won a landslide victory in the 1945 election and, by the late 1940s, a social security system was established which protected everyone from destitution or want.

In 1945 a system of family allowances was established; in 1946, a free National Health Service, financed from taxation, was set up and also the National Insurance Act was passed, providing relief in times of want (Fraser, 1973).

The modern state tries to provide a minimum standard of living and some minimum benefits for all its citizens. By establishing the appropriate institutions, the state now assumes a large responsibility for the material and spiritual development of the growing child, a responsibility that formerly resided entirely with the parents. It also takes on some of the family's financial responsibility; for example, through family allowances, workers' compensation and social security. This supportive legislation obviously had a large effect on family life; especially that of the lower classes. They are no longer starving, their children do not have to work and the right to education is not determined by income. The welfare state releases the family from its former economic subjection, guaranteeing at least the basic necessities of life. The preoccupation with social conditions which began as a response to the effects of the Industrial Revolution, continued to develop as it became clear that economic advance would not of itself remove anomalies and create a secure prosperity for all (Bruce, 1968; Fraser, 1973).

5.0 PARENTAL AND PUBLIC POLICY
 TOWARDS CHILDREN

There would not appear, however, to be a fundamental change in parental attitudes towards children; despite the great changes of industrialisation. The children who worked during the Industrial

Revolution, suffered such dreadful hardship because the state at that time was not capable of alleviating their plight, not because they were subjected to such economic exploitation by their parents as Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969), among others, have argued. (Even in this century this neglect by the state of some children also occurred. ^{iv}) Evidence given to the committee of 1831, which was

iv. It was not till the mid-20th century that the appalling conditions in the institutions for the care of children were discovered. Orphans in the 19th century were looked after in workhouses. These institutions in the 19th century were intended as deterrents; as punitive establishments intended to discourage people from being dependent on the Poor Law. Therefore the level of care was designed to be lower than a child would receive in the home of the lowest paid worker. The early institutions simply transferred the workhouse ideas and this had drastic effects on the children. At first the officials were usually not trained and, as a consequence, the children "were subject to a routine of unthinking indifference, which included opportunities for all kinds of abuse and cruelties" (Middleton, 1971, p. 203). Children in the early 20th century institutions had their material wants attended to, but not their emotional wellbeing. Their whole life was communal; they were viewed as a group, not as individuals, and had no opportunity to form adequate relationships with others.

At first it was the high mortality rate of children in institutions which aroused concern, but when better physical care was provided and more survived, Spitz's (1945) study on children reared in institutions revealed that they were still adversely affected by institutional life.

institutionalised children practically without exception developed subsequent psychiatric disturbances and became asocial, delinquent, feeble-minded, psychotic or problem children (54).

For those children reared in institutions from an early age, the prognosis for recovery was poor and permanent damage to emotional wellbeing usually ensued. Spitz's studies brought the problem to the notice of society; but, even when society is aware of such problems, it takes some time for the situation to be rectified. Later studies of children in institutions such as that of Flint (1957) revealed that some institutions were still inadequate. Flint found that the children were apathetic, showed no initiative, and did not know how to play or interact with other children. Parents of the same period would not be viewed as treating their children in the same way, but rather as providing at least adequate mental, emotional and physical care. Thus society's treatment of children is not necessarily paralleled by parental treatment.

set up to investigate the working conditions of children reveals that the parents were very much against their children working (Children's Employment Commission 1831-32). The committee was set up by parliament to investigate the condition of children in factories with reference to a proposed 10 hour bill which wanted to limit the working hours of children to 10 a day and also to forbid the employment of children under the age of 10. The people interviewed by the committee ran a real risk of losing their jobs and being branded as trouble-makers, and therefore not eligible for parish relief, by speaking out against the system of child employment which existed at the time. A variety of people were interviewed: those who worked or had worked in factories, parents with children working, and doctors. The following evidence is taken from the minutes of the committee on Children's Employment (1831-32).

Of the 18 parents interviewed, all were forced to let their children work through necessity, regarded the long hours (often as much as 16 or 17 hours a day) as unhealthy, and all wanted the proposed bill. Though the shorter hours would mean a reduction of wages, it was hoped that, by cutting children's hours, the factory owners would no longer prefer to employ them and so increase adult employment. The parents were all desperately unhappy about the condition of their children, but could not do anything about it. Though the parents disliked their children working, the social system at that time allowed them no choice; Poor relief was generally refused to a family if it contained children capable of working. For example, when an officer for parish relief was asked by the committee:

Supposing that the parents applying for relief for their children, refused to allow them to labour in mills or factories, in consequence of their believing and knowing that such labour

would be prejudicial to their health, and probably destructive of their lives, would they, in the mean time, have had any relief from the workhouse Board, or from you as an overseer, merely on the grounds that the children could not bear the labour.

the reply was: "Certainly not." (464).

It is clear that the parents interviewed by this committee were very distressed at the effect the long hours of work had on their children.

William Kershaw whose children were working stated:

an if it had been in my power to prevent it, they should never have gone. My wife has numbers of times upbraided me for suffering them to go, but still I thought it was better to allow them to go there than altogether starve for want of bread (47).

Joshua Drake said:

with regard to their long labour, I am of the opinion that it always did hurt and always will hurt the children; it keeps them unhealthy (39).

John Allet stated his children were:

very sleepy I have thought I had rather almost seen them starve to death, than to be used in that manner (109).

William Bennet also stated that his children were very tired:

Of a morning when they had to get up, they have been so fast asleep that I have had to go upstairs and lift them out of bed and have heard their crying with the feelings of a parent; I have been much affected by it (102).

The owners of the factories wished to see a return for the money they had invested and so whenever a factory received an order, the employees worked very long hours, sometimes as much

as 36 hours with only meal breaks, until the order was completed. Those parents who dared to ask for a shortening of the hours for their children (four of those parents who gave evidence had done so) either had their child/ren dismissed immediately or were told that there were others waiting to take the place of anyone who disliked the conditions. The same result happened if a parent complained about the ill-treatment a child received and, with unemployment very high, few risked complaining. If a father was employed, he tried to have his own children working under him so that they would be treated better. However, as the weekly quotas of work were set so as to demand continual maximum effort, a father would often have to resort to beating his children when they were tired or the whole family would lose their jobs. The parents interviewed did not think this was the right kind of life for their children at all. They saw the factories as having a damaging effect on their morals, health and capacity for education. The majority wanted their children to be educated so as to improve the children's status in life; but, although there were Sunday schools, the parents were reluctant to force their weary children out of bed in order to attend such schools. The working-class in general wanted a reduction in the hours their children worked. No-one wanted (or at least told the committee so) total prohibition of the employment of children. That would have been much too radical and, at that time, due to the general low wages, and the construction of machines which only children could operate, impractical. The parents interviewed felt that 10 hours a day was quite long enough for those children of 10 years and above. This was in marked contrast to the majority of mill owners who informed the committee that a 12 hour day would not harm a child as young as 8 years of age.

6.0

CONCLUSION

The Industrial Revolution did bring great misery to countless numbers of adults and children; but it also led to the creation of a different, and in many ways better, society. It brought increased wealth (although grossly unevenly distributed); and this is a necessary prerequisite for humanitarian legislation. The industrial urban society it helped to create produced new problems, leading to changes in the law, the power of central government and in the attitudes and morals of society. It increased the power of the middle class and, later, the working-class, paving the way for the extension of the franchise in 1832 and 1867 and thus making it essential for politicians to listen to the needs and wants of the masses. Finally, the Industrial Revolution promoted education - this being necessary in a world of increasingly complex skills and technology - and led to the idea that education should be available to all of society.

However, despite all these changes, parental care would appear to have changed little. The 19th century parents were just as appalled at the conditions in which their children worked as 20th century parents would be today. It is possible that parents always have had the concept of childhood; whereas society had to learn not so much what a child is; but that its helplessness could be exploited by society and it therefore needed state protection. Parents have always tried to do what is best for their children, within the context of their society. It is not necessarily cruel for a child to help on the farm or with the cottage industry of his parents from an early age: in a society where there was little choice of employment and also little help for the poor, learning the necessary skills early on was probably the best thing for that child.

In the small rural villages, room could normally be found for the homeless child within the community, helped by the church. The Poor Law books of the 17th and 18th century rural parishes reveal that these children were usually very adequately cared for. The state would only intervene to stop the exploitation of wardships and to regulate the duty of the villagers to the poor. Before the 19th century the mass of people were not concerned with rights or a share in the power of government, to any great extent; they sorted out their own problems without help from the state. However, the distress caused by the Industrial Revolution, the massing together of social problems in the industrialised towns, led to the realisation that state intervention was necessary and to the development of the institutions capable of solving the problems. The state had to learn how to protect the deprived sections of society; including the poor and orphaned child, from exploitation and ill-treatment.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Grace (1938): The Child and the State; University of Chicago Press.
- Altick, Richard (1973): Victorian People and Ideas; J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London.
- Ashton, T. S. and Sykes, Joseph (1964): The Coal Industry of the Eighteenth Century; Manchester University Press.
- Beales, Derek (1969): From Castlereagh to Gladstone 1815-1885; Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., London.
- Berlins, Marcel and Wansell, Geoffrey (1974): Caught in the Act; Penguin Books Ltd., London.
- Birch, R. C. (1974): The Shaping of the Welfare State; Longman Group Ltd., London.
- Booth, Charles (1889-1903): Life and Labour of the People in London; Macmillan & Co., London.
- Briggs, Asa (1959): The Age of Improvement; Longmans, Green & Co., London.
- Briggs, Asa (1972): "The history of changing approaches to social welfare"; in Martin, Ernest, ed. Comparative Development in Social Welfare; George Allen and Unwin Ltd., pp. 9-24.
- Bruce, Maurice (1968): The Coming of the Welfare State; B. T. Batsford Ltd., London.
- Brundage, Anthony (1978): The Making of the New Poor Law; Hutchinson & Co., London.
- Children's Employment Commission (1831-32): "Report from the select committee on the labour of children in the mills and factories"; in British Parliamentary Papers, vol. 15.
- Children's Employment Commission (1833): "First report. Employment of children in factories"; in British Parliamentary Papers, vol. 20.
- Children's Employment Commission (1942): "First report of the commissioners. Mines"; in British Parliamentary Papers, vol. 15.

- Dicey, A. V. (1903): Law and Opinion in England; Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London.
- Flint, Betty (1967): The Child and the Institution; University of London Press Ltd.
- Fraser, Derek (1973): The Evolution of the British Welfare State; The Macmillan Press Ltd., London
- Friedman, Lawrence (1977): Law and Society; Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Friedmann, W. (1959): Law in a Changing Society; Stevens & Sons Ltd., London.
- Harris, R. W. (1963): England in the Eighteenth Century; Blandford Press, London.
- Helfer, Ray and Kempe, C. Henry (1968): The Battered Child; University of Chicago Press.
- Heywood, Jean (1978): Children in Care; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Houghton, Walter (1957): The Victorian Frame of Mind; Oxford University Press, London.
- James, Thomas (1962): Child Law; Sweet and Maxwell, London.
- Laslett, Peter (1971): The World We Have Lost; Souvenir Press, London.
- McKendrick, Neil (1974): "Home demand and economic growth: a new view of the role of women and children in the Industrial Revolution"; in McKendrick, Neil, ed. Historical Perspectives. Studies of English Thought and Society; Europa Publications, London, pp.152-210.
- Marshall, Dorothy (1973): Industrial England 1778-1851; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Marshall, J. D. (1968): The Old Poor Law 1795-1834; The Macmillan Press Ltd., London.
- Middleton, Nigel (1971): When Family Failed; Victor Gallancz Ltd., London.

- Oastler, Richard (1830): "Slavery in Yorkshire"; letter in Mercury newspaper, Leeds.
- Perkin, Harold (1969): The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Pinchbeck, I. and Hewitt, M. (1969): Children in English Society; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Quinlan, Maurice (1941): Victorian Prelude; Columbia University Press, New York.
- Roberts, David (1969): Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State; Archon Books, London.
- Rodgers, Brian (1968): The Battle Against Poverty; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Roebuck, Janet (1973): The Making of Modern English Society from 1850; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Rowntree, Benjamin (1901): Poverty: A Study of Town Life; Macmillan & Co., London.
- Ryder, Judith and Silver, Harold (1970): Modern English Society; Methuen & Co. Ltd., London.
- Smelser, Neil (1974): "Sociological history. The Industrial Revolution and the British working-class family"; in Flinn, M.W. and Smout, T.C., eds. Essays in Social History; Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp.23-38.
- Spitz, Rene (1945): "Hospitalism"; in The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, vol. 1, pp.53-74.
- Stein, Peter and Shand, J. (1974): Legal Values in Western Society; Edinburgh University Press.
- Thane, Pat, ed. (1978): The Origins of British Social Policy; Croom Helm, London.

CHAPTER FOUR

ISSUES CONCERNING EVIDENCE

No document can tell us more than what the author of the document thought - what he thought had happened, what he thought ought to happen or would happen, or perhaps only what he himself thought he thought.

(Carr, 1961)

1.0

INTRODUCTION

The reconstruction of family history is difficult; there are few facts, little that can be proven. A miscellany of various sources of evidence is available, none of which provide a complete history of childhood and all of which possess numerous problems. With this situation, all that is possible is to fit all of the pieces of evidence together - almost like a jigsaw - decide which kind of general picture they produce and then use this as a basis for filling in the inevitable gaps. In order to be able to do this with any degree of accuracy, a systematic analysis of all available sources is necessary. Unfortunately such an analysis has not yet been done - although some authors have investigated child-rearing theories through the centuries, they have still tended to concentrate on what they consider to have been influential theories and thus there is little or no discussion of other theories which were also in existence at the time. With reference to child-care in the past, the sources used so far have not been very helpful: there are too many gaps left, little information on actual family life and some of the sources used (for example, child-rearing advice literature) do not contribute to our knowledge of how parents reared their children in the past. They are more like pieces from another jigsaw: how 'experts'' views on child-rearing theory change through the centuries.

This study has been concerned with providing a detailed analysis of three types of evidence, in an attempt to fill in some of the gaps:

- (a) diaries, both parental and child diaries;
- (b) autobiographies;
- (c) newspaper reports of court cases concerning child abuse before The Prevention of Cruelty to and Protection of Children Act, passed in 1889.

2.0

DIARIES

Diaries, autobiographies, letters and wills belong to the class of personal documents. The last two have been ignored in this study, apart from when they have been included in a diary or autobiography. Letters and wills share the same disadvantages as diaries and also possess some additional ones. Letters, for example, are written with another person in mind which will affect what events are noted and how they are related. Wills are useful for studies of inheritance, but contain little on child-care.

A total of 496 published diaries and autobiographies were read for this study, of which 80 contained no useful information. The remaining 416 are composed of 144 American diaries, 236 British diaries and 36 autobiographies only (that is, autobiographies which were not attached to a diary or, if they were included in a diary, the diary section contained no information on child care). Of the diaries, 98 were written by a child or started when the diarist was a child. All American texts are signified by an asterisk. The diaries differed in length from a few pages to nine volumes and were of varying degrees of usefulness. In addition, 27 unpublished British manuscripts were looked at. Of these, 10 were discarded either because they were illegible or no use. Nearly all of the texts were found in the bibliographies by Matthews (1945 and 1950). The diary of Blundell was cited in MacFarlane (1970) and the diaries of J. *Bayard, *Bissell, *Bowers, *Chace, *Hadley, *Hazard, Smith and *Wister were discovered by chance when looking through the British Library catalogue. Those texts published after 1950 were found in the National Bibliography catalogue. Appendix B lists all of the texts used in the study.

The use of diaries as a main source of evidence does present a number of methodological problems:

- (a) That of representation: what kind of people wrote diaries and why did they do so?
- (b) That of censorship: are important details omitted either by the diarist or the editor?
- (c) That of generalisation: is it possible to infer the behaviour of other sections of society from the diaries?

2.1

Representation

Diaries can rarely be traced before the 16th century - there was little self-expressive literature of any kind. Their chief impetus in the 17th century came from the Puritans with their compelling anxiety to put their thoughts to paper as a means of cultivating the holy life by the discipline of self-examination and self-revelation. Obviously the diaries only represent the literate section of society; but within this limit the diaries studied do cover a wide stratum: a Queen of England down to a poor farmer. The occupation of the diarists and autobiographers is shown in Table 6.

The writers followed varying religions as shown in Table 7.

Table 6: Percentage Division of Sources by Occupation (where known)¹

Nationality	Occupation									
	Church	Arts/ Science	Politics	Business/ Trade	Law	Farming	Medicine	Navy	Army/ Navy	Education
American n = 154	21	4	8	8	3	10	3	6	10	3 ²
British n = 279	15	11	7	6	5	5	5	4	3	10 ³
ALL n = 433	17	9	7	7	4	7	4	5	5	7

Notes:

1. The listed fields of employment cover a wide range of occupations. For example: Church covers travelling preachers up to archbishops.

Business or trade covers small shop owners up to owners of or partners in large business firms. Farming covers small farmers up to wealthy land owners.

Army or Navy covers soldiers/sailors up to majors/admirals.

The specific occupation of the writers is given in Appendix B.

Of the writers whose occupation was unknown, one American and 23 British (8% of the British sample) were titled aristocrats. Of the sample as a whole, 2% of the American writers were either title holders or wealthy plantation owners; 17% of the British were titled aristocrats. Of the 433 sources, 11% belong to the top regions of the upper classes.

2. These were: 2 clerks; 1 anthologist; 1 fur trapper and 1 deacon.

3. These were: 2 apprentices; 2 brewers; 2 clerks; 2 engineers; 2 ladies-in-waiting; 2 tailors; 3 yeomen; 1 alderman; 1 antiquary; 1 baker; 1 book seller; 1 civil servant; 1 government official; 1 nanny; 1 pewterer; 1 shop-worker; 1 skinner and glover; 1 surveyor; 1 turner and 1 watchmaker.

Table 7: Percentage Division of Sources by Religious Belief

Nationality	Religious Belief					
	Puritan	Quaker	Orthodox ¹	Dissenting Sect ²	Religion Unspecified	Religion not mentioned/followed
American n = 154	18	10	1	20	33	20
British n = 279	6	13	17	14	34	16
ALL n = 433	10	12	11	16	34	18

Notes:

1. The orthodox section consists of:

American: 1 Church of England; 1 Protestant.

British: 21 Church of England; 11 Catholic; 8 Protestant; 3 Church of Scotland; 3 Jew.

2. The dissenting sects comprised:

American: 9 Episcopal; 7 Presbyterian; 5 Methodist; 2 Baptist; 2 Mormon; 2 Unitarian; 1 Calvinist; 1 free-thinker; 1 Tractarian.

British: 12 Methodist; 7 Presbyterian; 5 Baptist; 3 Evangelical; 2 Episcopal; 1 Calvinist; 1 Christian Scientist; 1 Moravian and 7 unspecified dissenters.

Note: the religious categories used are based on the diarists' self-descriptions and may not be mutually exclusive.

In order to ascertain how representative diarists were of their society, it is necessary to discover how prevalent the practice of diary keeping was. This study is concerned only with what Matthews (1950) calls the "domestic" diary. There are numerous other types of diary: war, travel, political, purely religious and account-book. There would also appear to have been a great many diaries written. Matthews (1950) lists 363 diaries for the period 1490-1699. Not all diaries are included in Matthew's bibliography; for example he omitted the detailed diary of Nicholas Blundell and, of course, would not include any diary discovered after 1950. It is also likely that there are many more diaries hidden in attics still awaiting discovery (MacFarlane, 1970). These texts are also only the surviving records, presumably from a much larger sample. In addition, there were advice books on the function of and how to write a diary published in the 1650s (cited by MacFarlane, 1970). This suggests that the writing of a diary was a common activity. Some diarists do mention reading other people's diaries or being advised by another to keep a diary. For example, Jones quoted at the start of his diary the directions of one minister on diary-keeping:

Compile a History of your Heart's Conduct
.... Minute down your Sins of Omission:-
Register those secret faults to which none
but your own conscience is privy. Often
contemplate yourself in this faithful Mirror.
(Jones, 1755-1821)

Having sometime ago read Cobbets advice
ect, & having seen my dext Friends Jas Ogilvys
Diary & seen, and learnt its usefullness I come
to the determination to keep one, of such things
as might be usefull or interesting so here goes —
(*Sterne, 1801-52)

It is many Years since Doctor Samuel Johnson
advised me to get a little Book, and write in it
all the little Anecdotes which might come to my

Knowledge, and all the Observations I
might make or hear; all the verses never
likely to be published, and in fine
ev'rything which struck me at the Time.

(Thrale, 1741-1821)

Thus diary-keeping appears to have been a fairly prevalent practice - the diarists themselves certainly do not consider themselves in any way odd or different from the rest of society. However, it must be conceded that diarists as a class may be exceptional rather than representative.

2.1.1 The reasons for diary writing

As has been said, diaries are rarely found before the 16th century. This needs some explanation. The history of diary writing is related to the development of self-awareness. The centuries of a universal church and an international culture were unsympathetic to the expression of individuality in any form. It was the Renaissance and the Reformation in the 16th century, bringing in their wake freedom of thought and conscience, that paved the way for autobiography of all kinds (Spalding, 1949).

MacFarlane (1970) lists three types of motive for keeping a diary. Some diaries are simply account books noting purchases and bills; others are intended to help the diarist recall certain events and yet others are prompted by religious considerations in an attempt to examine the soul and so correct behaviour. Spalding (1949) would consider the "pure" diary as consisting of "the outflow of the spontaneous impulse to record experience as such and so preserve it" (21). Spalding argues that the best diaries are those in which no motive is apparent to the reader and, if the diarist was asked why he kept a diary, he probably would not know. For example, Kilvert (1840-79) wrote:

Why do I keep this voluminous journal? I
can hardly tell. Partly because life appears

to me such a curious and wonderful thing that it seems a pity that even such a humble and uneventful life as mine should pass altogether away without some record of this, and partly too because I think the record may amuse and interest some who come after me.

(Spalding, 1949, p.21)

As diaries are influenced by the personality of their writers, it is obviously important to consider why the diarists used in this study wrote diaries. Almost one quarter of the diarists (24%) specifically state why they are writing a diary. Of these most write for their own amusement or improvement:

Sitting before the fire this evening, a thought came over me to write a few lines every night, of what sort of weather we have, whether we go out or not, who comes to see us, and how we spend our time summer and winter.

(*Eve, 1749-74)

[This diary] is to be in some sort a register of my life, studies and opinions.

(Newton, 1762-1830)

I find it [diary] such a useful practice, and so entertaining, that I am fully resolved to continue it all my life.

(Shore, 1819-39)

Others used their diary as a confidant:

To have some account of my thoughts, manners, acquaintance and actions is the reason which induces me to keep a Journal - a Journal in which, I must confess my every thought - must open my whole heart with the most unlimited confidence, the most unremitting sincerity, to the end of my life!

(Burney, 1752-1840)

This book is quite a little friend to my heart; it is next to communicating my feelings to another person.

(Fry, 1780-1845)

Treasure of my thoughts! Dear companion
of solitary hours! Herein I inscribe
the workings of my secret soul.

(*May, 1840? -?)

Some diarists wrote for religious reasons; particularly the
earlier diaries:

I have decided to perpetuate, for the benefit
of my children and grand-children, a
memorial of the goodness of God.

(Townsend, 1757-1826)

Believing that my progress in the Christian
course may be assisted by the practice of
noting the condition of my soul, and recording
some of the events which pass around me, I
feel encouraged to commence a journal.

(Tregelles, 1806-1884)

I did write down these mercies of God

(Wallington, 1598-1658)

Other diarists wished to leave a record for their children:

[The diary is] only for the private use
of such of my children as may survive me,
from which by ye Grace of God they may
possibly learn to escape many errors that
I have committed and avoid many evils I
have fallen into.

(Clegg, 1679-1755)

To my dear little Marianne I shall "dedicate"
this book, which if I should not live to give it
her myself, will I trust be reserved for her
as a token of her Mother's love

(Gaskell, 1810-65)

I only intend it [diary] for the perusal of a
few, and of my own child in particular

(Weston, 1776-1850)

A few diarists wrote their diaries so that they would be able to
recall events later:

[The diary is] a shorte breviat to be carried about me to helpe my memorie concerning those things & upon all occasions.

(Powell, 1581-1656)

I have all my life regretted that I did not keep a regular Journal. I have myself lost recollection of much that was interesting

(W. Scott, 1771-1832)

These lines are penned that in after life should my life be spared I may have the opportunity of comparing myself, and of calling to mind many events which might be forgotten.

(*Walker, 1814-97)

Some diaries are begun as a response to a special event such as a visit to friends (for example, *Orr, 1764? -?); travel abroad (for example, Damer, 1809? -48) or marriage:

I have concluded to keep a journal of my life as I have begun with rather bad prospects - today is my wedding day. I am married privately as all parties are opposed to it.

(*Phelps, 1810? -?)

A few of the child diarists were instructed to write their diaries: a daily journal was a task imposed on Fleming (1803-1811) by her teacher who then corrected any misspelt words; Post (1819-1835) wrote his diary at the suggestion of his father and J. Scott (1792-1862) began "to keep a journal, under the guidance of my dear mother."

The majority of diarists give no reason for keeping a diary. Many diaries do seem to be spiritual exercises; a way of becoming closer to God and of improving the diarist's faith; but most diaries, particularly the better, more detailed ones, appear to be written in response to an inner impulse to record things, for no better reason than that they had occurred.

I should live no more than I can record,
as one should not have more corn growing
than one can get in. There is a waste of
good if it be not preserved.

(Boswell, 1740-95)

Sometimes after our people is gone to
Bed I get my Pen for I Dont know how to
content myself without writeing Something.

(*Condict, 1754-79)

I have for some years past, kept a sort of
diary, but intended to discontinue it, and
make this a memorandum book - but seeing
a fine snow falling this morning, and being
used to make observations on the weather,
began this first day of the year in my
accustomed manner.

(*Drinker, 1734-1807)

Most diaries are very private documents, containing a wealth of trivial and personal details which were clearly not intended for the public gaze. Of the 433 texts studied, only 26 of the writers considered publication of their work (6%) and, of these, only 10 began their diary with the express purpose of publishing it later. (These tended to be the 20th century diarists.) There may have been more diaries written with publication in mind, although the writer did not admit it. This is particularly likely to be true of those texts concerned with public events or the diarist's/auto-biographer's work - a further 7% of the total sample size. The glimpses of family life portrayed in such texts are more suspect than those contained in texts where publication was not considered - the writer, for example, may deliberately suppress anything he thinks society will condemn or which reveals himself in a less than favourable light. Nonetheless, in the diaries studied here there does not appear to be any significant difference between those intended for publication and those that were not. One diarist who did intend to have his diary published wrote that a diary has a:

singular disability truth. In all other forms
[of literature] one can either invent what is
not true or suppress what is. In the diary
not so. If it is not written within the confines
of strictest truth it is not worth writing.

(Hutchinson, 1880-?)

In addition, looking at one aspect of the parent-child relationship
- that of discipline, those writers who at least considered publica-
tion of their work and who referred to discipline, described the
same range of experiences as contained in the rest of the texts.
For example, Cooper (1801-85) described the cruel treatment he
received as a child, at home and school; whereas Owenson (1780? -
1859) recalled receiving nothing but kindness as a child. Mill
(1712-1805), Jones (1755-1821) and Skinner (1772-1839) noted the
trouble they experienced with some of their children.

It is arguable that any diarist who keeps a diary long enough
must consider that it will be read by others. However, most
diarists appear to cherish the private nature of their diary.
Privacy, in fact, seems to be the essence of a diary; a place
where people can relate their regrets, hopes and dreams without
fear of ridicule or disapproval. The majority of the diarists
studied regarded their diaries as confidential repositories for
their thoughts and viewed the thought of anyone else reading their
diaries as an intrusion. Johnston's mother wished to see her
journal; but her daughter wrote in her diary:

I do not think I shall, because showing it to
anybody would, I think, take off the pleasure
and value of my journal . . .

(Johnston, 1808-52)

I cannot but think that much curious information
is detailed in diaries not intended for publication.
Think not that my diary is intended for publication;
but perhaps Evelyn or Burton, perhaps, thought
the same But if my diary might be discovered
in the 20th century and printed, I would offer to the

reader a few remarks:-

1. Various sentiments in this book there are, which, perhaps, I should now condemn.
2. The matters of fact in this diary, are matters of fact.
3. This diary is strictly private; it details private feelings; and feelings which, perhaps were often to be checked.
4. Judge leniently
(Post, 1819-35)

My diary is of such a nature, that I should not like to trust it to any one but my other self.
(Steadman, 1764-1837)

2.2

Censorship

Diarists (and autobiographers) do select the information which they wish to record. Thus it is possible that significant information on the history of childhood is omitted in the texts. For example, the disciplining of children would appear to be a very emotive area. Information on physical punishment may not appear if:-

- (i) The diarist omitted it because:
 - (a) Physical punishment was so commonplace it was not thought worth mentioning.
 - (b) The diarist considered physical punishment too shameful to relate.
 - (c) The diarist believed society would consider it shameful.
- (ii) The editor omitted any details on physical punishment contained in the original manuscript from the published text.
- (iii) Severe physical punishment did not occur.

To take these in order.

2.2.1 The diarist

- (a) Punishment, physical or verbal, is a salient event. It generally causes distress to both the inflictor and the victim (Newson and Newson, 1976). It does not seem very likely, therefore, that punishment would not be recorded on the grounds that it was too ordinary an event - particularly as the diaries do contain a great deal of trivial information such as the food eaten or clothes worn that day and also information on the methods used to discipline children.
- (b) If the diarists did not mention physical punishment because they were ashamed of inflicting it, then at the very least, the diarists were opposed to what has been put forward as the attitudes of society to children in the past. However, the diarists did not simply ignore discipline - it is, in fact, one of the main recurring themes of the diaries. The diaries were concerned with the way they reared their children: not spoiling; but not repressing them. (They certainly did not ignore their children.) The diaries frequently contain long passages on the appropriate punishment for any childish misdemeanour. These include lecturing, reproaching, sending to bed or out of the room and fining. Infliction of some kind of physical punishment from a slap to a "whipping" is mentioned by 27 diarists (6%). Whippings were noted very rarely, usually on only one or two occasions and do seem to have been a last resort. The way the event was described in the diaries does not suggest that the diarists concerned were ashamed of inflicting the punishment; but rather that they thought it justified in the circumstances. For example, Boswell "beat" his son for telling a lie; Byrd

whipped his nephew "exceedingly" for bed-wetting and Sewall whipped one son for playing truant. As any whippings are mentioned when they do occur, it appears that they were an infrequent event. Some fathers, such as Martindale and Bright, complained when their child was beaten at school and *Ward, when a school teacher had to apologise to parents for hitting his pupils too hard on the hand. This would appear to suggest a general disapproval of physical punishment.

- (c) If the beating of children was considered by society to be perfectly acceptable, even praiseworthy, as has been suggested by some historians, then there would be no need for the diarist to conceal it.¹

As the majority of diarists also did not consider publication, then it is unlikely that the attitudes of society at large would have any influence on what the diarist wrote. If it were the case that the diarists suppressed evidence of ill-treatment because they felt society would condemn it, then this would present a serious problem to the thesis that the ill-treatment of past children by all was the normal method of rearing. As the diaries do contain details on punishment when it occurred, it seems likely that the diarists simply noted the punishment as they would any other event of the day.

i. There was not total approval of physical punishment for children. Some theorists through the centuries have spoken out against the use of such discipline, particularly in schools. For example: Pluto 400 B.C., Plutarch 1000 A.D., Asham and Ingeland in the 16th century and Locke and L'estrange in the 17th century were all opposed to physical punishment (Helfer and Kempe, 1968). (This does seem to be a continuing debate: corporal punishment in schools today is both regarded as necessary and condemned by sections of society.)

By attempting to assess the "honesty" of the diarists, it may be possible to ascertain how much of what the diaries contain can be relied on. The diarists did include in their diaries actions or thoughts of which they repented. The Puritans and Methodists in particular, using their diaries as a means of spiritual improvement, were likely to note all of what they considered to be their faults and good points that day. If, for example, they considered it their duty to beat their child, then they would either record in their diary their regret at not having done so or their satisfaction in performing their duty. Other diarists also included in their diary their regrets. Gambling, failing to provide for their wife and children, ignoring their father's advice, refusing to go to Eton, losing their temper, and being impatient with their children are a few examples. The diarists did record details which they wished to keep private. Boswell committed adultery on numerous occasions, each noted in his diary. His wife happened to find the diary, read it and was exceedingly annoyed at the contents, so much so that Boswell decided that: "Perhaps I should not put such things as this into my Journal." However, the next time he was unfaithful, it was also recorded in the diary. It is almost as if diarists are compelled to record what actually happens as otherwise their diary would be worthless. Lady Holland also wrote in her diary details of an incident which she obviously would not have wanted to be made public. She wished to divorce her husband and re-marry. The law at the time (the late 18th century) gave custody of all children to the father. Lady Holland particularly wished to keep her youngest child, Harriet, and so she wrote to her husband while he was on a business trip, telling him Harriet was dead. She then removed Harriet to a hiding place. If the plot had been discovered, both Lady Holland and her new

husband would have faced a term of imprisonment - something not undertaken lightly in the 18th century. Similarly, Thrale and Guest recorded in their diaries their growing love for a man they knew would be totally unacceptable to their children and their circle of peers. Morris admitted receiving smuggled French wine on a number of occasions. For example, he noted: "I got up to let in Amey Rogers with 4 Gallons & 6 pints and $\frac{1}{2}$ of French White-Wine."

The diarists also included details of their behaviour with which they were not entirely happy, often regretting the incidents. See, for example, the diaries of Boswell, *Byrd and Ryder which describe their sexual liaisons, often with prostitutes, and their ambivalent attitudes towards and later regrets for their behaviour. Grange - a senator of the college of justice - similarly noted: "I drank and whor'd and followed sensual pleasures" - to such an extent that he contracted one of the venereal diseases which somewhat dampened his enthusiasm. Byrom, Smith and Turner regretted their drinking habits. Smith noted he was:

so overcome with Liquor and in so bad a state
that I knew not what I did and too bad to be
mention'd; only I make my Sincere Acknowledge-
ment to my Creator and Preserver and stedfastly
promise never to commit the like beastly
Wickedness.

(Smith, 1673-1723)

Turner wrote that he:

came home drunk, Oh! with what horrors does
it fill my heart, to think I should be guilty of
doing so, and on a Sunday too! Let me once
more endeavour never, no never, to be guilty
of the same again.

(Turner, 1729-89)

Unfortunately for Turner's peace of mind, he was "guilty of

the same" on many other occasions.

The diarists were concerned with recording the truth as they saw it. They were obviously selecting which events to record; but they would not appear to have been deliberately falsifying them:

I may make bold to remark here that I know and am certain, that a strict regard has been paid to truth, throughout

(Taylor, 1743-1819)

I shall say little more here than that all I write is the simple and entire truth.

(Weston, 1776-1850)

Some diarists were aware of how difficult it was to record only the exact truth. Jones, for example, was afraid that others might find him too sinful and wrote:

Imagining that my Journal may fall into the hands of friends or others, I find within me, in spite of all I can do, a studious care employ'd, tho' not to misrepresent the Truth, yet to avoid setting it forth in glaring colours.

(Jones, 1755-1821)

Others, on looking back over their diaries, believed the texts revealed more of the writer's failures than achievements:

A diary tempts one to be cynical: a man shows himself a poor prophet or a hasty builder. Looking back on mine from now I can see the flimsiness of many hopes.

(Hewlett, 1861-1923)

. . . . it is only too true that an exact and honest review of life cannot be made without seeing in bold relief the weakness, vanity and imperfections of even our best efforts.

(Sopwith, 1803-79)

The diarists were honest about their feelings: four diarists, already having some children, hoped they would not become

pregnant again, or admitted they were not happy when they became so; Fry and "Prentiss suffered from post-natal depression after the birth of their child and Boscawen was terrified of childbirth. Gurney, on the birth of her first child, decided to answer all her children's questions; seven children later, she admitted this was one of the most "trying" things she had ever undertaken.

2.2.2 The editor

There are disadvantages in using published texts. Whether or not a manuscript is published depends on someone considering it worth publishing. Most manuscripts were shortened for publication and therefore significant details may have been omitted. In some diaries many of the family details were omitted because they were considered to be too personal, or in the 19th century not of interest to the public. Ultimately, research in this area will have to concentrate on the original manuscripts - although some of these are no longer available. For this study, the large number of sources used made it impossible to study the manuscripts - the latter are not renowned for their legibility - although an attempt was made to read a few. It is hoped that the large number of texts would help to counteract individual vagaries in editorial policy. As the vast majority of sources were used in their published form, a discussion of editorial policies is necessary.

It appears that it is the very private nature of a diary which caused problems for the editors. Some editors were reluctant to "bare the soul" of the diarist.

This journal enters too minutely into the details of his daily doings, and touches too closely the secrets of his inner life, to be given to the world.
(Ewing's diary; pub. 1877)

There are almost daily references to them [Macready's children] in the diaries, but they are mainly of too intimate a character to admit of quotation. Their faults as well as their merits are impartially recorded, but even his [Macready's] severest displeasure was seldom untempered with evidences of deep and anxious affection.

(Macready's diary; pub. 1912)

There is no office involving more difficulty than that which devolves on the editor of a Diary Reserve has, however, rather to do with the expediency of such a publication than with the manner in which it is conducted. A Diary is chiefly interesting as a portraiture of feelings which are discoverable through no other medium In the Diary of Bishop Sandford, many passages have been repressed, which - though deeply delightful to his nearest relations - were considered of too sacred a character for the public eye.

(Sandford's diary; pub. 1830)

However, it seems that in most cases, even if private details were suppressed, the editors were concerned with publishing a representative sample of the original manuscript. They often list what they have omitted: this list includes notes on books read or sermons listened to, repetitive visits, repeated observations on the weather and any item which may cause distress to persons still living at the date of publication.

It may be claimed that nothing of importance has been omitted. The diary called for compression for Glenvervie often repeated himself, was often tedious about minor political movements which have lost all interest, given to reflections, moral or literary, which do not rise above the level of platitude, and sometimes indulged in flights of facetiousness devoid of wit.

(Douglas' diary; pub. 1928)

In making this abridgement I have endeavoured to preserve the essential interest of the Journal, while

omitting such details as lists of correspondents, or of calls made and received, bald statements of commonplace happenings, and other recurrent features of little interest.

(Mantell's diary; pub. 1940)

.... as a limit [on extracts] was absolutely necessary, it was resolved to be guided by the object of exhibiting individual character as much as possible, without violation of what, even at this distance of time, are felt to be the sacred privacies of the soul, an intrusion on other personalities. A great deal of what is interesting and characteristic, especially of the almost daily notes of her studies and observations on natural history, had to be omitted. But nothing which has been suppressed would tend to give a different idea of her character from what the published extracts convey.

(Shore's diary; pub. 1898)

Some editors also included in their published version certain entries with which they did not agree. For example, Rathbone mentioned "whipping" her infant for crying. The editor, in a footnote, remarked that, although this action did not seem very likely, it was so stated in the diary. Other editors published details which the diarist would prefer not to have been revealed. For example, Gladstone had prepared some extracts of her diary for publication but died before the diary was published. The editor of her diary considered these extracts too "edited" and therefore ignored them and used the original manuscript. In his diary, Mill had crossed out a disparaging remark on his daughter's character (see Chapter Eight) but, as it was still legible, the editor included it in the published text.

2.2.2.1 Comparison study. In order to discover if anything significant to the history of childhood was omitted, a sample of manuscripts was compared with the published text. The American

manuscripts were listed in Matthews (1974) and the British ones in Matthews (1950). The American libraries who owned the required manuscripts were asked for a microfilm or a Xerox of the text. The comparison of the British manuscripts was confined to those manuscripts which were available for study in libraries in London. The American and British diaries were considered separately and divided into groups according to the date of publication. The American diaries had publication dates ranging from 1760-1951. Manuscripts for those diaries published before 1825 (two) and for the only diary published after 1950 were not available. This left a range of publication dates ranging from 1825-1950, which gave five periods of 25 years. Two manuscripts were looked at from each period except that of 1925-50 where only one manuscript was obtainable. This gave a total of nine manuscripts. The publication dates of the British diaries ranged from 1750 to 1967. Manuscripts for those diaries published before 1825 (six) and those after 1950 (seven) were not available. Two manuscripts were read for each 25 year period 1825-1950, and three were used for the period 1900-25, giving 11 manuscripts. These manuscripts are listed in Table 8.

Table 8: Manuscripts used in the Comparison Study

Nationality	Period				
	1825-1850	1850-1875	1875-1900	1900-1925	1925-1950
American	Elias Hicks	Samuel Dexter	Increase Mather	Landon Carter	William Byrd
	John Pemberton	Timothy Newell	Ann Warder	Cotton Mather	
British	Henry Clarendon	Sarah Fox	Walter Calverly	Susanna Day	John Skinner
	Mary Rich	Nehemiah Wallington	Caroline Powys	Abiah Darby	Richard Rogers
				John Thomlinson	

Results:

(a) Verbatim

Those manuscripts which were reproduced verbatim (or very nearly so) were: *Byrd, Clarendon, C. *Mather, *Newell, *Pemberton, Rich and Thomlinson. In the case of *Pemberton, the editor omitted a few entries, but provided an accurate summary of them so that, in effect, nothing contained in the manuscript was excluded from the published version. The editor of Thomlinson's diary omitted a few religious entries at the beginning of the diary; but the remainder was verbatim. The editor of *Newell's diary did not omit anything in the manuscript, although he did occasionally alter a word or word order slightly.

(b) Less than 25% omitted

The editors of the diaries of Calverly, *Hicks and Rogers omitted less than 25% of the original manuscript.

Calverly: The editor omitted about 10% of the manuscript; details of accounts; the occasional entry on debts and the visits of friends or relatives. No family details were omitted.

*Hicks: The editor omitted about 10%: accounts of dreams, details of some of the religious meetings which *Hicks attended, entries regretting his poverty. The only family detail excluded was an entry describing the sending of two of *Hick's daughters to boarding school. The editor sometimes paraphrased what *Hicks had written, but without altering the sense.

Rogers: The editor omitted about 10%: Rogers' frequent regrets at neglecting his studies, an entry considering whether or not to bring a teacher into the

family and an entry in which Rogers recorded that too much of his time was given to delighting in his family when he should spend it appreciating God.

(c) 25-50% omitted

The diaries of Day, I. *Mather, Powys, Wallington and *Warder fall into this category.

Day: The editor of Day's diary was mainly interested in Day's religious experiences and so omitted most of the family details - about 30% of the diary - details on her children's illnesses, entries revealing Day's concern for the health of her children, an entry describing taking "dear little Agatha to school", a number of entries referring to the visiting of this daughter at school and notes on the visits Day received from her married children and grandchildren.

I. *Mather: The editor omitted about half of *Mather's diary; these were mainly religious details: numerous entries on the meetings he attended, his struggles with his faith and details on sermons. In addition, the years 1688-97 - covering a large part of *Mather's family life - were excluded from the text. This is possibly due to the fact that the manuscript for these years belongs to a different library. The Xerox of the manuscript for this period proved to be practically impossible to decipher.

Powys: The editor omitted about half of the manuscript: parts of letters, frequent descriptions of houses and places she visited on her travels, her reason

for writing the diary and entries in which she talked about other people. An occasional reference to her children was also excluded: her decision to make one of her son's a new outfit and her distress at the death of her baby daughter.

Wallington: The editor omitted about half of the manuscript: description of a period of famine, Wallington's recollection of he and his brother stealing 1/- from their father twice and many religious entries. In addition, the editor omitted many of the references to Wallington's children, although they are summarised to some extent in a preface to the diary. These omissions were: entries on his wife's difficulties with breast-feeding, references to the illnesses of his children, a description of the time his daughter was missing for a few hours, his wife's miscarriages, and some small details of Wallington referring to enjoying the company of his daughter and to his son as being "merry... and full of play".

*Warder: The editor omitted about half of the diary: the description of *Warden's voyage to Philadelphia, details on the kind of food she ate, many descriptions of the furnishings of houses she visited and people she met, entries referring to the writing of letters home and some entries on Warder's daily activities such as sewing and mending. Some references to her children were also excluded: an entry in which Warder hoped her "sweet dear dearest offspring" were happy while she was away from them, her description of her delight in seeing

them again and of taking them round various places in America, an account of one son who was unwilling to go to bed, was later found asleep and taken up to bed where he gave an "ill-natured cry". However, *Warder wrote that, as she realised her son did not know that she had heard and as she did not wish to arouse the "inevitable passion" if she "corrected" him, she did not. Her feelings at the death of her young daughter were also omitted - *Warder regarding this as an "affliction" - as well as entries in which she referred to American children as spoilt in that they were rude to their parents and had too much freedom.

(d) Over 50% omitted

The diaries of *Carter, Darby, *Dexter and Skinner fall into this category.

*Carter: The editor omitted about 75% of the entries: frequent long entries on debts owed to him, bills to be paid, Carter's state of health, observations on the weather, his religious beliefs and the running of his plantation. Very few family entries were omitted, however: some entries on family visits, an entry on Carter's views on the contraceptive effect of breast-feeding and two incidents of discord with his sons - similar entries for other occasions were included in the published text.

Darby: The editor omitted about 75% of the manuscript: Darby's reason for writing, descriptions of her parents and siblings, frequent letters to and from

friends described in the manuscript, long accounts of the numerous Quaker meetings Darby attended and also many descriptions of her religious experiences. A few family details were also excluded: Darby's breast-feeding difficulties, entries on her children's illnesses and education, and notes on them going to meet their mother as she returned from her religious meetings.

*Dexter

The editor omitted about 75% of the manuscript: *Dexter's reason for keeping a diary, frequent preaching details, his regret at not writing in the diary daily, many accounts of his religious struggles and of the religious lectures and conferences he attended, and a list of what *Dexter considered to be his faults. Very few family entries were excluded: the entry referring to *Dexter's distress at the death of his daughter and son - "a bitter cup" - and his view of children as gifts from God.

Skinner:

The manuscript of Skinner's diary runs to 98 long volumes, which were condensed into one volume for publication. The early years of the journal are largely omitted; they reveal Skinner's affection for his children and his enjoyment of their company. Most of the later volumes are taken up with Skinner's growing disillusionment with life and his discord with his parishioners and his children. A representative sample of this is included in the text.

For this sample almost half of the editors (eight) omitted more than 50% of the manuscript from the published text. This seems a great deal; but, as has been shown in the results, this would not appear to have significantly affected the entries on family life, although there are more references to children in the manuscripts. (The published diary of Sarah Fox contained no references to children; but, after examining the manuscript, I discovered she had no children.) It would appear to be mainly incidental details which were excluded from the published texts: descriptions of places and houses visited, financial arrangements, religious meetings and repetitive entries. The editors did try to provide a representative selection and the omissions, even if on a large scale, do not detract from the overall impression provided by the published text. The omissions would not alter any conclusions; but rather provide additional evidence to reinforce them. It is of interest that MacFarlane (1970), in his study of Josselin's diary, thought he was using a complete transcript of the diary. However, he later discovered that this transcript was incomplete; but on reading the full version, he found that the omissions did not affect his conclusions regarding Josselin's family life. Instead, these entries contained more details to support his argument.

3.2.3 Ill-treatment did not occur

The function of parental care and the effects of neglect or ill-treatment on children are discussed in Appendix A. From this evidence, it seems unlikely that severe abuse would occur on a large scale. Thus it seems reasonable to accept that details of severe physical punishment did not appear in the diaries because it did not occur. Child abuse occurs in all socio-economic groups, although there is a tendency for it to be more common at the lower

end of the scale. As all the diarists are literate, then, particularly for the earlier centuries when literacy was the mark of a higher education, perhaps it would not be expected that they would ill-treat their children to any great extent.

2.3

Generalisation

Most of the diarists belong to the middle classes; there are very few lower class diaries or autobiographies. The diaries do leave open the possibility that certain segments of society did abuse children. This is not disputed here. Nevertheless the diarists would seem to represent a large class of people who did not ill-treat their children and who have been largely ignored in accounts of the history of childhood.

The majority of diarists were not exceptional, but ordinary people living out their lives in anonymity. Not all of them were happy - to name a few: Boswell and Trant became exceedingly depressed; Freke and her husband quarrelled continuously; Skinner was in constant discord with his older children and his parishioners; Weston was beaten by her husband and not allowed to see her child and Thrale was rejected by her daughters and society after her second marriage. Nor did they depict idealised children: some diarists admitted they found the care of their children a burden at times and the majority were aware of the faults and limitations of their children. They did not present a picture of a perfect world. A few diarists recalled ill-treatment during their own childhood; for example, Cooper from servants, Forman from his mother and siblings; Grant and Hare from their parents; and Stedman from his uncle. Many more related the severe discipline they experienced at school. Freke and Russell both noted the neglect of their child by the nurse and, in both cases, the nurse was

changed. Twenty-six of the diarists (6%) recorded the ill-treatment of children occurring in society, such as baby-farms, infanticide and neglect. Newcome took in his own grandchild because he could not tolerate his son's "shameful abuse" of the child.

The diaries do reflect social changes: the 18th century diaries recorded the introduction of inoculation for smallpox with the parents debating whether or not to take the risk and have their child inoculated. Nineteenth century diaries are quite different from previous ones in that they do depict a much wider, more technological world. For example, the diarists noted train journeys, new forms of entertainment such as exhibitions and museums and new kinds of toys and books. If the diaries were sensitive to these changes, then it is at least possible that they would also be sensitive to drastic changes in the concept of childhood, if these did occur.

One way of assessing the possibility of generalising from the diaries would be to check how representative 20th century diaries are of present day practices as depicted in such studies as Newson and Newson (1965, 1968, 1976).

Diaries do not provide all the necessary evidence for a reconstruction of child life in the past. There is, for example, a lack of infant data. However, they do have a number of advantages when used as a prime source of evidence. They present a more personal, intimate picture providing glimpses into actual households. They reveal children in their context - as part of a society with adults - rather than isolated from it. They go some of the way to revealing the actualities of childhood rather than the attitudes to it. The child diarists present the child's point of view as a child rather than an adult looking back. Diaries are the closest we have available to direct observation of parent-child

interaction and so are a very valuable source of evidence.

It is not possible to prove conclusively that diaries only contain the exact truth; but, on the face of all the evidence, it seems more reasonable to accept what they say rather than reject it. The diaries do not prove that child-rearing was more kind or more cruel in the past; but what they do suggest is that there was a large section of the population whose methods of child-rearing appear to be no harsher than today. It is this section which has been omitted from most previous works on the history of childhood because most authors would appear to have been more concerned with finding evidence to support the thesis that children were not valued in the past, rather than examining the prevalence of different attitudes at various times.

3.0

AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

A total of 120 autobiographies were read (27 American and 93 British). Of these, only 27 were solely autobiographies; the others were written as an introduction to a diary. Autobiographies suffer from the same problems as diaries and also possess some additional ones. They are written in retrospect and generally for publication. Therefore they are likely to be more selective than the diaries in what they contain. They depend on how the writer views the actual events from hindsight, and he may attempt to show himself in a better light. They are also dependent on what the author himself remembers and thus, apart from the fact that memory is notoriously selective, are unlikely to contain information on infancy. What is of interest is to see how much similarity there is in the accounts of childhood given by autobiographies, child diaries and parental diaries.

4.0

NEWSPAPER REPORTS

... until late in the nineteenth century both Parliament and the national press were largely unconcerned with the way in which parents treated their children, regarding even the most barbarous cruelty as beyond comment and beyond public intervention since children were not regarded as citizens in their own right.

(Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969, p.611).

In discussing this subject, Pinchbeck and Hewitt refer to the case of one woman who put out the eyes of a child in her care in order that he (child) might then earn money by begging. They claim that it was only because the woman was employed by the parish to look after children that her cruelty was prosecuted and that, if the woman had been the child's mother, no-one would have bothered to intervene because it was accepted that parents could treat their offspring as they pleased. Thus they infer from one particular case the attitude of the whole of 18th and 19th century society to child abuse.

Chapter Three has dealt with the appearance of child protection legislation, showing that it appeared as part of a general response by the state to a national crisis. The lack of such legislation until the 19th century does not necessarily mean that people condoned child abuse. In order to test Pinchbeck and Hewitt's claim that cases of child cruelty were not reported, The Times newspaper from 1785 to 1860 was read (excluding the years 1788 to 1790 for which there were no indices).

The newspaper reports of child abuse cases were found by searching the Criminal Court and Police sections of the indices to The Times newspaper and then looking in the appropriate newspaper. In all, 385 cases of child cruelty, neglect and sexual abuse were found (19 cases were of incest) for the period 1785-1860.ⁱⁱ Of

ii. 1785 was the earliest date for which an index to the newspaper was available.

these cases 7% were found not guilty and 24% were to be sent to a higher court for trial. The cases which resulted in a not guilty verdict were not, as might have been expected, concentrated in the earlier part of the period covered but occurred from 1806 to 1860, typically one case every few years. The police and magistrate courts, up till 1862, could only impose a maximum penalty of £5 or two months in the House of Correction and therefore sent many cases of cruelty to the central courts where a higher penalty could be imposed. A few cases (11%) involved apprentices; the earliest reported case of cruelty to a child by a parent appeared in 1787.

The manner in which the cases were reported by the newspaper provides an indication of the attitudes of the time to cruelty to children. The fact that the majority of cases were also found guilty meant that the law and society condemned child abuse long before the specific prevention of cruelty to children act appeared in 1889. Parents who abused their offspring were generally considered "unnatural" and the cruelty as "horrific" or "barbaric". The following 14 cases have been selected as representative examples of the attitudes to child abuse during the period studied.

In December 1787 The Times reported a case of cruelty to a child by his guardian. The report occupied a complete page of the newspaper and the judge and court regarded the case as "very rare" with reference to the extent of the cruelty. The 3-year-old child was so ill-treated and neglected that he was physically deformed by the abuse and his appearance in court "drew tears from almost everybody". The case was described as one "of the most savage transactions" heard by the court (11.12.1787, p.3).

In 1809 a "case of the most unparalleled barbarity" was described. William Marlborough and his wife were charged with starving their 6-year-old daughter "together with a series of other

atrocious cruelties, hardly to be equalled". The girl slept in an underground cellar on a heap of rubbish and was given very little food; "but this however horrible to relate, was not the worst of her sufferings" as she was also beaten with a leather thong at the end of which were pieces of iron wire. Her parents said they had punished her for lying but "The Magistrate, however ... expressed a becoming indignation at their brutal conduct" (10.10.1801, p.3c).

The next year a mother was charged with "barbarously beating and ill-treating her own child" - a daughter aged 4. When the mother was taken out of the office after her trial, "it was with the greatest difficulty she could be protected from the fury of the women outside" (28.5.1810, p.3e).

Elizabeth Bruce was charged with "cruelly starving, unmercifully beating and otherwise most inhumanly treating her own son". The trial was said to have "exhibited a picture truly shocking to every feeling of humanity" (28.10.1812, p.3e).

A case of "shocking inhumanity" was reported in 1817. Benjamin Turner was charged with "inhumanly beating, depriving of food, and otherwise ill-treating three of his children". The children were beaten till the blood flowed and salt was then rubbed into the wounds. In addition, he held his two daughters under water. The magistrate "expatiated with indignation upon the conduct of the defendant" (17.2.1817, p.3e).

Mr. and Mrs. Cayzer were charged with cruelty to their children - "by stifling the calls of humanity, they made themselves intoxicated, and then commenced a scene of barbarous cruelty, the recital of which shocked every person in the office, and in many instances was such that we cannot lay before our readers". The magistrates "strongly reprobated such inhuman cruelty" and, in taking the defendants to prison, the officers had great difficulty in

protecting them "from the fury of an immense crowd that had assembled" (7.4.1824, p.4c).

Patrick Sheen beat his 8-year-old son till blood flowed because the child would not stop crying and then threw him on the fire so that the child's back was burnt by the hot grate. Sheen said the child was perverse and obstinate "adding, that he thought every father had a right to do as he pleased with his own child, and that he did not see what right other people had to interfere". The magistrate replied that: "the law must teach the defendant that this doctrine of his was very erroneous" (17.11.1824, p.3c).

James McDougal and his wife were charged with neglecting and beating their three children. The chairman said:

that they had been convicted of a most atrocious offence, and for the sake of human nature he trusted there would never be such another instance of diabolical cruelty exercised towards an unoffending and helpless child unable to protect itself How they could reconcile such inhuman conduct to their consciences, he was at a loss to conceive, without they were entirely callous to every feeling of humanity
(24.6.1829, p.4a).

N. Weston bound his 11-year-old daughter to a bed post and struck her with a belt and buckle until her skin was cut. The magistrate thought the child's back:

was the most shocking sight he ever beheld;
it was the duty of parents to correct disobedient children, but not to inflict such barbarous punishment

and regarded Weston as unfit to look after the child (26.5.1834, p.6f).

In 1837 the "unnatural conduct of a mother" was described - she had exposed her 2-month-old twins. The chairman told her:

Your conduct has been the most unnatural, and of the most cruel character, I ever remember to

have become acquainted with. The Court would be wanting in the common feelings of humanity did they not mark their opinion of your behaviour by a severe punishment (1.4.1837, p.6e).

M. Noed beat his 14-year-old son with a stick which had six cords attached to the end. The magistrate stated: "I never recollect in all my experience a case of greater cruelty" (25.5.1844, p.8e).

A 2-year-old girl was beaten with a knotted whip by her parents so that she was severely marked and bruised. Her parents believed her to be a stubborn child who needed a great deal of punishment. On the other hand, the judge believed:

Those persons surely could not have expected to improve a poor little child's disposition by such a course of brutal treatment as they appeared to have practised on her (30.3.1848, p.7a).

E. Butterfield inflicted four cuts on the buttocks of her 7-year-old daughter after the latter had refused to go to school. The magistrate:

said the offence was one of such atrocious and unusual description that it was difficult to conceive how it could have entered into the heart of a mother to commit it (23.7.1850, p.8b).

E. and P. Hennessey neglected their child aged $2\frac{1}{2}$ to the extent that he would be crippled for life, if he survived. The judge passed the maximum sentences (two years in prison for the mother and one for the father) "but he felt that the sentence he was about passing upon the woman might be thought inadequate to the heinousness of the offence" (21.9.1853, p.9c).

Newspaper reports would seem to be a fairly reliable source of evidence. The reports are accounts of actual behaviour and the way in which the event is reported gives an indication of how the act

is regarded by society. Thus, if newspapers are not entirely "neutral" observers, they surely reflect the attitudes of the period.

The reports given here, apart from totally disproving Pinchbeck and Hewitt's (1969) claim, reveal the sense of outrage evoked by cruelty to children. The magistrates, witnesses and general public (for the last, see especially the reports of 1810 and 1824) were all horrified that parents could inflict such cruelty on their offspring, seeming to find it completely inexplicable that the parents could do so. Such parents were regarded as "inhuman", aberrations from the norm rather than as typical. This contradicts the arguments of many historians that adults were indifferent to children and that cruelty to children was practised on a large scale - the case in 1824 especially reveals that parents could not treat their children exactly as they pleased, even when there was no specific law to protect children.

REFERENCES

- Carr, Edward (1961): What is History? Macmillan & Co. Ltd., London.
- MacFarlane, Alan (1970): The Family Life of Ralph Josselin: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, William (1945): American Diaries; University of California Press, Berkeley & Los Angeles.
- Matthews, William (1950): British Diaries; Cambridge University Press, London.
- Matthews, William (1974): American Diaries in Manuscript; University of Georgia Press.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1965): Patterns of Infant Care in an Urban Community; Penguin Books, Middlesex.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1968): Four Years Old in an Urban Community; Penguin Books, Middlesex.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1976): Seven Years Old in the Home Environment; George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.
- Pinchbeck, I. and Hewitt, M. (1969): Children in English Society; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Spalding, P.A. (1949): Self-Harvest. A Study of Diaries and the Diarist; Independent Press Ltd., London.

CHAPTER FIVE

ATTITUDES TO CHILDREN

INTRODUCTION

Four sources of evidence have been used in this study, from the 16th to the 19th century inclusive. These sources are: published adult diaries, child diaries and autobiographies and unpublished manuscripts. The child diaries include texts written by older offspring still under parental authority. The autobiographies either describe the childhood of the writer (the majority) or recall his later life as a parent. A number of texts contain more than one type of source, for example, an autobiography and a diary. Where this occurs, the two sources are considered separately (see Appendix B for details of the sources contained in the texts). Both American and British texts were studied, although only those American manuscripts used in the comparison study, described in Chapter Four, have been read. The texts were divided into centuries according to the date of birth of the writer. It was decided to do this rather than to categorise them according to the dates of the text or the date of the specific entry because it was thought that giving the lifespan of the writer would place him in his context better.ⁱ (Appendix B contains information on the dates of the texts.) Table 9 shows the sample size of each source for each nationality and century.

The largest sample size is available for the 18th century and this is also the period in which the most detailed, introspective and analytical diaries are found. There are relatively few 16th century texts, and unfortunately the diary entries in these texts are fairly brief and factual. In addition, the unpublished manuscripts, apart from that of Steuart, contained little useful evidence.

i. For convenience, the diary of Machyn (born 1498) was considered with the 16th century sources and the diaries of Colt (born 1916) and Waugh (born 1903) were considered with the 19th century data.

Table 9: Division of Sample Size by Nationality, Century and Source

Nationality	Century	Text				Total
		Adult Diary	Child Diary	Autobiography	Manuscript	
American	16th	1	0	1	-	2
	17th	13	2	0	-	15
	18th	60	25	13	-	98
	19th	31	20	14	-	65
Total		105	47	28	-	180
British	16th	15	2	5	0	22
	17th	39	5	14	7 ¹	65
	18th	83	14	43	7	147
	19th	57	31	31	4 ²	123
Total		194	52	93	18	357
ALL		299	99	121	18	537

Notes:

1. Sample includes six diaries and one autobiography.
2. Sample includes three child diaries and one adult diary.

Within each topic discussed, the American data is quoted first - all American texts are asterisked. Where the sample size is small, for instance, with the 16th century texts and the unpublished manuscripts, all the information is discussed. With a larger sample size, a representative selection of quotations spanning the century is given whenever possible. Diarists who made the same point but are not quoted from are listed in the text, or if the list contains more than 10 writers, are contained in Appendix C. The primary objective in this study is to bring together a body of material to facilitate detailed discussion of the history of childhood (by expanding knowledge). As yet only the first steps in interpretation are possible.

1.1 A Historical Outline

In order to provide some kind of social context for the data, a brief outline of the main events and changes of the period covered is given.

1.1.1 Britain

During the 16th century the system of demesne farming ("feudalism") collapsed, leading to a great deal of poverty. The age was characterised by profound emotional instability - life was so uncertain (Hill, 1967). When this instability was exacerbated by the beginnings of a market economy (which made life even more uncertain), it created a deep spiritual crisis and led to the rise of the dissident sects (for example, Puritans, Anabaptists, Brownists). The Protestant Reformation was established in England by Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy 1534 which removed England from papal control.

The Reformation had enormous social consequences. At a time when there was a lack of a daily press and society was still largely illiterate, the pulpit was almost the sole source of ideas on economics and politics. The king became, in theory, as well as in practice, head of church and state and the early Protestant reformers were committed to the support of the monarchy. The spread of Protestantism depended on the new craft of printing - the increased availability of the Bible allowed individual study of the scriptures (Hill, 1967).

The 17th century continued to be characterised by religious fervour - eventually an act of 1689 gave freedom of worship to Protestant dissenters. In addition, from the 1640s onwards, England was embroiled in civil war. By 1640 even the ruling classes were dissatisfied with the way Charles I ran the country. The revolution in 1640 resulted in the temporary abolition of the monarchy and the creation of a Protectorate under Cromwell. These revolutionary decades shook the foundations of English society as they revealed that no institution, not even the crown, was permanent. Though the monarchy was restored in 1660, it never regained its former power. Finally, the 17th century was also marked by the growth of science, notably the theories of Newton (Hill, 1967).

During the 18th century England advanced to a position of unrivalled political and economic supremacy in Europe (Owen, 1974). Apart from the rise of Methodism from 1729, there was little religious fervour compared with the previous century. The age was remarkable for its passion for literary expression - literary output of all kinds increased dramatically. During the second half of the 18th century, Britain was transformed into an urban, industrial society by the Industrial Revolution. (The effects of this have been discussed in Chapter Three.) This,

accompanied by the French Revolution in 1789, followed by the wars with Napoleon, led to a disturbed society, bewildered by the rapid social changes (Owen, 1974). The change to an industrial society had occurred when the nation was almost continuously pre-occupied with the wars with France and therefore had little time or inclination for solving social problems at home. After the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, the government could turn to home affairs, leading to the production of reform legislation of all kinds (Beales, 1969). This legislation was the foundation for the Welfare State which fully came into existence in the mid-20th century. The 19th century also saw a renewal of religious enthusiasm as a response to drastic social changes and general social unease.

1.1.2 America

The relevant social history for this study is that of New England. The majority of the American writers came from New England and its surrounding states as shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Percentage Division of American Texts by Place of Residence (where known)

Century	Place of Residence					
	New England	Pennsylvania	New York	Virginia	New Jersey	Other
n=1 16th	100	0	0	0	0	0
n=15 17th	93	0	0	7	0	0
n=87 18th	58	13	9	8	6	3 ¹
n=51 19th	39	4	10	2	2	37 ²
n=154 ALL	55	9	8	5	4	14

Notes:

1. 1 writer came from Illinois, 1 from Missouri, 1 from North Carolina.
2. 6 writers came from Illinois, 3 from Ohio, 2 from Wisconsin, 1 from Kentucky, 1 from Missouri, 1 from South Carolina, 1 from Tennessee, 1 from Texas, 1 from Toronto, 1 from Washington.

During the early part of the 17th century, a section of English Protestants, mainly the Puritans, became dissatisfied with the regulation of the church in England. In 1629, when Charles I opted to rule without a parliament, it was realised that the Reformation had little hope of flourishing in England. Thus plans for emigration were made. These Puritans set out for America in order to build a "Citty upon a Hill", a city which would be a shining example of religious purity to the rest of Europe (Axtell, 1974). The Puritans emigrated for the benefit of their children's souls; they wished to leave God in the midst of the rising generation and thus they were extremely concerned with the training and education of their young. In the 17th century the New England colony:

was a closed corporate community ordered and bound by love; justice; and mercy. Its chief bulwarks against worldliness and Satan were the family and the church, while the community as a whole was charged with preserving social harmony and moral consensus.

(Axtell, 1974, p.285)

However, the Puritan ideals proved difficult to live up to. The Puritans had to come to terms with such things as a diversifying market economy from 1660 on and eventually they rebelled against the trading regulations imposed by their mother country, Britain, in 1775. The American Declaration of Independence in 1776 was the driving force which finally resulted in the United States of America - that is, a nation rather than a loose conglomeration of colonies tied to Britain.

The importance of the church and family declined during the 18th century. Axtell (1974) estimates that only about 25% of New Englanders were members of the church by the mid-18th century. In addition, the rise of schools eroded the supremacy of the family in the education of the young.

Britain did continue to have a great deal of influence over the form of American development until the American Civil War of 1861-65.

2.0 THE CONCEPT OF CHILDHOOD

Ariès (1962) argues that there was no concept of childhood until the 17th century. He defines a concept of childhood as:

an awareness of the particular nature of childhood, that particular nature which distinguishes the child from the adult (125).

However, the very vagueness of Ariès' definition negates his whole argument: it would be impossible not to realise that a child was different from an adult, children are all too obviously dependent on adult care and protection. If there is an awareness of the immaturity of the child in either the physical - (for example, an awareness of such developmental stages as teething and speech) - or mental - (for example, the need to socialise a child by discipline and education) - sphere, then whoever has that awareness possesses a concept of childhood, no matter how basic or limited. The point at issue is not whether there was a concept of childhood in the past; but whether this concept has become more elaborated or changed through the centuries.

Related to the above theme is the problem of socialisation - the process by which an egocentric individual is moulded into a participating member of adult society. How far, if at all, were past parents concerned with this need and what methods of socialisation did they employ are questions that have yet to be adequately answered. One way of studying the problem would be to discover not only how parents viewed their children; but also how they

viewed the parental role. In addition, the parent-child interaction should be investigated: for example, by asking how far the parents accommodated the demands of their offspring and if their methods of socialisation differed with respect to the age of the child.

2.1 How Parents Regarded Their Children

The 16th century

Diaries. Children were seen as developing organisms: Clifford, Dee and Wallington referred to such things as weaning, teething and early utterances. Children also played: Dee, *Jefferay and Wallington included entries on play in their diaries. It was realised that children needed some form of guidance: Dee, Hope, *Jefferay and Powell wrote of discipline. Boyle, Dee, Hope, Mildmay, Oglander, Powell, Rogers and Winthrop advised their offspring; Mildmay solved his son's problems at school and Boyle arranged the marriages of his offspring. Children were also creatures who had to be protected and looked after: Clifford, Dee, Hope, *Jefferay, Mildmay, Powell and Wallington nursed their children through illness. Clifford noted leaving baby-sitters for her daughter aged 3 when she left on a visit; Wallington searched for his young daughter when she failed to return from play and Oglander sent his children to the mainland when trouble broke out on the island. In addition, children had to be provided for: Boyle, Hope, *Jefferay, Powell and Winthrop recorded giving their offspring financial aids towards independence.

There was some ambivalence in 16th century parental attitudes to children. Children brought joy, company, irritation and anxiety. The parents were pleased at the birth of their children and later enjoyed their company (for example, Clifford and Wallington enjoyed

speaking with their young children, Dee was amused by his offspring's play and *Jefferay regarded his children as "a comfort"). On the other hand, parents could be annoyed with their offspring as in the diaries of Clifford, Hope, Mildmay, Powell and Winthrop. Children also brought anxiety, particularly with reference to illness. In addition, Mildmay was worried about his second son's conduct at school and Wallington was concerned when his daughter was missing.

Autobiographies. G. Mildmay appreciated the susceptibility of the young to external influences:

It is certain that there is foundation and ground of many great and ensueing evils when the nobilitie and great personages have no regard nor forecast what governors they sett over theyr children, nor what servants they appoynt to attend upon them.

(G. Mildmay, 1552-1620, p.127).

Discussion

These sources reveal that children were seen as:

1. Organisms that pass through developmental periods.
2. Organisms that indulge in play.
3. Organisms that need care and protection.
4. Organisms that need guidance, for example by education and discipline.
5. Organisms that have to be financially provided for.

These facets of a concept of childhood reappear in each century and therefore will not be considered in any great detail for the 17th to 19th centuries. Instead, the change in any type of attitude will be highlighted.

From the 16th century texts it is quite clear that these writers possessed a concept of childhood - they were aware not only that

children were different from adults, but also appreciated the ways in which children were different. They realised that children were physically and mentally immature and so dependent on adult protection and guidance. It is more difficult to discover if children were seen as being at the bottom of the social scale, as has been argued by various historians (see for example, Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969, Shorter, 1976 and Tucker, 1976). It is of significance that these parents were prepared to spend money on their offspring in order to educate them, purchase apprenticeships and set them up in independent households. In addition, the wish of G. Mildmay that parents should choose carefully any servants who were to look after their children implies that she considered children were something to be valued. Clifford also noted that on her daughter's fifth birthday "my Lord caused her health to be drank throughout the house" (105), which contradicts the idea of parental indifference. The diarists were obviously attached to their offspring, revealing a great deal of anxiety when their children were ill and also a desire to help their children when necessary.

There would not appear to have been a formal parent-child relationship: Clifford liked her young daughter to sleep with her, *Jefferay gave long detailed accounts of the natural history excursions which both he and his children enjoyed, and Winthrop's letters to his son at college were full of friendly, affectionate advice. In addition, the fact that some offspring continually opposed their parents' wishes suggests that these children at least were not in awe of their parents (see Chapter Eight).

The 17th century

Diaries. The American diarists of this period also referred to the developmental stages their children passed through and also to their children playing (see *Byrd, *Green, C. *Mather and

*Sewall). In addition, apart from being concerned with the discipline and education of their offspring, the more articulate diarists provide information on their expectations of their children at a given age. *Byrd (1674-1744) was delighted when he took his daughter, aged about 4, to a wedding where she "behaved herself very prettily" (1941, p.495).ⁱⁱ C. *Mather wrote that his 11-year-old son, Increase, was "now of Age enough to know the Meaning of Consideration" (vol. 8, p.49). At the age of 13, Increase was considered by *Mather old enough to

hear from me such Documents of Piety, and of Discretion, as I shall endeavour to suit him (vol. 8, p.151).

When another son, Samuel, reached the age of 11, *Mather was considering "What shall I now enrich his Mind withal?" (vol. 8, p.435). A few months later, *Mather decided to:

Entertain Sammy betimes, with the first rudiments of Geography and Astronomy, as well as History; and so raise his Mind above the Sillier Diversions of Childhood.

(C. *Mather, 1663-1728, vol. 8, p.473).

C. *Mather also believed that his children possessed an inherently sinful nature.

Pride was another emotion roused in parents by their offspring. *Byrd wrote of his second daughter that "her accomplishments, if a Father can be a judge [were] as great as any Damsel in this part of the World" (1942, p.5). *Sewall (1652-1730) was similarly proud of one of his sons, "a worthy minister" (vol. 6, p.418).

There was not a formal parent-child relationship in these American diaries: the company of their children was enjoyed by

ii. In this and all other cases, where parts of the text have been published at different times, the relevant publication date is given.

the parents; *Green (1675-1715), for example, often "went a fishing" with his three sons (95) and *Knight (1666-1727) described her daughter waiting "with open arms" to greet her mother after she had been away (12). Nevertheless, children were not all pleasure. The 17th century diarists also described the extreme anxiety experienced by a parent when a child was ill. *Byrd and C. *Mather were in conflict with at least one of their adolescent children and *Sewall became embroiled in the problems of his eldest son.

Turning to the British diarists, Blundell, Byrom, Evelyn, Grange, Josselin, Newcome and Turner revealed an awareness of the developing abilities of a child. For example, Evelyn (1620-1706) told a son of almost 5 years that a book would be too difficult for him to understand. This is particularly interesting as this child had reached a very high level of educational attainment by the age of 5 and has been put forward as an example of the preciousness which 17th century parents forced on their children (see for example, Illick, 1976). However, Evelyn obviously considered his son an exception to the normal child: he referred to his son's "strange passion" for Greek, his "strange . . . apt and ingenious application for fables", his "astonishing knowledge of the scriptures" and concluded that his son's achievements far exceeded "his age and experience . . . such a child I never saw" (96). That Evelyn considered some books too difficult for his son suggests that Evelyn was not forcing his son beyond his capabilities. Grange (1679-1754) thought his 7-year-old son "had a wantonness, as such of his age use to have" (72), and Newcome decided to read to his children from scriptural authorities as "they are more capable now" (43).

As with the American diarists, no formal parent-child relationship was revealed. These parents were very much involved with their children: enjoying the latter's company, deciding on their

education and solving their problems. Josselin (1616-83) described his children as "comforts" and as "shoots" (12, 123) growing up and A. Brodie (1617-80) also referred to his "sweet" children as "earthly comforts" (209). "Comfort", in fact, appears to have been the standard way to describe a child by these diarists; it being the term most commonly appearing in the diaries. The diarists also tended to be proud of their children. Morris (1659-1729), for example, wished his daughter to reveal her prowess in French when he had guests and Martindale (1623-86) described his son of not quite 2, beating back a calf that used to run at children: "I doe not think that one child of 100 of his age durst doe so much" (154). Some parents at least regarded their children as hopes for the future (A. Brodie, Byrom, Josselin, Martindale, Newcome and Slingsby). Slingsby, for example, regarded his sons as:

those precious pledges wherein I had
treasured all my inferior hopes, being
next in care to the eternity of my soul.
(Slingsby, 1601-58, p.200).

Parents were ambivalent, at times, with regard to their children:

I am not without concern about the health and
behaviour of the children whose happiness so
much touches me, and whose time of life is
subject to such dangers as one can never guard
too much against.
(Byrom, 1692-1763, vol. 40, p.240).

Newcome was concerned that he would have rebellious offspring:

I consider the sad things that befall parents
about children. May not one beg of God, that
if it be his will, he will save us from such
afflictions, and if he sees it good.
1. That my children may be kept in health, or
from sad and grievous distempers.

2. However not to die immaturely, if God see it good, esp. not untimely deaths.
3. That they may not die while they live; nor be a cross and exercise to us by rebellious untowardliness, as Joseph Burnett is, and my cousin Rathbard's daughter.

(Newcome, 1627-95, p.105).

Newcome did not achieve his last wish - he was continually upset at the behaviour of one of his sons (from his diary he appears to have been preoccupied with the problem of rebellious children). Newdigate (1644-1710) managed to be "pleasant with the Children", although he was "very weary" (214). Many of these diarists experienced discord from their offspring (see Chapter Eight).

Two British diarists referred to the sinful nature they believed a child possessed. Heywood wrote of his children:

I am apt to over love them, but their inward deformity by the fal checks my too much dealing on their due proportion and desirable beauty.

(Heywood, 1630-1702, vol. 1, p.146).

Housman (1680-1735) tried to convince her 8-year-old daughter "of her Sin and Misery, by Nature and Practice"; but when the child became upset, Housman softened her approach (81).

Manuscripts. Of the two manuscripts which contain any evidence on how children were regarded, Pledger (1665 - ?) reported that he was going to "love" and "delight" in his daughter only as far as this was compatible with her being "proof" of the glory of God and Rule referred to the disappointment he experienced with his children:

The greatest outward affliction this year that has befallen me, is the disappointment I have met with [on] account of my children.

(Rule, 1695-?, p.37).

Autobiographies. Pringle (1625-67) was aware of the immaturity of a child, leaving a letter of advice to his youngest child as "I knew not if I shall live till he comes to understanding" (24). Rich, although she wanted some children, did not want too many children:

When I was first married, and had my two children so fast, I feared much having so many, and was troubled when I found myself to be with child so soon.

She feared that too many children would ruin her figure and her husband thought they had insufficient income to support a large family:

and my husband too was, in some measure, guilty of the same fault; for though he was at as great a rate found of his children he had, as any father could be, yet when he had had two he would often say he feared he should have so many as would undo a younger brother.

(Rich, 1624-78, pp.32-33).

Discussion

Both the American and British texts of this century would appear to reveal more appreciation of the capabilities of a child and also attempt to ensure that the education and advice which they gave to their children were suited to the level of understanding the child had achieved. The texts also revealed the amount of pride a parent took in his offspring and the concern he showed to them - the children were indeed hopes for the future. However, because these parents were involved with their children, the latter inevitably took up a great deal of their time. Thus the texts also contained evidence on parental ambivalence towards offspring - the writers appeared to be ambivalent towards their children because they were so concerned for them and/or had expectations for them which the

children did not live up to.

Three diarists referred to the child's sinful nature (7% of the 17th century diaries). These were all Puritans and it should be remembered that Puritans did not consider that it was only children who were sinful. To a Puritan all were sinful, adult and child. They were thus not exulting in adult superiority, but simply trying to help their offspring come to terms with what Puritans regarded as an unpleasant but inescapable fact of life. These diarists were not being cruel; Original Sin was an integral part of their doctrine, and therefore they saw it as their duty to make their offspring aware of it (Powell, 1917; Schücking, 1969). In addition, they sympathised with their children's distress and, as Heywood's diary reveals, did not manage to consider their children as sinful as their religion demanded.

The images of children which these 17th century texts provide do not correspond to those given by many historians. Hunt (1972) for example argues that children were not wanted or valued and were regarded as something to be controlled and not enjoyed. Stone (1977) suggests that the Puritans of the 17th century were so preoccupied with the concept of Original Sin that they were intent on breaking the will of the child. However, out of the texts studied here (at least 15 of which were written by Puritans), only 4% referred to the concept of Original Sin and none wished to break the will of their child.

The 18th century

Diaries. The American diarists saw children as bringing pleasure. *Alcott viewed his children as "objects of great delight", adding:

They are indeed the charm of my domestic life.
They keep alive and vivid the sentiment of

humanity, and are living manifestations of the theories of my intellect; for they are the models of our common nature from where these theories are in no small degree framed and delineated.

(*Alcott, 1799-1888, p.54).

*Silliman (1779-1864) described his son as giving "only delight" to his parents (276). There was a great deal of affectionate interaction between parents and their children. For example, *Bayard described returning home after seeing friends:

As they expected us the child was kept up and came running to the door with his Papa to meet us; never did my heart experience more lively sentiments of maternal affection and joy than in the moment I clasped him to my bosom - I could not speak; the dear fellow observing my emotions burst out a-crying, and, with his little arms round my neck, begged me not to cry, now I was with him.

(*Bayard, 1761-69, p.59).

*Stiles (1727-95) enjoyed debating with his offspring, appreciating one daughter's "ingenious and a new Thought" with regard to the scriptures (vol. 1, p.341). *Tucker (1775-1806) wrote of her daughter that "this little object grows every day nearer to my heart . . . her understanding is far beyond her years; her memory retentive, her sensibility exquisite" (315).

Apart from anxiety and discord, more evidence is given in these diaries on ambivalent attitudes experienced by parents towards their offspring. M. *Cutler (1742-1823) believed that boys should board with "sober families" when sent away to school rather than living in rooms by themselves as "their immature age is an insuperable objection to their having so much the direction of themselves" (255). *Carter, *Parkman and *Sewall referred to the expense of children and *Huntington and *Lowry mentioned the amount of time and care it took to look after children. *Huntington, for example, wrote:

The truth is, no one can govern a family of children well without much reflection, and what the world calls, trouble (135).

She also regretted her impatience with her offspring:

[my] unevenness of temper, which makes me impatient with the daily little faults of my children, such as carelessness, noisy and inattentive behaviour, &c.iii

(*Huntington, 1791-1823, p.326).

The majority of British diarists would also appear to have seen their offspring as "delights". For example, Jones wrote of his children:

May they ever rejoice with me when I rejoice, but never weep when I weep! May their cheerful spirits remain as long as possible unbroken May no impatience or fretfulness arising from my painful feelings ever check their sweet smiles or interfere with their innocent cheerfulness. Never let me grudge them all the happiness they can enjoy!

(Jones, 1777-1821, p.102).

Macready felt unworthy of his children:

When I look at my children I think how little I have deserved the blessings that are heaped upon me - I wish to deserve them.

(Macready, 1793-1873, vol. 1, p.50).

Sandford took great delight in his daughter:

S -- amuses me and pleases me very much: she has a great deal of lively humour, and like her dear sister, is always cheerful.

(Sandford, 1766-1830, p.368).

Fry, Stanley and Young saw their children as future comforts.

For example, Stanley wrote:

Are not one's children given to one that they may see for us, do for us, and that we may live over again in them when we have done

iii. &c = etcetera.

living for ourselves.

(Stanley, 1792-1862, p.324).

Parents tended also to be proud of their children:

I have much to comfort me in the present aspect of my family. My eldest son, independent in fortune, united to an affectionate wife - and of good hopes in his profession; my second, with a good deal of talent ... Anne, an honest, downright, good Scots lass, in whom I would only wish to correct a spirit of satire.

(W. Scott, 1771-1832, p.39).

Stedman wrote the following account of his son:

My wonderful Johnny once drew a tooth to keep company to Mama, then physic'd and lived low for company to me, and at last inoculated for company to his brother George.

(Stedman, 1744-97, p.306).

Mascall, Rathbone, Thrale and Woods discussed how much time their offspring took up. Thrale, for example, remarked that her friends had reproved her for failing to note down all the sayings of Dr. Johnson, and added:

They say well but ever since that Time I have been the Mother of Children, and little do these wise Men know or feel, that the Crying of a young Child, or the Perverseness of an elder, or the Danger however trifling of any one - will soon drive out of a female Parent's head a Conversation concerning Wit, Science or Sentiment, however she may appear to be impressed with it at the moment: besides that to a Mere de Famille doing Something is more necessary & Suitable than even hearing something; and if one is to listen all Eveng and write all Morning what one has heard; where will be the Time for tutoring, caressing, or what is still more useful, for having one's children about one. I therefore charge all my neglect to my young one's Account, and feel myself at this moment very miserable that I have at last, after being married fourteen Years and bringing eleven Children, leisure to write a Thraliana forsooth.

(Thrale, 1741-1821, p.158).

A few diaries (those of Boswell, Jones and Skinner) contain evidence on the great expense of rearing children. Jones, for example, wrote:

According to her [wife] estimate we shall not be able to support our dear family of nine children, even if we adopt a plan of the utmost economy.

(Jones, 1755-1821, p.103).

Some diarists described the impatience they experienced with regard to their children: Macready (1793-1873), for example, "grew impatient and spoke with temper" when he tried to teach his daughter, although he continually regretted doing so (vol. 1, p.166). Watkin's diary contains similar evidence. Other diarists found their children too much to take at times. Fry wrote:

I feel, at times, deeply pressed down, on account of my beloved children. Their volatile minds try me (145).

and also:

with my dear little ones I often feel myself a poor mother

(Fry, 1780-1845, p.151).

Woods described her feelings with regard to her offspring:

I am now sitting with my dear little ones, watching them in their evening's repose. They attach us strongly to life; and without a guard over ourselves, we are in danger of centering too much of our happiness in them. They may, indeed, in various ways, be deemed uncertain blessings; their lives are very precarious, and their future conduct proving as one could wish, not less doubtful. I already often look forward with anxiety, and the most ardent wishes for their welfare, in a state of permanent felicity.

(Woods, 1748-1821, p.85).

Burney's diary firmly quashes any notion of a formal parent-child relationship. She wrote to her son at Cambridge, complaining that

he wrote in too artificial a manner:

I remember you once wrote me a letter so very fine from Cambridge, that, if it had not made me laugh, it would certainly have made me sick. Be natural, my dear boy, and you will be sure to please your mother without wasting your time.

(Burney, 1752-1840, p.144).

Turner's attitude would appear to be representative of nearly all the 18th century diarists. He wrote to his daughter on the birth of her first child:

You must expect, my dear child, now that you have a baby (and such an one too!!) to be visited with more anxiety than formerly, for bitters and sweets alternate with each other.

(Turner, 1793-1873, p.208).

Mascall (1702-94), a Methodist, did, however, see her children as sinful.

Manuscripts. Only one manuscript contains any information on this topic. Steuart noted the exasperation her children could arouse in her. She found them "troublesome when in the house" during bad weather (102), and also wrote:

The children sometimes put me out of humour when they are inattentive at their lessons - what a shocking example that is to them - & how ready they will be to follow it.

(Steuart, 1770? -1808, p.103).

Autobiographies. *Bailey (1746-1815) described her offspring as being "twined about my heart" (109). *Hicks referred to the worry which children could cause. His sons were all invalids and died before the age of 20. Nonetheless, *Hicks recalled:

But although thus helpless, the innocency of their lives, and the resigned cheerfulness of their dispositions to their allotments, made the labour and toil of taking care of them agreeable and pleasant And when I have observed

the great anxiety and affliction, which many parents have with undutiful children who are favoured with health, especially their sons, I could perceive very few whose troubles and exercises, on that account did not exceed ours.

(*Hicks, 1748-1830, p.14).

No other autobiography contains any relevant information.

Discussion

More abstract concepts of childhood are found in the 18th century texts, although only in a minority. The 18th has generally been regarded as the century in which more humane attitudes to children appeared and certainly the previous quotations do reveal a great deal of affection for (but also ambivalence towards) offspring. However, there is a problem with these 18th century cases: the writers are far more articulate and far more capable of analysing their feelings. In the introspective texts, every facet of life is subjected to detailed scrutiny, not just childhood. The 18th century writers described emotions and not just facts. Parents in the earlier centuries may not have shared the attitudes of the 18th century writers, or they may simply not have been able to express such feelings.

If the quotations from the 17th and 18th centuries are compared, then it is revealed that the 18th century texts do not refer to different aspects of childhood (apart from innocence) but discussed the same aspects in a far more eloquent manner. For example, both *Knight and *Bayard described their child greeting them with open arms. *Knight (1666 -1727) did so in one line whereas *Bayard (1769? -?) took a whole paragraph - see also the entries of Newcome (1627-95) and Woods (1748-1821), both of whom refer to the care of offspring. Children are, however, referred to as "innocent" for the first time (*Hicks, 1748-1830 and Jones, 1755-1821). It is possible that this, in an age not noted for its religious

fervour, was a reaction to the concept of children as depraved - only one diarist (Mascall, born 1702) in the large sample of this century referred to the doctrine of Original Sin. It is also possible that the emergence of the concept of innocence was due to the ideas of Locke (1699) and Rousseau (1763). Locke attacked the doctrine of Original Sin and Rousseau explicitly referred to children as innocent.^{iv}

The 19th century

Diaries. These diarists continued to derive pleasure from their children, as in the 18th century, particularly from their offspring's early reasoning abilities and their zest for life. *Hayes (1841-93), for example, tried to explain death to his 4-year-old son by stating that God took good people to heaven. He was amused when Birchie asked: "Do He pull them up with a rope?" (521). *Longfellow (1807-82) wrote of his offspring: "The interest with which they invest common things is quite marvellous" (176). The "innocence" of childhood is again noted. *Colt referred to:

Innocent and trusting childhood; sipping
enjoyment like bees, whenever it can be
found.

(*Colt, 1817-?, p.78).

and *Ward (1841-1931) referred to his baby son as "innocent" (186).

iv. As there is as yet no adequate survey of the child advice literature - only the main theorists are reviewed, notably Locke, Rousseau and works of a Calvinistic denomination and there is no discussion of other theorists of the same period. As the works of Locke and Rousseau were widely available and were re-published a number of times, it is likely that many people read them. As it seems that some of the texts studied do reflect the ideas of these two theorists, it has been decided, because of the lack of alternative knowledge, to concentrate on them. (There is a great need for a systematic analysis of child advice literature.) Of course, it is equally likely that the parents studied here were not affected by these theorists' views.

A few diarists expressed regret at their children reaching maturity. *Lawrence (1814-86) wrote: "What strikes me most is the quickness with which our children have come and gone" (255). *Prentiss described her attitudes towards her children:

I am inexpressibly happy in the mere sense of possession. I hate to have them grow up and to lose my pets, or exchange them for big boys and girls.

(*Prentiss, 1818-78, p.217)

*Burrough, *Lovell, *Prentiss and *Walker exhibited ambivalence towards their children. *Burrough (1837-1921) referred to the "joy" he experienced from having children; but also when comparing children to dogs wrote that the latter "make no demands upon you, as does a child; no care, no interruption, no intrusion" (90). *Prentiss, when her daughter was a few weeks old, wrote:

I find the care of her very wearing, and have cried ever so many times from fatigue & anxiety, but now I am getting a little better and she pays me for all I do.

(*Prentiss, 1818-78, p.102).

*Todd found the care of his young daughter very tiring. When she was aged 3½ months he wrote:

She cries more than any child that we ever saw. Sometimes there is not an hour in the night that we are not disturbed, and do not have to get up to still her We sometimes get quite discouraged, and almost worn out with her (209).

*Todd later noted that Mary, at the age of 16 months:

grows well, and learns to talk fast, and to us is interesting; but oh, what a child! She never wants to sleep or to rest. It seems as if we should never have a night's rest or ever be free from headache and fatigue.

(*Todd, 1800-73, p.213).

The 19th century British diarists also looked on their children with pleasure and affection. A few described different images of childhood. Alford and Cooper regarded their offspring as hopes for the future. For example, Cooper wrote of one son:

How often have I meditated on his future aid
and sympathy in all my thoughts and pursuits
for the good of mankind.

(Cooper, 1801-85, p.283).

Gurney wished to treat her children as adults:

I tried to treat them [children] as if they were
"grown up" people, and not as little children,
and it is certain they rose to the trust placed in
them, and their opinions became of value as
their powers of mind and body increased.

(Gurney, 1851-1932, p.35).

T. Powys, on the birth of his son, wrote:

it is a goodly boy, and shows in its countenance,
the old animal and the child man, also at times
thought that beginneth to awaken, and in that
thought is the life hidden.

(T. Powys, 1882-?, p.77).

Allen, Brabazon and Hanover described their regrets as their children grew up. Brabazon, for example, wrote that:

[This day] was a very sad one to me, as
Normy [aged 13] for the first time put on
manly attire, and it made me realise how
time had passed, and that I must very soon
bid him farewell. It is sad to feel his child-
hood is passing away.

(Brabazon, 1848? -1918, p.56).

Hanover (1819-1901) noted that her daughter of 3 was: "fast, alas!
growing out of the baby - is becoming long-legged and thin" (1964,
p.213).

What is particularly striking of the 19th century British diarists is the large increase in the references to feelings of ambivalence

experienced by parents with regard to their children. Information on this topic is contained in 18 diaries¹ (32%) - see Appendix C - (although it is perhaps not quite correct to regard Waugh as ambivalent towards his offspring - he definitely disliked them).

Hanover wrote:

I have no tendre for them [infants] till they have become a little human; an ugly baby is a very nasty object - and the prettiest is frightful when undressed - till about four months; in short as long as they have their big body and little limbs and that terrible froglike action (1964, p.91).

Later she wrote of her children:

Though I quite admit the comfort and blessing good and amiable children are - though they are also an awful plague and anxiety for which they show one so little gratitude very often!

(Hanover, 1819-1901, 1964, p.94).

Johnston noted (when her children were away for a while):

In the absence of all my precious party I have had time to contemplate them; and I have perceived that I have allowed myself to be too much encumbered with cares and labours about them, so that the flowers of daily delight, love and companionship, have been in a measure choked.

(Johnston, 1808-52, p.169).

The editor of Palgrave's journal included extracts from the journal of Palgrave's mother. She wrote of her young sons, approximately aged 10 and 8:

They are indeed well taught - but, alas! the idleness and follies of my own childhood are shown me in a glass by Frank and Giffy; and I remember my trying ways to you, my dear Papa, and vainly try to make the children avoid having the same cause for self-reproach, by urging them to greater application and zeal than their mother showed.

(Palgrave, 1824-97, p.15).

T. Powys, of his two young children, wrote:

The babes seem well, only there are many little disturbing influences that torment, distract and offend. I take it that Women have had almost too heavy a burden, the minding of babies being a heavier task than the bearing them. Though I believe one gains much by being thrown out of thought, set to baby games and made to brush and sweep and clean the little new life blossoms. Must they not be set in the way?

(T. Powys, 1882-?, p.164).

Waugh^v wrote of his offspring:

My children weary me. I can only see them as defective adults; feckless, destructive, frivolous, sensual, humourless.

(Waugh, 1903-66, p.640).

Manuscripts. Hewlett (1861-1923), the only adult writer for this period, described his children as "good, healthy-minded, happy and innocent souls . . . any parent must be proud of such a pair" (74).

Autobiographies. One autobiography (that of Lucas) contains evidence on the attitudes to children. He revealed great ambivalence with regard to his offspring and had doubts about his own competence as a parent:

I often feel most painfully my inability to act with judgement towards my children. Patience with firmness and command of temper are most important requisites. Our eldest boy is a trying, though, in some respects, a gratifying child (164).

-
- v. Waugh was a notorious "poser" and was writing in the knowledge that he would be read. Although it is debatable how much of what he wrote can be taken to represent his true feelings, with reference to his children, it does appear as if he put his theories into practice. Waugh had his own residence in London, rarely saw his children as infants and, as they all went to boarding school, did not see much of them as they grew up.

Eight years after this:

I feel at times much depressed from not being able to make myself so companionable as I ought to be with my children. I never had the art of winning children or getting free with them and I do not think I now can expect to do it. It is do difficult to put up with their extreme vivacity, and so difficult to remember what we once were at their age, and to make due allowance for it.... Christian humility and command of temper are great requisites and difficult attainments. When I look upon my seven boys I feel an inexpressible anxiety that they may turn out well, and feel how much depends upon my own example and character.
(Lucas, 1804-61, p.390).

Discussion

There are two distinctive features of the 19th century texts: the appearance of nostalgia for childhood and also an increase in the proportion of texts which describe ambivalence. These may be related to the massive social changes occurring in the 19th century. Perhaps the wish to retain childhood was linked to the wish to revert back to a predominantly rural society rather than live in an urban, technological one? It is possible too that the upheaval caused by the Industrial Revolution, the French Revolution and (for Britain) the wars with France - all of which deeply affected society - influenced parental attitudes to children. The writers studied were predominantly from the middle classes who were disturbed by what they believed to be the sinful state of society. In an attempt to counteract this, they perhaps may have been more concerned with the behaviour of their offspring. Three diarists, Allen, *Lovell and *Walker, believed their children had "depraved hearts". The British diarist was possibly affected by the Evangelical movement in Britain, but I can see no reason why this concept should reappear in American parents. It may simply

be due to their own religious beliefs - *Lovell was a Quaker and *Walker a Methodist missionary.

Overall, a concept of childhood was in evidence by the 16th century. There does seem to have been some changes in attitudes towards children. During the 18th and early 19th centuries some parents would appear to be more ostentatiously concerned with the state of childhood. Confronted with the minute dissection which many 18th century writers applied to their lives, it is all too easy to dismiss earlier writers as "indifferent", when clearly they were not. Though there is not the dramatic transformation in attitudes to children that has been argued (from parents regarding children as being at the bottom of the social scale to parents being pre-occupied with their offspring's every need), there is more discussion of abstract notions of childhood. This is seen first in the 17th century Puritans. This development is accompanied by more discussion on the undesirable aspects of childhood - the amount of time and trouble it took to rear children.

If the names by which children were referred to are studied, they would seem to correspond to the differences in attitudes. In the 16th century children were referred to as my son or daughter or, in the case of Clifford, "the child". When a more abstract term was employed, this was either "comfort", "benefit" or "blessing". In the next century children were still "comforts" and "blessings" and also "plants", "birds", "lambs", "flowers" and "pledges". In the 18th century children were "buds", "fruit", "joys", "delights", "pleasures", "stimulants", "cares" and "incumbrances" in addition to "flowers", "blessings", "lambs" and "plants". In the 19th century children were referred to as "lambs" and as "balls of love", "blossoms", "chicks", "gifts", "pets", "treasures", "froglike", "a plague" and "trying". The word "it" used to refer to a child appeared in at least one text in each century: that of Wallington in

the 16th; Josselin in the 17th; Oliver in the 18th and Powys, K. Russell and *Sterne in the 19th. Thus it does not seem that the use of "it" was evidence of the indifference to children before the 18th century, as has been argued by Shorter (1976). It appears that the term was used more with reference to young children - apart from Josselin's daughter who was aged 8 (and not always referred to as "it"), the other children were all under the age of 5. In addition, Clifford referred to her young daughter as "him". It seems that young children were regarded more as sexless than worthless.

The vital question is how far, if at all, these changes in attitudes lead to or reflect changes in behaviour towards children. Did, for example, 18th century parents treat their children any differently because they were concerned with analysing the nature of childhood? Would parents who regarded their child as depraved subject him to a system of rearing markedly different from parents who regarded their child as innocent? These questions will be considered in Chapters Six to Eight.

2.2 How Parents Regarded the Parental Role

Very few parents articulated any abstract concept of parental care (only 6% of the total sample). Thus, in order to gain some idea of how they regarded parenthood, their attitudes were inferred from the behaviour they recorded, although it is realised that a specific behaviour could be the result of different attitudes. Table 11 summarises what appears to have been considered the most important aspects of the parental role according to the evidence contained in the diaries. (The manuscripts and autobiographies were too small a sample to categorise; but what evidence they do contain will be discussed in relation to Table 11.)

Table 11: Percentage Division of Parental Functions as described in the Diaries

Function ¹	Century							
	16th		17th		18th		19th	
	A 1	B 15	A 13	B 39	A 60	B 83	A 31	B 57
Educative	100	54	31	65	46	45	42	59
Protective	100	54	62	53	41	59	48	49
Disciplinary	100	31	31	23	10	23	13	22
Provider	100	39	23	28	19	21	13	13
Advisory	0	69	8	35	9	18	10	5
Trainer	0	0	15	8	18	19	16	14
Helper	0	7	14	33	17	6	7	2

Note:

1. See overleaf

The protective function of parental care remains at a fairly constant level in the British diarists; but is much higher in the early American diarists. This is possibly due to the fact that these parents were living in a newly colonised land, fraught with health hazards and therefore tended to show more protection to their offspring. The American diarists would also appear to be less concerned with discipline from the 18th century on.^a This would appear to correspond to the conventional image of the American child as being less restrained and more precocious than the British child (Bremner, 1970-73; Smith, 1977; Thompson, 1974).^b It is also possible that, after the American Revolution when America

(a), (b). See page 211b.

Note to Table 11.

The functions were defined as follows:

Educative: The parents taught the child themselves or provided evidence to suggest they believed that education should be the subject of parental concern. For example, Heywood (1630-1702) wished to move house in order that his children would receive a better education and Smith (1673-1723) noted "the great Circumspection" with which he chose his son's tutor.

Protective: The parents nursed their children through illness or revealed an awareness of the need to protect a child from harm. For example, Clifford (1590-1676) noted arranging baby sitters for her daughter before going on a visit.

Disciplinary: The parents noted inflicting some type of punishment on a child.

Provider: The parents were concerned with the financial responsibility of children. For example, Jones (1755-1821) regretted signing a bond as "I am a husband, - I am a father! I have robbed my wife and children! I painfully feel that I ought not to have done it".

Advisory: The parents gave their child advice. For example, Evelyn (1620-1706) wrote: "I gave my sonn an Office, with instructions howe to govern his youth; I pray God give him the grace to make a right use of it".

Trainer: The parents explicitly stated that they were concerned with the socialisation of a child by training or moulding the child into shape. For example, J. Taylor (1743-1819) had "thought a deal on 'Train up a child in the way he should go'". *Huntington (1791-1823) believed that mothers "have to mould the character of the future man, giving it a shape which will make him either an instrument of good to the world, or a pest in the lap of society".

Helper: The parents gave the child whatever help he or she required. For example, by paying debts, furnishing a house, solving employment problems or by providing emotional support in times of crisis.

The above categories may not be mutually exclusive. Ideally a selection of diaries should have been read by another person in order to ascertain the reliability of the categories.

Footnotes to pages 211 and 212^{*}

- (a) There is a significant difference in the number of diaries recording discipline in the 16th and 17th centuries when compared with the 18th and 19th centuries, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 6.3$, $p < 0.02$.

When a similar comparison was made for the British sample, there was no significant difference between the samples, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.20$, $p \gg 0.05$.

- (b) There is no significant difference between the number of American and British diaries recording discipline for the 16th and 17th centuries, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.54$, $p \gg 0.05$. When a similar comparison was made for the 18th and 19th centuries, there was a significant difference between the samples with more British texts than American recording discipline, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 5.16$, $p < 0.05$.
- (c) There is a significant difference between the number of American diaries recording advice when compared with the British sample, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 8.22$, $p < 0.01$. There is also a significant difference between the number of British diaries recording advice in the 16th and 17th centuries when compared with the 18th and 19th centuries, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 22.88$, $p < 0.01$. British diarists were more concerned with advising their offspring in the 16th and 17th centuries.
- (d) There is a significant difference between the number of British diaries recording training for the 16th and 17th centuries when compared with the 18th and 19th centuries, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 4.35$, $p < 0.05$. British diarists were more concerned with the training of their offspring in the 18th and 19th centuries. When a similar comparison was made for the American sample, there was no significant difference, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.09$, $p \gg 0.05$. There is no significant difference between the number of British diaries recording training in the 18th and 19th centuries when compared with the American sample, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.46$, $p \gg 0.05$.

* Yates' correction has not been used with the chi-square test as recent evidence suggests that its use results in an unnecessary loss of power; see Camilli, G. & Hopkins, K. D. (1979): "Applicability of chi-square to 2 x 2 figures contingency tables with small expected cell frequencies"; in Psychological Bulletin, vol. 85, pp.163-167.

declared her independence from Britain in 1776, parents also severed ties with the British mode of child rearing and set out to create a more independent child - as suggested by Bremner (1970-73). The American diarists would also appear to be less concerned with advising their offspring than the British diarists.^c Again this is probably related to their social situation: as emigrants to a new land they would be less able to help their children and possibly also wished their children to be independent. The large percentage of British diarists in the 16th century who advised their children results from their greater intervention in the marriage and career choice of their offspring. What is of particular interest is the rise of the training aspect of parental care - that of moulding a child into shape. It would seem to be non-existent in the 16th century, rising to a peak in the 18th.^d The following survey of the texts will be mainly concerned with the providing and training aspects of parental care - the other aspects will be discussed in later chapters.

The 16th century

Diaries. None of the early diaries described how the diarist felt about rearing children or their attitudes to the parental role. They only noted educating and disciplining their children, nursing them when ill and endeavouring to ensure some supervision.

Autobiographies. G. Mildmay was the first to refer to parental responsibility for the children produced:

Parents have much to answer for before God, who neglect theyr duty in bringing up their children, or prefere any care, labour or delight in the world before that natural and most necessary employment.

(G. Mildmay, 1552-1620, p.127).

She believed in religious and academic education for children and

(c), (d). See page 211b.

also that care should be taken with the environment in which the child lived.

The 17th century

Diaries. C. *Mather's diary was the only one of this century to contain direct evidence on the moulding of a child. He was constantly preoccupied with the religious education of his children from their earliest years, attempting to make them come to terms with the "sinful and woful condition" of their "Nature". He decided that, in his duty as a parent, he should, in addition to promoting schools in the neighbourhood:

Grow yett more fruitful in my Conversation
with my little Birds, and feed them with more
frequent and charming Lessons, of Religion ...
(vol. 7, p.304).

As each child reached the age of 11, or thereabouts, *Mather increased his attention to their religious state and increased his exhortations to them to strive for religious salvation. He was nonetheless prepared to adapt his religious training to suit the temperament of each child:

I would carefully observe the Temper of each
of my Children. And, first, I would warn
them against the peculiar Indiscretions and
Temptations whereto they may be exposed in
their Tempers. Then I would see, whether
I can't suit their Tempers with Motives that
may encourage and animate their Piety.

(C. *Mather, 1663-1728, vol. 8,
p.91).

Another Puritan diarist, *Sewall, would appear to be less concerned than C. *Mather with the socialisation of his offspring. He did on one occasion attempt to make his 10-year-old son aware of the suddenness of death and comforted the child when he showed distress. His children had obviously absorbed the precepts of

Puritan religion, although it is unclear from the diary whether this was due to *Sewall's training or to the sermons of other Puritan preachers.

Betty [daughter of 14] comes unto me almost as soon as I was up and tells me the disquiet she had when awaked; told me was afraid should go to Hell, was like Spira, not Elected. Ask'd her what I should pray for, she said, that God would pardon her Sin and give her a new heart. I answer'd her Tears as well as I could, and pray'd with many Tears on either part; hope God heard us (vol. 5, p.422).

*Sewall may not have been as assiduous in the training of offspring as he should have been:

Last night I dream'd that all my Children were dead except Sarah; which did distress me sorely with Reflexions on my Omission of Duty towards them, as well as Breaking oft the Hopes I had of them. The Lord help me to thankfully and fruitfully to enjoy them.

(*Sewall, 1652-1730, vol. 5, p.399).

*Green, C. *Mather and *Sewall recorded providing financial assistance for their children. C. *Mather seemed to be obsessed with the idea of his own early death and is concerned that his children would be looked after, writing (many years before his death): "I am now providing Patrons for my children, when they shall be Orphans" (vol. 8, p.95).

Heywood and Housman, both British Puritans, also attempted to make their children realise the sinfulness of their nature. Housman (1680? -1735) in particular was concerned to instil religious principles into her daughter, for example: the pernicious consequences of Sin; her own original depravity and the necessity to accept Christ in order to be saved. Byrom was also concerned with the religious training of his children, although this would not

appear to be as harsh as Heywood and Housman:

I consider them [children] as being the children of God who created them and who loves them and that comforts me again. Let us take all occasions to incite them to love and think upon him; to look to themselves, their healths and thoughts, and works, with a view to please him in everything they do see or hear, &c (vol. 40, p.240).

Byrom was also preoccupied with the health of his offspring.

For example, he wondered:

Do not children go too bare about the neck for coughs and cold weather? I am sure that herbs, roots and fruits in season, good house-bread, water porridge, milk fresh, &c, [sic] are the properest food for them; and for drink, water and milk, and wine, ale, beer, posset, or any liquor that is in its natural or artificial purity, whenever they have the least occasion for it.

(Byrom, 1692-1763, vol. 31, p.389).

Other diarists were more concerned with having enough money for their children rather than with their religious education. Cowper, for example, played for low stakes at basset:

I played out of Duty, not Inclination, and having four Children, Nobody would think ill of me if for their Sakes I desired to save my Money.

(Cowper, 1685-1724, p.14).

Freke's (1641-1714) was "borne butt to two hundred pound A yeare, but By God's Blessing an my Indistry he will have after my death Above Two thousand pound A yeare" (50).

At times the necessity of financial provision for offspring could cause a parent a great deal of anxiety. Newcome constantly hoped:

I do not fall into reproach for not providing for my family (for this is now my constant fear lest

I die and shall leave nothing for my wife and children).

(Newcome, 1627-95, p.135).

Manuscripts. The manuscripts contain little information on the function of parenthood. The writers simply noted educating and nursing their offspring and also providing them with adequate money.

Autobiographies. Pringle (1625-67) saw himself as an advisor to his children. Rich (1627-78) wished to bring up her children "religiously" so that they might be good, and do good afterwards in their generation (21). She also "shut up" herself with her son when he had smallpox. In addition, she was concerned with the financial aspect of children, hoping that she would not have so many as to impoverish her and her husband.

Discussion

It appears from the texts that, from the 16th century, parents were prepared to accept the responsibility for the children they produced. (Newson and Newson, 1976, suggest that this is fundamental to the parental role.) At least some of the Puritans wished to ensure that their children would grow up to be true to their faith. They were perhaps following the advice of such Puritan conduct books^{vi} as that of Gouge (1622), which ran to eight editions. Gouge emphasised the duty of parents to provide their children with religious instruction and advises that this religious

vi. The Puritan conduct books advised Puritans on every aspect of their lives, particularly family relations. See Powell (1917) for a review of such conduct books. As Mechling (1975) has shown (see Chapter Two, section 1.1), advice literature must be used with caution. However, it seems reasonable to assume that denominational literature will at least be read by those who subscribe to that religious belief.

instruction should be adapted to suit both the age and the temperament of each child. Those parents who were concerned with religious education wished to train the child in order to increase that child's chances of future salvation. (Later diarists were more concerned with training the child to fit into society.)

Illick (1976) has argued that 17th century Americans were concerned with breaking the will of the child as advised by Locke (1699). His sources are drawn only from New England. In the texts studied here, no parent endeavoured to break the will of the child, not even C. *Mather, despite his preoccupation with their religious education. If texts from elsewhere are used, such as the diary of *Byrd, a plantation owner from Virginia, then these reveal no evidence at all to support the idea that 17th century parents wished to break the will of the child. *Byrd, for example, was aroused at his wife attempting to force their daughter to eat against her will. In addition it is more likely that the Puritan New Englanders read their conduct books than the works of such theorists as Locke.

The 18th century

Diaries. The diaries of this century reveal an increase in concern with the formation of a child's character, this time not necessarily for religious reasons. The parents would appear to be concerned with "training" the child. *Adams (1767-1848) believed that for children there is a "duty not less sacred than that of giving them bread . . . that of training them up in the way they should go" (16). *Griffith (1713-76), after his wife's death, placed his children "where they might be trained up in the way of truth" (59). *Tucker wrote that the care of children:

is a burden pleasingly oppressive on my
mind, to train up one little heir of
immortality

(*Tucker, 1775-1806, p.319).

*Huntington's diary provides a great deal of information on how one mother regarded her function. On the birth of her first child, she was:

Deeply impressed with a sense of the vast importance of a mother's duties, and the lasting effect of youthful impressions, I this day resolve to endeavour, at all times, by my precepts and my example, to inspire my children with just notions of right and wrong, of what is to be avoided and what pursued, of what is sacredly to be deserved and what unreservedly depreciated (77).

Fifteen months later she wrote: (present author's emphasis)

There is scarcely any subject concerning which I feel more anxiety, than the proper education of my children The person who undertakes to form the infant mind, to cut off the distorted shoots, and direct and fashion those which may, in due time, become fruitful and lovely branches, ought to possess a deep and accurate knowledge of human nature (88).

Six months after the above she noted: (present author's emphasis)

Legislators and governors have to enact laws and compel men to observe them; mothers have to implant the principles, and cultivate the dispositions, which alone can make good citizens and subjects. The former have to exert authority over characters already formed; the latter have to mould the character of the future man, giving it a shape which will make him either an instrument of good to the world, or a pest in the lap of society. Oh that a constant sense of the importance and responsibility of this station may rest upon me! that grace may be given faithfully to discharge its difficult duties.

(*Huntington, 1791-1823, p.100)

This is the first explicit reference to the socialisation of the child as opposed to a concern with his future salvation. The diaries of *Alcott, *Drinker, *Fenimore-Cooper, *Mitchell, *Silliman and

*Shippen also contain evidence on the training of a child.

The function of the parent as the provider of a child's needs continues to arouse anxiety. For example, *Alcott (1799-1888), who experienced many financial disasters, wrote that he wished, for the sake of his wife and children " I could have a pair of profitable hands and marketable wits" (356). *Hull was willing to work as hard as was necessary to provide for his wife and children:

for whose comfort I am so desirous, that I am willing to exert my strength in labouring for their subsistence both day and night, if necessary.

(*Hull, 1765-1834, p.320).

*Sewall found that his farm did not provide a large enough income to support his family's needs. Thus he decided to start a school:

[I] rode around to most of my neighbours relative to a school which I have concluded to take charge of until harvest. I am compelled to do this for the benefit of my own children.

(*Sewall, 1797-1846, p.244).

Some of the British diarists were similarly concerned with the "training" of their children.² (see Appendix C). Moore, referring to the "loving and loveable nature" of his daughter felt:

how ticklish will be the steerage of such a creature, when her affections are brought more strongly out.

(Moore, 1779-1852, vol. 2, p.245).

J. Taylor (1743-1819) had "thought a deal on 'Train up a child in the way he should go'" (118). Trench (1768-1837) believed that the "first object of education is to train up an immortal soul" (1837, p.7).

Woods wrote of her children:

I would encourage them to lay open their little hearts, and speak their thoughts freely; considering that by doing so, I have the best means of correcting their ideas, and rectifying whatever may be amiss.

(Woods, 1748-1821, p.427).

Mascall was the only diarist of this century who believed that a parent should make their offspring aware of their inherent sinfulness, noting that she endeavoured:

to my utmost to convince my children of their natural sinful state, & ye necessity of a Saviour & to teach ym wt to believe & practice yt they may be saved.

(Mascall, 1702-94, p.13).

As in the 16th and 17th centuries, the financial aspect of parental care is again referred to in the diaries. Jones, for example, regretted signing a bond as:

I am a husband, - I am a father! I have robbed my wife & children! I painfully feel that I ought not to have done it.

(Jones, 1755-1821, p.197).

Mantell, having little success in his chosen employment, wondered whether to move:

My little ones however render it necessary that I should pause before I take a step fraught with such importance to them, and I am therefore in that anxious state of suspense than which nothing can be more unpleasant.

(Mantell, 1790-1852, p.47).

Macready wished to ensure that his children would be better provided for than he was:

my own experience of the painfulness of struggling without assistance through life makes me nervously anxious to afford my dear

children some little support in their journey through life, which I wish to be an active and industrious one.

(Macready, 1793-1873, p.135).

The 18th century British diaries contain some additional information on parental care. Boscawen wrote to her husband while he was away at sea:

Have no anxious thoughts for the children. Assure yourself they shall be my sole care and study and that my chief purpose and the business of my life shall be to take care of them and to procure for them a sound mind in a healthy body. God give me success!

(Boscawen, 1719-1805, p.54).

Wynne's husband, on the other hand, was concerned that she would take too much care of their children. He wrote to her, also while away at sea:

if there is any subject on which I feel diffident, it is that your kindness and affection for the Children will lead you to take too much care of them, believe me nothing tends, more to health than exercise and Air, and that the more they are out of the house the better Consider what your boys must undergo before they arrive even at Manhood, and I am sure you will agree with me that it is not wise to bring them up too tenderly.

(Wynne, 1779-1857, vol. 3, p.96).

Fox thought that childhood should be a happy period; that children should be encircled in an atmosphere of kindness and love, although with some restraints:

The dear children have a constant claim, requiring the judicious restraint and direction of parental discipline. Their desire to be with us, and the enjoyment we have in their society holds out continual inducement to indulge them, perhaps beyond the proper point, but we have ever been fearful of weakening, by undue restraints that entire confidence they repose in us. How difficult it is, in all things,

to maintain the golden mean (309).

She was also prepared to spend a good deal of time with her offspring:

I used to wonder, when I was a girl, that mothers were so absorbed in their children, as to have little inclination, at times, for anything else. Now I wonder when I see a mother who is fond of going out.

(Fox, 1793-1844, p.250).

Backhouse and Fry were unsure how to rear their offspring. Backhouse, for example, wrote that:

Children, and the education of them, is a subject of too much anxiety. Too sensible perhaps of idleness and awkwardness; too earnest for, and valuing too highly, intellectual cultivation, easy action, and decorum of manner.

(Backhouse, 1787-1850, p.50).

Finally, Townsend referred to parents as:

fond and anxious parents who have sacrificed your ease, your rest, your worldly property, your health, your all, for the comfort and prosperity of your offspring; perhaps, too, for unfortunate, for disobedient, yea, even for cruel children

(Townsend, 1757-1826, p.34).

Manuscripts. Most manuscripts contain information only on the disciplinary, educative, protective and financial aspects of parental care. The diary of Steuart (1770-1808), however, reveals more details. She regarded child-rearing as a "sacred charge" and was aware of the different personalities of her three children, adapting her method of discipline to them. She believed her behaviour should set an example for her children to follow.

Autobiographies. *Bailey (1746-1815) was concerned with protecting her children from the abuses of their father. (He was

stern with his children and formed an incestuous relationship with at least one of his daughters. *Bailey eventually obtained a divorce.) Carvosso wished his children to be religious and, as his youngest son remained unconverted:

I felt my mind deeply impressed with the duty of embracing the first opportunity of opening my mind to him, and talking closely to him about eternal things.

(Carvosso, 1750-1834, p.46).

Discussion

The 18th century texts contain the first specific references to the "training" of a child. These parents would appear to believe that a child could be moulded into shape. There was also, particularly in the British diaries, evidence on the growing unsureness of the ability of parents to rear their children properly; feelings of incompetence predominate. The 18th century is the first one in which women wrote diaries to any great extent. There would appear to be different functions assigned to the mother compared with the father. The former is concerned with the training, the latter with providing enough money for the family. These mothers would seem to be devoting every waking moment to the care of their offspring.

The 18th century is generally put forward as an example of humane, enlightened modes of rearing compared with previous centuries, although de Mause (1976) does suggest that 18th century parents wished to conquer a child's mind "in order to control its insides". From a child's point of view it is debatable whether the 18th century really was more humane; a minority of children were now subjected to a rigorous training procedure in order to produce model citizens. These parents would seem to be displaying what

Ariès (1962) calls an "obsessive love" and they were clearly uneasy about their new role - as with attitudes to children, these parents were more self-consciously aware of their duties as a parent.

This articulated awareness of the parental role may be due to the influence of Locke (1699) rather than Rousseau (1763). Locke emphasised how much the parent was responsible for the development of the child and the damage a parent could do by rearing a child incorrectly. Rousseau, on the other hand, suggested that a child should be allowed to develop without adult intervention. It was also Locke (1699) who argued that children should not be "coddled"; they should be encouraged to bathe in cold water and play outside in all weathers. Wynne's husband seems to have been influenced by Locke's views, hoping that his wife would not rear their children too tenderly. The quotation from Wynne's diary is in marked contrast to that of Byrom in the 17th century who was concerned about the effects of cold weather on his offspring's health.

The 19th century

Diaries. Those diarists who recorded in their diary their efforts to mould their child appeared to be even more concerned than the 18th century parents with having the child comply with the parents' will (*Duncan, *Lovell, *Prentiss, *Todd and *Walker). For example, when *Lovell's daughter aged 5 refused to say "Good Morning" to a visitor, she was sent to her room, then smacked, followed by a lecture from her father and finally threatened with a stick, and Caroline at that yielded. *Lovell regarded this defiance as "if the enemy had her completely in his power, and was trying to effect her ruin" and also as an example - of "the depraved state of the unrenewed heart" (89). *Lovell

wanted her daughter to be obedient:

We wished to train her to a habit of implicit compliance with our directions, and on this account we frequently had occasion to correct her in such a way as we thought would best promote this object.

(*Lovell, 1809? -?, p.84).

*Todd described his view of child-rearing:

The first thing a boy needs is a good, firm, powerful constitution worked on him, so that in after-years he can endure great fatigue and labor. The next thing he needs is a firm, decided government over him, to which his will shall bow without any reserve, and with cheerfulness. The last thing (though the first in reality and importance) is piety - a heart submissive and obedient to God.

(*Todd, 1800-73, p.285).

Other diarists were not so involved with the training of their offspring. *Hayes wrote:

I would much prefer they would lay up a stock of health by knocking around in the country than to hear that they were the best scholars of their age in Ohio.

(*Hayes, 1822-93, p.437).

*Judson loved her children just as they were:

I love them for their own sakes; for sweeter more lovely little creatures never breathed; brighter, more beautiful blossoms never expanded in the cold atmosphere of this world.

(*Judson, 1817-54, p.230).

The idea of parental sacrifice re-appears in *Howe's diary:
(see Townsend in the 18th century, section 2.2)

We must and ought to love our children with all our hearts; love them better than ourselves, but be willing to sacrifice our own feelings and inclinations for their good.

(*Howe, 1801-76, p.295).

On the other hand, the financial aspect of parental care seems to arouse less concern in the 19th century, although it still mattered to those diarists who referred to it. *Lawrence, for example, wrote:

My chief care and ambition for this world
now centres in the welfare of my children.
(*Lawrence, 1814-86, p.165).

He gave each child a patrimony when they reached the age of 21 so that they would be financially independent.

The British diarists of this period were also concerned with the formation of a child's character (Allen, Cobden-Sanderson, Gaskell, Gurney, Hanover, Palgrave, F. Russell and Tregelles). Cobden-Sanderson trained his son of 19 months to go to sleep when put in his cot rather than to cry:

He now goes to bed noon and night and to sleep without a cry. If this can be done, how much more may not be done? What a responsibility! What a superb instrument, gymnast of virtue and of beautiful conduct, may not a man be made early in life! (vol. 1, p.246).

In addition:

Our anxiety for his future makes us careful in ridding him of bad habits and making his will "supple" as Locke - whom we are now reading - would say.

(Cobden-Sanderson, 1840-1922,
vol. 1, p.246).

Gaskell referred to her "extreme anxiety in the formation of her little daughter's character" and wished to teach Marianne self-control as soon as possible. For example, Marianne at 13 months took a dislike to being bathed, however:

this last two days she has tried hard to prevent herself from crying, giving gulps and strains to keep it down. Oh! may this indeed be the

beginning of self-government (16).

At the age of 3½ Marianne was sent to infant school in the morning:

not to advance her rapidly in any branch of learning, but to perfect her habits of obedience, to give her an idea of conquering difficulties by perseverance and to make her apply steadily for a short time.

(Gaskell, 1810-65, p.34).

Gaskell did hope that her daughter would not be "adversely affected" by the school and other pupils.

F. Russell had a specific aim in rearing her children. She hoped that:

each of my children may add some little ray of light by thought, word, and deed to help in dispelling the darkness of error, sin, and crime in this and all other lands.

(F. Russell, 1815-98, p.227).

T. Powys believed that children recompensed parents for their care:

The babes reward all one's labour, every night time one feels the reward, the feeling of the Father that increaseth, that taketh away from the self and giveth to the child.

(T. Powys, 1882-?, p.164).

The parental obligation to provide for their offspring was again referred to. Kitto, when convalescing, was asked to walk six miles a day by his doctor and was unwilling to do so:

However, seeing that there are so many little ones whose immediate welfare seems to have been made dependent upon my existence I decided to walk .

(Kitto, 1804-54, p.625).

Tregelles was also anxious about providing for his offspring:

I have sought by insuring my life, and by a careful investment of the payments I receive for my exertions in business, to lay by a suitable provision for my family. This has cost me much toil and some anxiety at times; but I have acted from a sincere desire to do right, and not from the love of accumulation.

(Tregelles, 1828-84, p.118).

Manuscripts. The one parental manuscript for this period (Hewlett) contains evidence on the nursing and educating of children. Hewlett would appear to be satisfied with his performance as a parent, writing of his children:

They are never out of my thoughts, and I can't reproach myself in their regard at least.

(Hewlett, 1861-1923, p.79).

Autobiographies. Dawson was upset when he could give little financial assistance to his sons to carry out their hobbies:

It is true they tried to make a shop in part of their bedroom, but it made me melancholy to see how little they could carry out their notions in the face of such difficulties.

(Dawson, 1811-78, p.82).

Lucas was very much aware of the different temperaments of each of his nine children, describing each child in his autobiography. He did not have a high regard for his competence as a father. For example, he disliked inflicting corporal punishment (although he did so):

for after all how much more important is the good example of parents when they can gain their children's affections than all systems, rules or rostrums of education (164).

In addition he wrote:

Often do I pray for more ability to guide and influence the dear dispositions of our dear children.

(Lucas, 1804-61, p.241).

Discussion

As in the 18th century, those parents who referred to parental care were concerned with the active formation of their child's character. There would appear to be in the American diarists a lessening of this desire, see for example *Hayes and *Judson - was this a response to Rousseau (1763)? The British diarists appear to be still following the advice of Locke - Cobden-Sanderson and Gaskell noted that they were reading his work. Locke (1699) gives a great deal of advice on how to "weed" out a child's faults in order that a parent may "plant what Habits you please". However, these parents are a minority, others are not so concerned with the active formation of a child's character.

Overall, many aspects of parental care appear to change very little. Nevertheless, the amount of parental interference in a child's development would appear to increase during the 18th century. In the 17th century a small number of diarists wished to ensure that their children would be good Puritans. This training appears to have taken the form (following the precepts of the non-conformist religions) of making a child aware of his inherently sinful nature and so paving the way for his salvation. In order to further the continuance of these new faiths, it would be necessary to ensure that children imbibed the religious principles so that they would conform as adults. It is not till the 18th century that some parents (although still only a minority) became concerned not with forming a child so as to ensure his salvation but with forming a child who would be accepted by society. In this development, the different attitudes of these 18th century diarists are connected with their different rearing method - although it is unclear whether these attitudes reflected their behaviour or produced it. These parents saw their children as "delights"; but as imperfect delights and therefore reared their children in such a way as to

"weed out" (Locke, 1699) these imperfections.

In each century some parents referred to the financial aspect of children. These parents appear to have been concerned not only with having sufficient income in order to rear their children properly; but also with leaving enough money to provide for their children if the latter became fatherless (see for example Newcome, *Hull and Tregelles). At a time when the state gave very little financial assistance to families, the expense of rearing children would be an important matter, and in the less affluent families a cause for concern.

3.0

ILLNESS

The concern for children shown by parents is clearly demonstrated in their accounts of child illness and death, in every century.

The 16th century

Diaries. *Jefferay (1591-1675) sent for the doctor "on some small Sickness of one of my children" (71).

Of the British diarists, Dee, Oglander and Powell simply noted that their children were ill and Powell also went to visit his married offspring when they were unwell. Dee (1527-1608) did, however, note that his son, aged 8, "slept well" after a stick had accidentally pierced his left eyelid. This suggests that Dee was sufficiently concerned to either watch the child at night or at least inquire how he had slept the next day. Dee also hoped "God spede the rest of the cure!" (125). Clifford wrote of her daughter, aged 2 years and 8 months:

the Child had a bitter fit of her ague again, insomuch I was fearful of her that I could hardly sleep all night, so I beseeched GOD Almighty to be merciful to me and Spare her life.

(Clifford, 1590-1676, p.54).

Hope referred to the illness of one of his older children:

The faittis of sicknes increseit on my deir sone The Lord pittie and spair him, if it be his holy will.

(Hope, 1585?-1646, p.194).

H. Mildmay's diary contains frequent references to his son Charles (aged about 11) during the latter's illness and Mildmay was clearly worried about him:

My poor Charles very unruly and ill; God help him and comfort with help and care.

The next day he wrote:

This was a sad night with poor Charles and all of us God amend him.

(H. Mildmay, 1592-1667, p.66).

Winthrop's son felt ill while away at university. His mother wrote to him:

I am very sorry for thy sickness and pray to God night and day for thy good recovery which I desire with the most intire affection of my hart, and wish my selfe present with thee.

(Winthrop, 1587-16?, p.280).

The 17th century

Diaries. Out of the 25 diarists who referred to the illness of a child, only three (*Danforth, Grange and *Pike) revealed no concern. The other diarists were all exceedingly concerned ³ (see Appendix C). *Byrd wrote when his infant son and daughter were ill:

I rose by 5 o'clock and sent our excuses to Colonel Hill for not going with him to Colonel Harrison's because our children were both sick. However, they came to see us in our affliction.

(*Byrd, 1674-1744, 1941, p.181).

A few months later *Byrd's daughter was ill again and he noted " [I] ate no breakfast, I was so concerned for my daughter" (1941, p.213). I. *Mather noted that he "sat up all night with Nath who continued to be ill". The next day "Nath continuing ill", *Mather reported he was "much hindred in my studyes" (341). The day after that *Mather wrote:

Much interrupted in studyes by Nats illness
.... Little doe children think, wt affection is
in ye Heart of a Father (341).

*Mather believed that he was the cause of his children's illness, writing two days after the last entry when Nathaniel was still very ill and his brother had also succumbed to the infection:

There hath bin much Health in my Family for a long time; & God has spared ye lives of all my children, but I have not bin thankfull & humble as I should have bin, & therefore God is righteous in afflicting me. I have noth to say but to ly down abased bef him & let him doe with me & mine as seemeth him good. Onely I can not but Trust in him yt. Hee will be gracious, for his owne Names sake could doe little at my study bec. of childrens sickness.

(I. *Mather, 1639-1723, p.341).

C. *Mather, son of the above, also believed that his sins led to the illness and death of his offspring and that he should resign himself to the will of God. However, the last point does not mean that he was unconcerned when a child was ill; on the contrary, *Mather's diary contains a great deal of information regarding his anxiety during a child's illness. For example, of one daughter, *Mather wrote:

my little and my only, Katharin, was taken so dangerously sick, that small Hope of her Life was left unto us. In my Distress, when I saw the Lord thus, quenching the coal that was left unto mee, and rending out of my Bosom one that had lived so long with mee, as to steal a Room there, and a Lamb that was indeed unto me as a Daughter, I cast myself at the Feet of His Holy Sovereignty (vol. 7, p.176).

*Mather did "resign" his child to God, but also begged for her recovery. Of another daughter, who had recently been accidentally burnt, and was now suffering from a fever, *Mather remarked:

My Soul was many wayes wounded with the deplorable State, which this little Bird, that had already undergone so much calamity, was again fallen into.

(C. *Mather, 1663-1728, vol. 7, p.303).

*Mather revealed the same anxiety when any of his offspring were unwell, yet Stone (1977) claims "There is little evidence in Mather's diaries that he was emotionally deeply committed to any of his children" (214).

The British diarists gave evidence of a similar concern. Freke (1641-1714) heard that her adult son was very ill "which soe Terryfied & Frightened mee thatt I had noe Reste in mee" (46). Housman, during her 4-year-old daughter's illness, wrote:

He [God] hath been touching us in a very tender Part. Hath threatened to take from us the Delight of our Eyes, the Joy of our Hearts, with Strake. But had Pity upon us, and in the midst of Judgement remembered Mercy.

(Housman, 1680? -1735, p.72).

Newcome also thought his actions could lead to the illness of one of his children. For example, when his young daughter was ill, he wrote:

I was much afflicted herewith lest the Lord should seem hereby to manifest his displeasure for my removing [house].

(Newcome, 1627-95, p.73).

Later this child was sent into the country in an attempt to cure her of rickets. When Newcome visited her: "She met us on her feet, which was a great rejoicing to us" (94). After one of his sons recovered from a fever, Newcome noted: "that heaviness endured for a night, but joy came in the morning" (97). Woodforde's son received a dangerous cut in his finger while away at school. She wrote:

He is at a great distance from us and all his relations, but Oh, my dear Lord do thou supply all our love and care in taking him into thy special protection.

(Woodforde, 1638-1730, p.19).

Manuscripts. Four manuscripts contain information on this topic. Pledger's daughter suffered from tuberculosis and her father was worried that he and his wife were more concerned with their daughter's frailty than her spiritual state:

I fear we have loved her out of her place and have not sufficiently resigned our wils to gods, it may be we have been more concerned for y life of her body yn her soul (63).

Though Pledger did pray for the recovery of his children, he seems to have been more prepared to return them to God than other diarists. For example, when his son of 3 was ill, Pledger wrote that:

we did not desire him of god or any other acct for his service in the world & rather yn he should lived to God's dishonour we ur willing to part with him then.

(Pledger, 1665-?, p.74).

Rule (1695? -?) recorded thanking God for the recovery of one of his sons. Stockton (1630-80) thought he was not as upset as he should have been by the sufferings of others and therefore God had visited this "affliction" - that is, the illness of his son - on him. His wife was concerned when their eldest daughter, aged 19, became ill:

when the Lord was pleased to com so neere to
her that I feared her life I found a great lothness
to part with such a deare and desirable Child
haveing also buryed 4 before and haveing but
one more and that a very weakely child also.

(Mrs. Stockton, 1635? -?, p.18).

Child Diaries. Fretwell (1699-1772) - the only one of this sample to refer to illness - aged 18, wrote that, when he was ill "my dear mother sate up with me till betwixt 3 and 4 o clock" and was very concerned for him (195).

Autobiographies. Two of these referred to the illness of their own children. Pringle (1625-67) recalled that when his eldest son was ill he (Pringle) "submitted" to the will of God and his son recovered. Rich thought her own behaviour resulted in her infant son's illness:

which [son] I then doated on with great
fondness. I was beyond expression struck
at it; not only because of my kindness for
him, but because my conscience told me it
was for my back sliding.

(Rich, 1624-78, p.17).

Rich had been trying, unsuccessfully, to be more religious; but now promised God that she would improve her faith if her child's health improved - which it did. When the same son at 19 caught smallpox, Rich wrote she "Shut up myself with him, doing all I could both for his soul and body" (29).

Discussion

It has been argued by most writers on the history of childhood that parents were not upset at the illness of their young children - that is, those under the age of 6 (Ariès, 1962; de Mause, 1976; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969; Shorter, 1976; Stone, 1977 and Tucker, 1976; among others). These writers suggest that parents were less concerned with the health of their children due to the high infant mortality rate. In order to protect themselves from emotional distress, parents maintained a distance between themselves and their offspring. The results from the 16th and 17th century texts do not support this argument; the parents were all too obviously concerned, regardless of the age of the child. In fact, it appears that the high infant mortality rate operated to increase their anxiety - a childish cold or cough was enough to send most of the parents into a paroxysm of panic. In the 16th century, Clifford, Dee and Powell noted the illness of a child under the age of 5. Clifford was the only one of the three to reveal any distress. However, Dee and Powell referred to the illnesses of their older offspring in the same brief manner in which they noted the illness of their younger offspring. Of the 17th century texts, 56% contain information on the illness of children under the age of 5. All the parents were upset, apart from *Danforth and *Pike who also did not record any distress at the illness of an older child. The religious diarists would appear to temper their anxiety with religious faith. Nevertheless, it seems that their actual feelings were different from those which they tried; to express in terms of religious fortitude - most of the parents found it difficult to resign themselves to the will of God (Erskine, Housman, C. and I. *Mather, and Pledger).

The 18th century

Diaries. Eight diaries (13%) out of those which dealt with illness merely stated that a child was ill, without giving any indication of their feelings (*Carter, *Constant, Goff, *Hiltzheimer, Mascall, *Parker, *Parkman and *Stiles). The two British diarists would appear to be unconcerned when a child was ill. For example, Goff (1730? -?) did not return home from a visit even though she knew that one daughter was very ill and her younger children had measles or whooping cough. In addition, when one of Mascall's (1702-94) sons was ill, his mother hoped the illness had improved his soul. The remaining diarists were evidently concerned⁴ (see Appendix C). For example, *Alcott (1799-1888) recorded sitting through the night with his daughter Elizabeth. Five years later, when Louisa caught typhoid fever while working away from home, *Alcott immediately went to collect her and both parents nursed her 24 hours a day until she recovered. *Gordon (1713-68) wrote when his baby daughter was unwell: "A great company here, which is rather disagreeable, as the child is so unwell" (232). When another young daughter was ill, he noted " [I] intended to go to Richmond, but did not incline to leave my dear little child" (233).

*Shippen described her state of mind during the illness of her 17-month-old daughter:

My baby thank God is much recover'd.
These six days past she has been so ill her
life has been despair'd off. I nurs'd her
attentively - I never left her more than an
hour altogether - O! what I have suffer'd
for several hours I thought she was dying -
what I felt then it is impossible to describe -
I have been ill too myself with fatigue & want
of sleep - Mamma was much affected & fain
wou'd have taken part of the trouble off my
hands but I would not permit it.

(*Shippen, 1763-1841, p.151).

*Huntington described her feelings at the illness of her infant son:

Yesterday my little son appeared very sick. I was awake with him most of the night, and was apprehensive of two disorders, one in consequence of a bad fall, the other the effect of having been exposed to an infectious disease I thought I should sink under the affliction of a separation from my child.

(*Huntington, 1791-1823, p.80).

The British diarists revealed a similar anxiety. For example, Boscawen wrote:

All three children have been ill at once. The two girls had coughs and fevers occasioned by teeth, which were lanced immediately. The boy had a violent and never-ceasing cough You can imagine the state I was in. For poor Fanny I trembled, her breath and lungs being already so oppressed that 'twas pain to hear her, and the slut [sic] would not drink anything, though she was dying of thirst. There was no sort of liquid I did not try her with As to the dear boy, he would at all times take anything I brought him; but then I dreaded a bleeding, which would have been necessary in the measles. I did not doubt my being able to persuade him to it. I had even got his promise. But I distrusted myself. I doubted my being able to stay in the room, and the least signs of fear in me would have inspired and justified his.

(Boscawen, 1719-1805, p.80).

Boswell (1740-95) was "tortured with apprehension" when he thought his 2½-year-old daughter had measles (255). Fletcher (1739-1814), when her adult daughter was ill, wrote: "I felt it as a knife in my heart. She is my earthly all" (186). Fox (1793-1841) "was distressed "to see her infant son's suffering when he was ill" (191). Fry wrote that she was:

very low and anxious on account of our little baby, who appeared uneasy and in much pain. She seemed suddenly really unwell. I wish my heart not to be too much set on her, or her health (98).

Fry believed that she should resign herself to God's will:

I desire, with regard to my dear lambs, to be ready to give them up, if called for at my hand; for we know not what is best for them; and I believe we should seek to look upon them, as charges committed to our stewardship, and not as our property (124).

Nonetheless, in practice, she did not feel it easy to subscribe to this belief and continued to be anxious when a child was ill. Of another child, Fry wrote she was:

Much occupied night and day by the illness of my sweet babe; I was so low in the night, that I shed many tears; a mother's feelings are strong in me.

(Fry, 1780-1845, p.155).

Rathbone described her young daughter's illness:

Hannah very poorly, and lay on my lap all day.

Two days later:

Hannah so poorly we could not get her up; I lay with her all day.

A few days after this:

My poor Hannah had but a painful night and the Drs. in the morning urged us most suddenly to take her into the country. I rose directly, and my W. R. and me in much terror took her in a coach on pillows to Green Bank My mind agonised by a struggle against hope which would flatter me.

(Rathbone, 1761-1839, pp.68-72).

W. Scott of his adult daughter recorded:

Anne is ill this morning. May God help us! If it should prove serious, as I have known it such cases, where am I to find courage or comfort?

(W. Scott, 1771-1832, p.94).

Manuscripts. Four manuscripts (57% of the total sample for this period) refer to a sick child and all show concern. Bishop (1751-1801) entered daily remarks on the progress of an ill child in her diary and sat up at nights with her sick children. Oliver (1741-1883) tried everything he could think of to help his ill daughter who appeared to be in the early stages of tuberculosis. She was taken to the seaside, taken "frequently to the cold bath but to no purpose", and also sent into the country (18). Rowntree's daughter had such a bad cough that the doctor was called and Rowntree hoped:

all might be done that could and that my will
might be made subject so as to say not my will
but thine be done.

(Rowntree, 1765? -?, p.109).

Steuart (1770-1808), after her two sons caught measles, hoped "it may be easy with Mary [daughter] when she takes it" (169).

Child diaries. Only two refer to illness. *Gallatin wrote of his 17-year-old sister:

Poor Frances has scarlet fever and is
isolated in the chalet in the garden.
Mamma will not leave her.

(*Gallatin, 1796-1876, p.172).

*Gallatin would not appear to like his mother's ministrations to himself when ill, refusing to take the medicine she offered him.

*Winslow (1759-1779) frequently suffered from small ailments such as colds and boils. However, she did not appear to mind because any illness meant she did not go to school; but sat wrapped up in front of the fire all day.

Autobiographies. Only one of these refers to illness and this may be because the treatment Grant (1797-1830) received when she was ill, differed markedly from the usual harsh mode she was subjected to. When she caught whooping cough at the age of 13, she

was given lovely meals, had a fire in her room and while convalescing was taken on many outings. Grant also recalled that when her brother was ill with scarlet fever at school, her mother went to the school to nurse him.

Discussion

As with the earlier texts, the age of the child would appear to be immaterial with regard to parental concern during illness. Those diarists who described no anxiety whenever their children were ill did so for both infants and older children. If the diaries of Goff and Mascall are considered, there would appear to be definite unconcern in some 18th century parents. Although the fact that a diarist does not specify concern cannot be taken to imply that he or she did not experience any, the fact that Goff did not return home from a visit when her children were very ill does imply that she did not suffer from anxiety.

The religious fortitude which is revealed in the 17th century texts reappears in some of the 18th century texts (*Bayard, A. Darby, Fry, F. Gray, *Huntington, Jones, Kilham, Macready, Rathbone, Rowntree, Sandford, D. Taylor). These parents also found that their religious beliefs and parental emotions did come into conflict - although they believed they should submit to God's will, they found it very difficult, if not impossible to do so.

The 19th century

Diaries. Out of 38 diaries referring to illness, Acland and Waugh only remarked that their children were ill. Waugh (1903-66) appears to have been unconcerned; writing, for example, "In the nursery whooping cough rages I believe" (667). The other diarists are not so unmoved⁵ (see Appendix C). After the death of her husband, *Colt should have attended the sale of their goods:

But my child [aged 10] is very weak. She cannot bear to be away from her mother a moment, it would be cruel to leave her & she's too ill to take.

(*Colt, 1817-?, p.183)

and so *Colt did not go.

*Howe was going to start a journey but, as his daughter of 7 was ill, he delayed his visit:

her present illness, though other people tell me it is nothing, seems to me alarming As soon as she is better, or so that I shall not worry and be pained by the thought of that poor thing is asking for Papa, I shall start.

(*Howe, 1801-76, p.369).

*Jackson's son of 14 had a typhoid fever which left him with his right leg one and a half inches shorter than his left leg. *Jackson was exceedingly distressed:

That in a word Our noble boy - our heroic boy - our active stirring energetic - life loving and life enjoying boy is at best a cripple for life. Oh! how this announcement seems to take hold of me - how it depresses me - and how the hot tears do flow from my eyes and how I could weep and how I do weep. And Oh! how I dread to make this disclosure to him. How can I make the dreadful announcement and how must it crush his buoyant young spirit - Heroic he is. How small would seem the sacrifice if by giving what property I possess I could restore him to soundness. And how cheerfully could I and how cheerfully could his mother go to work and how we would delight to struggle against poverty if by so doing we could but avert this calamity.

(*Jackson, 1816-1900, p.190).

*Longfellow wrote, as his daughter of 17 months lay ill, that:

When a child is ill in a house all the usual course of things is interrupted. All thoughts centre in the little patient.

(*Longfellow, 1807-82, p.122).

*Prentiss recorded great anxiety when any of her offspring were ill. For example she stayed up all night with her 2-year-old daughter:

But as we sat hour after hour watching the alternations of color in her purple face and listening to that terrible gasping, rattling sound, Oh, why I try to tell myself, what a night it was God knows, God only. How he has smitten me by means of this child, He well knows.

(*Prentiss, 1818-78, p.144).

*Todd's 14-month-old daughter was very ill:

I go to her bedside and gaze, and hear her short groans, as long as I can stay and then go away to weep. Wonderful skill! in creating and planting in the human heart that wonderful passion which we call parental! As I go about the house (and oh, this feeling is to increase to agony!) I see her little chair, her clothes, her things: here she sat, there she sung, there she gave me her sweet looks; every spot is associated with the past, and with fear.

*Todd was reluctant to lose his child:

I know we ought not to refuse to give this dear one, this sweet child, back to her Maker and Father. She must be better off than with us; but oh, the agony of breaking the heart-strings.

(*Todd, 1800-73, p.241).

The British diarists described the same concern. For example, Addison was concerned about the health of his children during the first world war:

it was painfully evident that their vigour is seriously affected by the war diet I believe the limitation of sugar in one form or another, is largely responsible for their condition (422).

Later his children caught measles and his youngest son "was

seriously ill so that I came away this morning feeling very anxious" (485). Addison's wife told her husband:

that if we survive this horrible time she thinks one of her most vivid recollections of it will be of an air-raid night, her trying to get Michael, age $3\frac{1}{2}$, to sleep, lying on his bed beside him monotonously chanting a nursery rhyme, everything in darkness, a terrific roar of barrage and bombs, the whole house rattling and rocking whilst he is murmuring feverishly with measles bad upon him, "scwatch me Mummy, scwatch me".
(Addison, 1869-?, p.492).

Bonar's diary contains information on the conflict already referred to - the conflict between religious beliefs and parental feeling. When Bonar's son, aged 2, was ill, he found that he was unable to resign himself to the will of God:

these two days have yielded me awful proofs of the coldness of my heart. I have felt my utter inability to rouse up grateful love. I have at times felt, as it were, sickness at the discovery of my selfish heart.
(Bonar, 1810-92, p.207).

Collins wrote to his 11-year-old daughter after she had undergone an operation:

I was thinking of you all the day you went through the operation and wished I could bear your pain for you. I am thankful to think it is all happily over now - I hope, dear, you will have no more pain.
(Collins, 1818-1908, p.215).

Cowell (1820? -?) mentioned that her son of 12 was "suffering shockingly again, with chilblains which distresses me greatly" (253). When Gaskell's 22-month-old daughter was ill, she wrote:

I did so try to be resigned; but I cannot tell how I sickened at my heart at the thought of seeing her no more here.
(Gaskell, 1810-65, p.11).

Hochberg's young son (aged 5) had to have an operation:

He was so good and brave, but cried dreadfully when he awoke from the chloroform. I saw him when he was still under the effects of it, lying there quite quiet with a little pale face and heavy eyes and I felt miserable for him and knew more than ever how I adore him, and it was misery to have him clinging to me in pain afterwards, poor precious mite.

(Hochberg, 1873-?, p.128).

Child diaries. Ten child diarists mentioned being ill, and all of them referred to parental concern (Cummings, Hanover, Johnston, *May, Palmer, Powys, *Richards, Shore, *Smith and *Webb). *Richards, for example, wrote that, as she had a very bad cough, her grandmother became concerned and sent for the doctor; but did not approve of the doctor's mode of examination:

He [doctor] placed me in a chair and thumped my lungs and back and listened to my breathing while Grandmother sat near and watched him in silence, but finally she said, "Caroline isn't used to being pounded"

(*Richards, 1842-?, p.194).

*Webb was sent to boarding school but:

I was a delicate girl and as it was so very cold my Mother was afraid to have me stay.

(*Webb, 1801-1900, p.148).

After Hanover had recovered from an illness at the age of 15, she wrote:

I must not omit to mention how very anxious my dear Mamma was throughout my indisposition, and how unceasing dear Lehsen [governess] was in her attentions and care to me.

(Hanover, 1819-1901, p.93).

L. Powys was sent to a sanatorium in Switzerland in an attempt to cure him of tuberculosis. His father wrote to him:

We are very thankful that you seem to be recovering so well, from your illness. We are very thankful indeed that you have been spared to us; & hope that your future life will be useful and happy.

(L. Powys, 1884-?, p.230).

Shore was also gradually succumbing to tuberculosis. At 19 she was very ill:

It is painful, however, to be the object of such constant care and anxiety to my parents, especially my poor father, who has harassment enough in his wearing profession without my (innocently) adding to it. It is impossible to describe how he watches me, and how, without being fidgety, he catches at any glimpse of my being better.

(Shore, 1819-39, p.265).

Autobiographies. Four autobiographies contain information on illness. *Chace (1806 - ?) described going "watching" at night whenever any one, child or adult was ill. *Judson recalled being much "indulged" as a child:

(probably on account of the fragility of my constitution), and also being several times prostrated for a week or more after a day's visit with my little cousins.

(*Judson, 1817-54, p.15).

Hare (1834-1903) became ill due to the way he was treated as a child. However, in his case, no allowance was made for any of his illnesses, in fact he continued with his daily lessons. Kitto (1804-54) described being "very anxious about baby; indeed miserable" when he was told that a bump on her head could prove fatal (557).

Discussion

The 19th century texts contain the same evidence as the 17th and 18th century texts: the age of the child would not appear to

affect the concern of the parent and also the conflict between parental anxiety and religious belief was again described, although in a smaller proportion of diarists (Bonar, Gaskell and *Todd).

Overall, the results reveal that almost all parents were extremely concerned whenever any of their offspring were ill, irrespective of the century in which they lived. It seems as if the deep emotional involvement which most parents had with their offspring prevented them (the parents) from feeling anything but distress and anxiety. In addition, nearly all the parents nursed their offspring themselves and were reluctant to leave children who were ill, even for short visits. It appears that they regarded the nursing of sick children as their responsibility. These results contradict the view that parents were emotionally detached from and indifferent to their children.

4.0

DEATH

Parents were so anxious when any of their children were ill because any illness, no matter how slight, could all too easily lead to death. (During the period 1550-1750, between 25 and 33% of all English children died before the age of 15 (Stone, 1977). It is likely that the American mortality rate was higher.) When an illness did prove fatal, the parents' anxiety was realised and most grieved deeply. They were not "indifferent" at the death of a child because so many died, as has been argued. The conflict between religious belief and parental love revealed in the illness section reappears in the quotations on death. The religious parents firmly believed, in theory, that a child was only lent to them and so therefore they could not object when he was recalled, through death, by God. Despite this, when they actually experienced the death of

a child, they found it very difficult, at times impossible, to reconcile their faith with their grief for the loss of a child. These passages are the most agonising the diaries contain; at times the parents are completely distraught. They could not come to terms with the death of a child, nor could they accept their inability to come to terms with this, believing they had lost their child and their faith.

As it has been argued that parents were indifferent to the death of their young children, i. e. those under the age of 6, the information on death will be divided into two sections: children aged 6 and under and children over the age of 6.

4.1 Parental Attitudes to the Death of Children under 6

The 16th century

Diaries. The offspring of five diarists died as infants. Two diarists revealed no emotion - Assheton and Powell. However, although Assheton did not seem to be upset at the death of his child soon after birth, he not only attended the funeral (Shorter, 1976, argues that parental indifference to children prior to the 18th century could be seen in such things as the non-attendance of parents at the funerals of their young children); but laid the child in his grave. Perhaps some of the early diarists suffered from an inability to articulate. Although they felt grief, they were unable to express it.

Brownlow, Wallington and Winthrop were able to express their grief and revealed great distress at the death of their offspring. For example, Brownlow lost numerous children shortly after birth; but this did not make him "indifferent". He described his feelings when two sons, who had survived for a few years, also died:

O Lord thou has dealt bitterlie with mee and
broken me with breach upon breach, when
wilt thou comfort mee (121).

And, on the death of the second:

I was at ease but Thou O God has broken mee
a sunder and shaken mee to peeces.

(Brownlow, 1594-1675, p.123).

Wallington was stricken at the death of his daughter, approx-
imately 4 years of age:

The grief for this child was so great that I
forgot myself so much that I did offend God in
it; for I broke all my purposes, promises, and
covenants with my God, for I was much
distracted in my mind, and could not be
comforted, although my friends speak so
comfortably unto me.

(Wallington, 1598-1658, p.xix).

Wallington's wife, on the other hand, reproved him for mourning
so deeply, saying: "I do as freely give it again unto God, as I did
receive it of him" (xix). Wallington was not convinced; he still
regarded it as a "bitter" portion when his young son died a few
years later.

The 17th century

Diaries. Six diarists revealed no emotion at the death of an
infant: *Adams, Browell, *Cooper, *Danforth, Heywood and Newton.
All of these were infants under 1 year of age; apart from the offspring
of *Danforth, all of whom succumbed to a disease at the same time.
As with the 16th century diarists, perhaps some parents were unable
to express their feelings. For example, Browell's diary (1660? -
1729) contains no emotion; but he did note that his daughter died at
"six weeks, one day and seven houres" old which seems to imply
that he paid sufficient attention to his daughter to note the precise
time of her entry into and exit from the world (186).

In addition, Hervey appeared to be resigned to his fate, writing when his 6-week-old son was overlaid by the nurse:

The Lord gave, & ye Lord hath taken away
yet blessed me ye goodness of my most
merciful God, who hath left me so many
alive.

(Hervey, 1665-1751, p.44).

Other diarists revealed considerably more concern. Four American diarists expressed grief at the loss of a young child: *Byrd, C. *Mather,*Pike and *Sewall. For example, *Byrd wrote of the death of his 9-month-old son:

My wife was much afflicted but I submitted
to His judgement better, notwithstanding I
was very sensible of my loss; but God's
will be done.

Four days later:

My wife continued to be exceedingly afflicted
for the loss of her child, notwithstanding I
comforted her as well as I could.

(*Byrd, 1674-1744, 1941, pp.186-
187).

C. *Mather was upset when any of his children died, finding it difficult to submit. For example, his daughter of a few months was overlaid by her nurse:

The spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, helped
mee, I hope, to a patient and cheerful
Submission, under this calamity: tho' I
sensibly found, an Assault of Temptation from
Satan, accompanying it (vol. 7, p.185).

and when a daughter aged $2\frac{1}{2}$ was dying, he wrote:

I begg'd, I begg'd, that such a bitter Cup, as
the Death of that lovely Child, might pass from
me Just before she died, she asked me
to pray with her; which I did, with a distressed,
but resigning Soul; and I gave her up unto the

Lord Lord, I am oppressed; undertake
for me!

(C. *Mather, 1663-1728, vol. 8,
p.261).

Many of the British diarists who noted the death of a child experienced similar grief: Byrom, Erskine, Evelyn, Grange, Housman and Josselin. Erskine lost three children from the measles within a few weeks.

My dear, sweet, and pleasant child, Ralph
[aged 2] died on Thursday . . . His death
was very grievous and affecting to my wife
and me; but good is the will of the Lord (266).

After Ralph's death:

I was called to return thanks, which I did; but
towards the end, when I came to take little
notice of the present providence, that God had
plucked one of the sweet flowers of my family,
my heart burst out into tears, so that I was
able to go no further (268).

A few days later Erskine wrote he had "been sadly, sadly,
afflicted with the loss of other two pleasant children": Henry
aged 9 and Alexander aged 5. Alexander was the last to die:

My affections were exceedingly kind to him, and
I was comforting myself in having him but
it seems the Lord will not allow me to settle
my affections on anything here below. I cannot
express the grief of my heart for the loss of
this child, the other two strokes being so late!
(Erskine, 1680-1754, p.270).

Evelyn (1620-1706) wrote that his son of a few weeks was overlaid
by his nurse: "to our extreme sorrow, being now againe reduced
to one: but God's will be done" (vol. 2, p.164). In addition, his
5-year-old son died "to our inexpressible grief and affliction"
(vol. 2, p.96). Housman (1680? -1735) regarded it as "A Trial
indeed the greatest I may say that I ever felt" when her young

son died (57). Josselin was more upset at the death of a child rather than an infant, although he did regard it as "sad" when his infant son died: "it was ye youngest and our affections not so wonted unto it" (47). This contrasts with the emotion he displayed at the death of a daughter of almost 8 years.

Manuscripts. Four texts refer to the death of a young child and all reveal at least some grief. Pledger was able to control his distress; although he had prayed for the recovery of his 4-year-old daughter, when she died, he wrote:

I thank God I was in composed frame as I had given her up to God in baptism, I wd not so play y hypocrit as to be unwilling to part with her at gods call.

(Pledger, 1665-?, p.73).

Stockton (1630-80) kept a day of fasting and "humiliation" when any of his children died, regarding in particular the death of his only son as an "affliction" (77). Mrs. Stockton (1635? -?) referred to "The sorrow & trouble of parting" when her offspring died (25). Rules' (1695? -?) 4-month-old daughter was probably overlaid by her mother. When she was found dead in the morning, Rule wrote: "What a hard evil this was to us both y lord only knows" (86).

Discussion

These results clearly show that many parents prior to the 18th century were exceedingly distressed at the death of a young child, although it seems as if parents were not so upset at the death of an infant (see for example the quotations from Evelyn and Josselin in the 17th century). Parents still did grieve at the death of a baby; but, as Josselin states, they were not as attached to an infant as to an older child.

The 18th century

Diaries. Six diarists expressed no grief at the death of a young child: Braithwaite, *Hazard, M. *Holyoke, S. *Holyoke, *Preston and Steadman. Other American and British diarists revealed more distress⁶ (see Appendix C). For example, *Bayard wrote, a few days after the death of her son:

Oh cruel recollections! this day my beloved
Child would have been nine months old, the age
I fondly flattered myself he would have run alone
- but alas! how often does a mysterious
Providence cut off our hopes and blast our most
favourite plans; he was a promising child as
ever lived, but hard as the trial was, last Saturday
he was committed to the silent grave.

(*Bayard, 1769? -?, p.122).

*Huntington lost a son of almost 2 and, 11 days later, a daughter of 5 years. She noted her feelings on the death of her son:

Thus the fond and cherished babe left me at a
moment's warning. It fell upon me like a
thunderbolt The greatest shock was the
first. But my mind was unsettled all that and
the next day. I hardly knew where or what I
was; so little sensible had I been how this
darling babe had entwined himself about every
fibre of my heart.

(*Huntington, 1791-1823, p.295).

When Elizabeth then died, *Huntington felt that this was too much and she "sunk at once" (298). *Silliman's eldest child died shortly before his fifth birthday:

This bereavement took fast hold on me. The
shaft of death, which never before had been
discharged in this house, was levelled against
my oldest son, a child of the most attractive
traits.

(*Silliman, 1779-1864, p.277).

*Silliman thought it a "deep sorrow when his son's beautiful form was laid in a premature grave" (277).

The British diarists also expressed deep grief at a child's death. Darby lost her 5-month-old son and thought "it was hard for me to submit" but added:

when we reflect that they are taken away from the evil to come, and are sure they are Glorified Angels dwelling in the Presence of Joy unspeakable . . . oh how can we repine at their happiness.

(Darby, 1716-94, p.84).

Jones was exceedingly distressed at the death of his 18-month-old daughter:

What a gloom overspreads my Soul! . . .
My Soul seems oppressed with a load, which
no length of time will ever lighten. O my
dear little infant, lying dead under this roof!
whose spirit I watched departing yesterday.

(Jones, 1755-1821, p.99).

Jones did think his sorrow was misplaced as his daughter had gone to "certain everlasting bliss" (99). Macready revealed similar grief at the death of his young daughter:

I scarcely know what I did, or how I felt,
except that it was unutterable and hopeless
agony. . . My child is dead - my blessed,
my beloved, my darling child (vol. 2, p.99).

A few days later he wrote:

The thought of that blessed cherub haunts
me everywhere.

(Macready, 1793-1873, vol. 2, p.101).

Trench lost a daughter of only a few days old and a son of 2 within a short time of each other. After the death of her son she wrote:

The loss of my infant daughter, which seemed heavy at the time, shrinks into nothing when compared with this. She was merely a little bud; he was a lovely blossom which had safely passed all the earliest dangers, and gave clearest

promise of delicious fruit Oh, my child,
my child! ... when I saw you cold and
motionless before me how came it my heart did
not break at once.

(Trench, 1768-1837, 1862, p.199).

D. Taylor (1738-1816) regarded the death of two of his children under the age of 3 as a "heavy stroke" (28).

Manuscripts. Two manuscripts refer to the death of a young child. Bishop noted that her 4-year-old daughter died

very unexpect'd in my Arms ... dear Lamb it
was a trying time to me to part with her but as
I am well satisfied there is more room for
thankfulness than to [grieve?] hope I shall make
my self as easy as I can.

(Bishop, 1751-1801, 2.5.86).^{vii}

Oliver's wife died six weeks after the birth of their last child. This child was then sent out to nurse and died there a few months later. Oliver (1741-1883) wrote of his "sorrow for my dear little Infant who was very near my heart particularly" and paid and dismissed the nurse "hoping never to see her again" (13).

Child diaries. Boswell at the age of 14 wrote to his mother, commiserating with her on the death of a son shortly after his birth. He also wrote: "besides if he had been more advanced in years, it would have been much greater grief to you" (vol. 1, p.418). This corresponds to the picture given in other texts, that infants, although mourned, are not mourned as deeply as older children.

The 19th century

Diaries. Four diarists either recorded no emotion at the death of a child or were not upset at the event. *Strang simply entered

vii. As the manuscript pages are not numbered, the date of the entry is given.

the deaths of his offspring in his diary. Two of Wilberforce's children died during the period of his diary (one as an adult and one as an infant) but there is no mention of these deaths in the published text. As Wilberforce did describe writing a letter of condolence to a friend whose son had died, it is likely that he was distressed by the deaths of his own offspring. *Hayes and Waugh were relatively unconcerned. *Hayes' son, born while his father was at war, died at 6 months of age. *Hayes wrote:

I have seen so little of him that I do not realize a loss; but his mother, and still more his grandmother, lose their little dear companion and are very much afflicted.

(*Hayes, 1822-93, p.414).

Waugh (1903-66) wrote of a daughter who died shortly after birth: "Poor little girl, she was not wanted" (489). The rest described considerably more distress⁷ (see Appendix C). All three of *Lovell's children died within 18 months of each other. The day after the death of her last child, aged 5:

[1] looked in vain for some token of childish play. The order and stillness of the house oppressed me. I sank under it (109).

One year later she wrote:

Our hearts still bleed.

(*Lovell, 1809? -?, p.109).

*Prentiss' son aged 3 died, followed four months later by his 4-week-old sister. *Prentiss herself was ill at the time and grieved deeply for her two children:

Empty hands, empty heart, a worn-out exhausted body, and unutterable longings to flee from a world that has had for me so many sharp experiences. God help me, my baby; my baby! God help me, my little lost Eddy.

(*Prentiss, 1818-78, p.137).

*Ward wrote, after the death of his 11-month-old son:

I need not dwell on the grief and tears which wrenched our hearts. I need not describe the void which now exists. It is the duty of this little journal to register only cold facts.

(*Ward, 1841-1931, p.200).

The British diarists revealed similar grief. Cowell recorded the anniversary of the deaths of her children in her diary. For example:

On this day, thirteen years ago, our first-born, our darling Joe died, three years and three months old. To this day his memory is a precious, a delicious sadness to us, but oh what wild what disobedient agony did we endure for years. God gave us many sweet children, but we pined for the one taken.

(Cowell, 1820? -?, p.10).

J. Russell's wife died of diphtheria, followed shortly after by their 5-year-old daughter:

I thought the cup of misery had been full enough, but it seems not. The child too had to go, and I have lost for ever the sweet caressing ways and the affectionate heart that might if anything could have been some consolation.... It is cruel, unspeakably cruel!

(J. Russell, 1842-76, p.571).

Timm's daughter died at the age of $2\frac{1}{2}$:

How transient are all things here below! how soon are our hopes and prospects blasted! my babe, my dear Mary Anne is taken from me, to bloom in paradise. Ah! I fondly hoped she would have been spared to us; but God has seen good to separate us, perhaps but for a little while. O how painful to nature! my heart bleeds. I am jealous of the worms; I do not like to give my Mary Anne to them; but the mandate is, 'dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return' I know it is my duty to submit - to be resigned

(Timms, 1808-44?, p.87).

Autobiographies. *Bowers wrote that he:

was born into a home sorely stricken by the
death of my idolized four-year-old sister
just one week before.

(*Bowers, 1880-1958, p.7).

This child's death "haunted" *Bower's father for the rest of his life. *Lee (1812-77), Mormon and polygamist, recalled only the dates of his children's deaths.

Discussion

The texts reveal that parental grief at the death of a child changes little through the centuries: the vast majority mourned their offspring deeply. There were a few diarists who recorded no emotion in each century - these were either indifferent or simply felt their diary was not the place to describe their grief. The evidence does not provide any support for the argument that, prior to the 18th century (Pinchbeck and Hewitt, 1969, would argue prior to the 19th), parents regarded the deaths of their young children with "indifference".

4.2 Parental Attitudes to the Death of Children over 6

As the texts reveal the same distress at the death of older offspring already described in section 4.1, much less quotation will be given in this section.

The 16th century

Diaries. Only two diarists suffered the loss of an older child. Hope (1585-1646) regarded it as a "sore straik" when his adult daughter died (153). H. Mildmay (1592-1667) did not grieve long for his adolescent son. Two weeks after the latter's death, Mildmay

wrote that the "house [was] full to dinner and no peace but music and mirth all the day and night" (91).

The 17th century

Diaries. *Danforth, *Hammond and C. *Mather lost older offspring. *Danforth revealed no emotion; *Hammond was upset and C. *Mather expressed the same grief he experienced at the death of his younger offspring.

In the British sample, Clegg, Evelyn, Josselin, Martindale and Newcome endured the death of an older child. All suffered distress and, of those who lost both an older and younger child, more grief was felt for the former. Evelyn referred to the death of an infant as occurring to "our extreme sorrow"; the death of a 5-year-old as to our "inexpressible grief and affliction"; to the death of a 20-year-old daughter "to our unspeakable sorrow and affliction". Josselin similarly revealed more grief at the death of an 8-year-old than a baby:

it ^{viii} was a precious child, a bundle of myrrhe, a bundle of sweetness: she was a child of 10,000, full of wisdom, womanlike gravity, knowledge, sweet expressions of God, apt in her learning, tender-hearted and loving, an obedient child to us. . . . Lord I rejoice I have such a present for thee . . . it lived desired and died lamented.
(Josselin, 1616-83, p.74).

Manuscripts. Only one, that of Osborne (1631-1712) contains evidence of the death of an older child. He expressed no emotion on the death of his 11-year-old daughter.

Autobiographies. Rich's only child, a son of 21, died from smallpox:

viii. Although Josselin referred to this child as 'it', it could hardly be argued that he was therefore unaware of her presence.

to my inexpressible sorrow It was so sad an affliction that it would certainly have sunk me had not my good and gracious God assisted me to bear it.

(Rich, 1624-78, p. 29).

Her husband was also the "saddest afflicted person he could possibly be" (30). Stout (1665-1752) recalled that his mother regarded the death of her two youngest sons as so great an "affliction" that "she continued in much sorrow for a long time" (76).

The 18th century

Diaries. The diaries of Goff and *Hiltzheimer record no grief at the death of an older child. Goff (1730? -?), as with the illness of her offspring, would appear to be totally unmoved: although informed that her daughter was ill, and later that she had died, Goff did not return home from a visit, not even to attend the funeral. However, this was not the case with the other diarists who were distressed by the death of any of their children⁸ (see Appendix C). *Stiles (1727-95) thought it a "mournful distressing Day" when his adult daughter died. The next day was also one of "Sorrow and Mourning" (204).

Many of the British diaries reveal the conflict between faith and grief. For example, when Macready's daughter died, at the age of 20, he wrote (showing the same distress as at the death of a younger child):

O God! how are we to address Thee? - how to acknowledge Thy goodness to us and bend to Thy dispensations, which appear severe - but no doubt are mercies! My thoughts are so confused, entangled, dulled, that I feel stupidly, and stagnant in mind and heart.

(Macready, 1793-1873, p. 453).

Sandford's eldest daughter died at the age of 21. He addressed

himself to God:

As a parent I bless thee for the comfort which during her life I ever experienced from her obedience and dutiful affection. Why, therefore, should I be unwilling to resign her to thy will? I feel this sorrow weigh down my heart; support me, for I am nothing but weakness.

(Sandford, 1766-1830, p.58).

Lettsom, Moore and Thrale lost a younger and an older child and all experienced more distress at the death of the latter. Moore, for example, revealed little emotion at the death of an infant, compared with the following outburst after the death of his 16-year-old daughter:

I could no longer restrain myself - the feelings I had been so long suppressing found vent, and a fit of loud violent sobbing seized me, in which I felt as if my chest was coming asunder.

(Moore, 1779-1852, vol. 6, p.21).

Manuscripts. Rowntree's (1765? -?) adolescent daughter appeared to succumb to tuberculosis and her mother revealed little emotion, merely writing "our great loss is Her lasting gain" (124).

Autobiographies. *Hicks (1748-1830) recalled the deaths of his children but did not express any emotion. In contrast, Townsend (1757-1826) described the day he heard of his youngest son's death as "a day of deep distress to me and mine" (115).

The 19th century

Very few 19th century texts refer to the death of an older child, evidence being only available in the diaries.

Diaries. Alford, Bailey, Benson, Bright, Cooper, Fowler, *Long, *Otey and Sopwith all lost an older child. All were distressed. *Long, for example, was very close to his adult

daughter and when she died wrote:

I am conscious all the time of a sense of indefinable loss; of being broken, if that is not too strong a word.

(*Long, 1838-1915, p.229).

Alford described the death of his 11-month-old son as "our bitter loss". However, he was quite distraught at the death of his 10-year-old son - "the joy of our hearts and the desire of our eyes", writing:

To think that those cherished ones, from whom we carefully fenced off every rough blast, whom we led by the hand in every thorny path, have by themselves gone through the dark valley.

(Alford, 1810-71, p.191).

Although he eventually accepted his loss, he and his wife were still "not what we were". Cooper wrote of the death of his son of 16:

The loss to us is irreparable; if we regard it only in reference to ourselves, we can neither describe nor appreciate calamity. What happiness had we not promised our declining years, from his respect, his love, his sympathy, his piety.

(Cooper, 1801-85, p.284).

Discussion

Overall, there were a few diarists who would appear to have been unmoved at the death of a child (Goff, H. Mildmay and Waugh) - these were not confined to the early centuries. In addition, a few more writers did not express any grief at the death of a child and may, therefore, have been indifferent. Again, these appeared in every century and with regard to all ages of offspring. The vast majority of writers were extremely distressed at the

death of a child, no matter at what age the child died. However, it does appear that, in every century studied, young infants were not mourned as deeply as older children. It appears that the parents grieved at the death of a baby for what that infant would become whereas, at the death of an older child, they grieved not only for what the child would become, but also for what the child had been - as Trench in the 18th century explicitly states. There would seem to have been no change in the extent of parental grief over the centuries and no support at all for the argument that parents before the 18th century were indifferent to the death of their young offspring, whereas after the 18th century they grieved deeply.

Of particular interest is the number of writers who were unable to reconcile their emotion at the death of a child: Brownlow and Wallington in the 16th; Erskine, Evelyn, Josselin and C. *Mather in the 17th; *Bayard, Boswell, Darby, L. and M. *Dow, Fry, F. Gray, Kilham, Jones, Macready, Sandford, Skinner and D. Taylor in the 18th; and Cowell, *Duncan, Timms and *Todd in the 19th. It would seem that it was very difficult for a parent not to react to the death of a child as a parent, no matter how strongly their religious faith urged otherwise.

5.0

CONCLUSION

There seems to have been some slight changes in the concept of childhood. Children were seen by a few parents as being depraved in the 17th century, innocent in the 18th and as both depraved and innocent in the 19th. In addition, the texts, particularly in the 18th century, contain more discussion on the

nature of childhood. A few of the 17th century Puritans and a number of 18th and 19th century parents were also more concerned with their duties as a parent and the texts reveal the doubts of many 18th and 19 century writers with regard to their competence as a parent.

On the other hand, the entries in the texts describing parental reaction to the illness and death of a child reveal virtually no change. The vast majority of all parents were anxious whenever a child was ill and grief-stricken if a child died (although, as has been said, they were less distressed at the death of an infant).

REFERENCES

- Ariès, Philippe (1962): Centuries of Childhood: Jonathan Cape, London.
- Axtell, James (1974): The School upon a Hill. Education and Society in Colonial New England; Yale University Press, New York & London.
- Beales, Derek (1969): From Castlereagh to Gladstone 1815-1885; Thomas Nelson & Sons Ltd., London.
- Bremner, Robert, ed. (1970-73): Children and Youth in America; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Gouge, William (1622): Of Domesticall Duties; John Haviland, London.
- Hill, Christopher (1967): Reformation to Industrial Revolution; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Illick, Joseph (1976): "Child-rearing in seventeenth century England and America"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.303-350.
- Locke, John (1699): Some Thoughts Concerning Education; A. and J. Churchill, London.
- de Mause, Lloyd, ed. (1976): "The evolution of childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.1-74.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1976): Seven Years Old in the Home Environment; George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.
- Owen, John (1974): The Eighteenth Century 1714-1815; Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London.
- Pinchbeck, I. and Hewitt, M. (1969): Children in English Society; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Powell, Chilton (1917): English Domestic Relations 1487-1653; University of Columbia Press, New York.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1763): Emile or an Education;
J. Nourse & P. Vaillant, London.

Schücking, Levin (1969): The Puritan Family. A Social Study
from Literary Sources; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Shorter, Edward (1976): The Making of the Modern Family;
Collins, London.

Smith, Daniel (1977): "Autonomy and affection: parents and
children in eighteenth-century Chesapeake families"; The
Psychohistorical Review, vol. 6, pp.32-51.

Stone, Lawrence (1977): The Family, Sex and Marriage in England
1500-1800; Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London.

Thompson, R. (1974): Women in Stuart England and America;
Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp.145-161.

Tucker, M. J. (1976): "The child as beginning and end: fifteenth
and sixteenth century English childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd,
ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.
229-258.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCIPLINE AND CONTROL

[The increased solicitude of adults]
inflicted on him [child] the birch, the
prison cell - in a word, the punish-
ments usually reserved for convicts
from the lowest strata of society.

(Ariès, 1962)

Century after century of battered children
grew up and in turn battered their own
children.

(de Mause, 1976)

harsh discipline was the child's lot, and
they were often terrorised deliberately,
and, not infrequently, sexually abused.

(Plumb, 1975)

Whipping was the normal method of
discipline in a sixteenth century home
Breaking the will of the child was the prime
aim, and physical punishment the standard
method.

(Stone, 1977)

INTRODUCTION

If de Mause (1976) is "obsessed with discovering child abuse or neglect in times past" (Smith, 1977), then most other writers on the history of childhood are obsessed with the disciplinary nature of the parental role. It has been used as the litmus test of parent-child relations in the past. In fact, most works on the treatment of children in previous centuries give the impression that parents only interacted with their offspring in order to whip them. Ariès (1962) argues that more severe forms of discipline (including a dramatic increase in adult supervision) appeared at the same time as a concept of childhood, i. e. during the 17th century. Most authors, though, believe that children have always been treated harshly at home and at school and that more humane methods of discipline did not appear till the mid-18th century (see for example, Lyman, 1976; de Mause, 1976; McLaughlin, 1976; Plumb, 1975; Sears, 1975; Shorter, 1976; Stone, 1977 and Tucker, 1976). Some authors, such as Robertson (1976) and Stone (1977) argue that children were again subjected to severe discipline and total parental control in the 19th century.

Most historians appear to have been examining the hypothesis that parents, and other adults, have evolved from treating children with cruelty to treating them with kindness. However, as has been shown in Chapter Two, little systematic analysis has been applied to any source of evidence. Thus the findings of these historians merely generate another hypothesis regarding the treatment of children in the past: that a great deal of individual variation in methods of discipline has always existed and thus no century was/will be notably cruel or kind. This chapter will be concerned with the methods used to discipline children, both in the home and at school, and also with the amount of control which parents tried to

exert over their children's lives.ⁱ The texts have been divided into 50 year time periods, from 1500 to 1900, in order to discover whether or not modes of discipline have changed over time.

2.0 METHODS OF DISCIPLINE FROM 1500-1900

2.1 Discipline in the Home

Table 12 gives the extent to which the four sources of evidence used discussed parental discipline and control.

i. The extent of parental control over a child's choice of career or marriage partner will be discussed in Chapter Eight.

Table 12: Number of Sources containing Information on Discipline in the Home

Time Period	Source														
	Diary			Manuscript			Child diary			Autobiography			All		
	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample
1500 - 1550	0	2	100	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
1550 - 1600	1	7	62	-	-	-	0	1	50	0	5	83	1	13	67
1600 - 1650	0	9	36	-	-	-	0	2	50	0	9	82	0	20	47
1650 - 1700	3	6	32	0	2	100	0	2	50	0	4	100	3	14	45
1700 - 1750	5	17	32	0	2	100	1	0	11	2	11	72	8	30	39
1750 - 1800	5	19	30	0	1	20	7	8	32	7	21	72	19	49	44
1800 - 1850	13	21	45	0	0	0	5	12	37	10	21	97	28	54	53
1850 - 1900	0	7	54	0	0	0	0	4	67	0	8	67	0	19	58

1500 - 1549

Diaries. Two adult diarists were available for this period and both referred to physical punishment:

Katharin [8 years] by a blow on the eare given by her mother did bled at the nose very much, which did stay for an houre and more.

(Dee, 1527-1608, p.31).ⁱⁱ

The iiij day of December was a voman [set in the] pelere [pillory] for beytyng of her chyld with rodes.

(Machyn, 1498-1563, p.98).ⁱⁱⁱ

In addition, Machyn also remarked on a young apprentice beaten so severely by his master that the skin was taken off his back. For that the master was again set in the pillory and whipped till, as Machyn noted with grim satisfaction, "blude ran downe" (311).

1550 - 1599

Diaries. Only one American diarist was born before 1600 in the texts studied here. Although *Jefferay did not mention any specific method of discipline, his diary contains some evidence on the mode of discipline he employed. He wrote of one of his daughters, who had fallen in love:

There has a gentleness come over her, also, that sets vastly well, Her brother and sister do scarce understand how she, who did at times task them so sharply on their duties, and did stand so for her own rights, can have become so seeming tame.

-
- ii. There is no way of telling from the diary if this was accidental or a punishment.
- iii. This punishment Machyn noted was also given on another occasion for "sedyssyous wordes & rumors & conseles agaynst the quen [s] mageste" (102) which reveals the extent of the condemnation against the beating of the child with rods. (Treason to 16th century England was a very serious crime.)

Her mother and I read her more clearly, as she turns to us with this new gentleness in her eyes, know, as well as if she had made speech of it, that now, (as life broadens and deepens) a new understanding of our love and care for her has come; and that she sees how our correctings, even (tiresome or needless seeming), were in love to cure a fault, or a weakness that should grow to one.

(*Jefferay, 1591-1675, p.132).

Of the British diarists for this period, not one noted inflicting any kind of physical punishment. There are signs that at least some of the parents wished to regulate their offspring's behaviour. For example, Penry (1563-93), while awaiting execution for treason, and with the eldest of his daughters not yet 4 years of age, wrote a long letter of advice to his children on how to regulate their behaviour. He advised them on such matters as religion and marriage and obviously had intended exerting some control over his daughters' lives if he had lived. Similarly, Winthrop (1587-16?) wrote letters of advice to one son at college, advising the latter not to become too worldly or extravagant and not to neglect his studies, and Hope (1585? -1646) also wrote to one of his sons telling him to "stay his tour, and to command him to attend his studies" (42).

Hope and Winthrop also tried remonstrating with sons who were continually in debt - though as neither father refused to bail their son out when necessary, they were implicitly encouraging their sons to continue such behaviour. Winthrop, for example, wrote to his son:

I have disbursed a great deal of money for you, more than my estate will bear I have many other children that are unprovided, and I see my life is uncertain.

(Winthrop, 1587-16?, p.285).

Powell (1581-1656) told his 18-year-old son to leave home; but gave no indication as to what the problem was, merely stating "my sone William disobedient departed my house" (23).

Other diarists, on the other hand, were not so concerned with controlling their children. H. Mildmay (1592-1667) over-indulged his second son, nicknamed "Nompée" and his favourite child. For example, though Mildmay wished his sons to be well educated and sent his other sons to Cambridge, as Nompée disliked school, Mildmay gave in to his son's wishes and allowed him to leave. Nompée was also given money whenever he wanted it, and was generally spoilt by his father to the extent that the latter had no control over his son. Mildmay did not try to discipline Nompée himself, but rather appealed to God, writing, for example, "Nompée a bad boy. God amend him" (63). Clifford (1590-1676) was upset by her 5-year-old daughter's behaviour. Margaret's speech had been "very ill so as strangers cannot understand her" all winter. In addition, she had been "so out of temper" that it "grieved" Clifford "to think of it". However, Clifford made no attempt to punish Margaret for "all these inconveniences"; but instead endured them believing that her daughter was suffering from "some distemper in her head" (110).

Ariès (1962) has claimed that past parents were indifferent to their children and thus the latter were subjected to very little parental restraint or supervision. Wallington's diary reveals that parents may not always know the whereabouts of their offspring; but they would prefer to do so and are concerned if a child is missing. His daughter aged 3 years and 8 months went out:

with a nother little childe to play as we had thought but it seems my dafter Sarah left the other childe and went herself as far as [the] fell.

Once it was realised that Sarah was missing, Wallington went out to look for her until she was brought home by a neighbour.

Wallington was obviously relieved, writing that, if Sarah had not been found:

what strange distractfull thoughts should we have had and how would we eate or have slept that night with thinking what is become of our poore childe, thinking yt maybe it is drowned at the wather side or some other mischief hath befallen it.

(Wallington, 1598-1658, MS.,
p.435) iv

Child diaries. There are two child diaries for this period; that of Tudor contains no reference to discipline. Clifford, aged 13, wrote:

My Mother being extreme angry with me for riding before with Mr. Mere, where my Mother in her anger commanded that I should lie in a chamber alone, which I could not endure, but my cousin Frances got the key of the chamber and lay with me.

(Clifford, 1590-1676, p.11).

Clifford does not explain why her mother objected to her riding with Mr. Mere; but as she disobeyed her mother's command it appears that 16th century children were not as much in awe of their parents as has been suggested.

Autobiographies. Six autobiographies are available for this period and three record physical punishment. Forman (1552-1601) wrote that, as he was the youngest, he was his father's favourite child "but his mother nor brethren loved him not" (3). His father

iv. This quote was not contained in the published text. Again note the use of 'it' to refer to his daughter (see Josselin, Chapter Five, section 4.2). As with Josselin, it could hardly be argued that Wallington was indifferent to his daughter.

died when Forman was 11 and from then on life at home was not too pleasant - Forman being "beaten" by his mother and siblings for any faults so that he left home to live with his aunt at the age of 12. G. Mildmay noted that she was whipped to "inculcate virtuous principles". She and her two sisters were brought up to behave with decorum and propriety:

[their governess] counselled us when we were alone so to behave ourselves as yf all the worlde did looke upon us, & to doe nothing in secret wherof our conscience might accuse us (120).

Mildmay's father obviously had control over how she was reared. He liked women to be reserved and serene so as to present a:

good hope of stabilised mynde & a virtuous disposition to be in her. I have seen him with his owne hands (for example's sake) scourge a young man, naked from his girdle upwards, with fresh rods, for making but a showe & countenance of a saucie & unreverent behaviour towards us his children, & put him from his service.

(G. Mildmay, 1552-1620, p.122).

Norwood wrote that, as a child:

often on a Lord's day at night or Monday morning I prayed to escape beating that week, or when I was sent on an errand two or three miles into the country, that I might not lose my way.

(Norwood, 1590-1675, p.10).

*Jefferay and Wallington, however, recalled no such discipline. *Jefferay (1591-1675) wrote that his mother "was ever a good and tender mother to me" (16) and Wallington (1598-1658) described his mother as "very tender-hearted to her children" (x).

Discussion

The 16th century texts contain little detailed information on discipline and control. However, the evidence they do contain does

not support the picture given by most historians of severe whipping being the normal mode of punishment (Machyn's comment would appear to explicitly contradict this picture), and of children being totally subject to their parents' will. The parents would appear to prefer advice to commands and the remonstrations of Hope and Winthrop suggest that some parents were unable to control the behaviour of their older offspring, even when they disapproved of it. In addition, the very fact that Hope, H. Mildmay and Winthrop were prepared to support their rebellious sons, no matter what, implies that at least some children were allowed a great deal of autonomy.

The autobiographies contain more evidence on physical punishment than the diaries. Forman would appear to be an exceptional case - not all the children in the family were treated as he was. However, both G. Mildmay and Norwood seemed to have experienced quite a number of whippings, although neither appears to have considered these unduly severe. In contrast, *Jefferay and Wallington refer to their "tender" mother. In general, it would seem as if there was a wide range of parental discipline in the 16th century.

1600 - 1649

Diaries. No American diarist was available for this period. Of the British diarists, Newcome was the only one to state he inflicted physical punishment (4% of the sample).

I discharged my duty of correction to my poor child [about 12], prayed with him after, entreating the Lord that it might be the last correction (if it were his will) that he should need.

(Newcome, 1627-95, p.302).

Newcome was continually upset by this son's behaviour later on.

Brodie, Freke, Josselin and Newdigate all tried remonstrating with troublesome sons.

In the Evening I called for my Son, and exhorted and admonished him to self-trial, and to more exactness, sincerity and watchfulness over his heart and thoughts than ever.

(Brodie, 1617-80, p.96).

and again later noted: "My hart rais with indignation" against the same son (179). Freke wrote a letter to her adult son:

as I thought it my Dutty to Admonish him of his Errors. I had only as usually a Rude Answer For Itt.

(Freke, 1641-1714, p.60).

Josselin threatened his son with disinheritance and, as John did not reform, Josselin wrote:

John declared for his disobedience no son; I should allow him nothing except he tooke himselfe to bee a servt; yet if he would depart and live in service orderly I would allow him 10/- weekly; if he so walkt as to become God's son, I should yet own him for mine.

(Josselin, 1616-83, p.167).

Josselin nevertheless did not carry out these threats; John remained at home and eventually inherited his father's estate. Josselin's view of the parent-child relationship was based on reciprocity rather than the natural authority and superiority of the parent. He believed that children should recompense their parents for the amount of care they had received by being obedient, although he did not attempt to force his offspring to go against their own wishes and even continued to support John despite his condemnation of his son's behaviour. Newdigate also attempted to make one son improve his behaviour:

I will this day enter my son John's Faults here, which I tell him of to make him humble.

(Newdigate, 1644-1710, p.298).

Newdigate fined his daughters if they annoyed him.

Evelyn, Martindale and Slingsby all tried to exert control over their children by giving them advice:

I gave my sonn an Office, with instructions how to govern his youth; I pray God give him the grace to make a right use of it.

(Evelyn, 1620-1706, vol. 2, p.334).

Martindale (1623-86) considered it as "a sunshine gleam" when his son finally agreed to accept his father's advice (215). Slingsby was in the same position as Penry - awaiting execution - and like him wrote a letter of advice to his children.

I am to address my self out of my Fatherly and tender care towards You. The ground of my discourse shall be Instruction; where-to, I am confident You will be ready to give the more serious attention, in regard it proceeds from his mouth, and devotion of his heart; who with a parental and tender affection ever loved You while he was living: and now dying leaves You this Memorial as my last Legacy for your future benefit, improvement and direction.

(Slingsby, 1601-58, p.197).

He wished his children to be true to their religion, not to be active in affairs of state, keep good company and a clear conscience and to be just.

Heywood did try to be severe with his sons of 12 and 13 years; but relented on seeing their distress.

on Saturday morning my sons having not made their latin in expectation to goe to Halifax, were loath to goe to Schoole, yet I threatened them, they went crying, my bowels workt and I sent to call them back.

(Heywood, 1630-1702, vol. 1, p.223).

Child diaries. Crosfield (1602-63) began his diary at the age of 16 and, from the information in his diary, it seems that he was

on very friendly terms with his father. He recorded no attempt of his parents to force him to give in to their wishes.

Autobiographies. Two of the 11 autobiographies for this period do not refer to discipline in any way (Newcome and Wood). Ashmole and Pringle recalled receiving physical punishment. Ashmole related that his mother:

was continually instilling into my ears such religious and moral precepts as my younger years were capable of. Nor did she ever fail to correct my faults, always adding sharp reproofs and good lectures to boot.

(Ashmole, 1617-92, p.26).

Pringle wrote:

In my childhood, tho I was much indulged by my parents ;... I was often led also to acknowledge God in my childish concernments, such as, the getting of my lesson, on being freed from reproofs; frequently praying to escape correction, when I expected it.

(Pringle, 1625-67, p.3).

Martindale (1623-86) worked for his father for a time and recalled that the latter gave him too much work to do and punished him if it was not done. Evelyn and Heywood recalled the general form of the discipline they received as children and both seemed to think it was fair and just. Evelyn, for example, referred to his father as being:

discreetly severe, yet liberal on all just occasions, to his children, strangers, and servants.

(Evelyn, 1648-85, vol. 1, p.2).

Heywood described his mother as:

though she was very indulgent to us, yet was she severe and sharp agt sin, especially such sins as she saw us inclined to, oh how did she disgrace sinful ways! and endeavour to prevent

our falling thereunto.

(Heywood, 1630-1702, vol. 1, p.51).

Freke, Hume, Josselin and Rich recorded that they received indulgent treatment as children. Freke (1641-1714) recalled that she had a very happy childhood and that she never heard an unkind word spoken to her. Josselin (1616-83) wrote that his father "loved me exceedingly" (3) and Rich (1624-78) referred to her father as "indulgent" and to Lady Claytone who looked after her (Rich's mother died when Rich was 3) as making "so much of me" (2).

Pringle was the only autobiographer to note the treatment of his own offspring. Believing that he may not live till his youngest child reached the age of "understanding", he wrote some words of advice for that child.

Discussion

The evidence from these texts is very similar to that contained in the 16th century sources: a few parents inflicted physical punishment, others tried remonstrations and threats and yet others tried advising their offspring. Again it was the autobiographers who recalled the strictest discipline, although even here the discipline was certainly not as harsh as has been argued. It seems that parents would like to control their offspring's behaviour, although they did not always find it possible. The evidence from Pringle and Slingsby (and Penry in the 16th century), who all wrote letters of advice for their children, suggests that the parents did think it was their responsibility to regulate their children's behaviour. However, as the diaries of Brodie, Josselin and Newdigate reveal, parents were not always successful in this aim. In fact they seemed to realise the limits of parental authority - Evelyn and Martindale merely hoped their offspring would heed their advice and those diarists who disapproved of their son's behaviour continued to come to the latter's aid.

1650 - 1699

Diaries. Blundell, *Byrd, Morris, Richards and *Sewall (18% of the sample) stated that they used physical punishment as a disciplinary technique. *Byrd did not seem to whip his own children but did record that he whipped his niece and nephew (reared by *Byrd): the former for soiling the bed and not learning to read and the latter because he also "would not learn his books" (1941, p.204). *Byrd did not approve of too severe a punishment as he noted: "I quarrelled with my wife for being cruel to Suky Brayne, [niece] though she deserved it" (1941, p.285). He would also seem to have been fairly lenient with his own children, writing: "I was out of humour with my wife for forcing Evie [daughter of almost 3 years] to eat against her will" (1941, p.182). *Sewall recorded whipping two of his sons, each on one occasion. The punishment of Joseph has already been referred to. *Sewall's 10-year-old son was "corrected for breach of the 9th Commandment, saying he had been at the Writing School, when he had not" (vol. 5, p.225). *Sewall also reared some of his grandchildren after their parents' death. He eventually became so exasperated with his adolescent grandson's behaviour that he asked the boy to leave his house. Blundell (1669-1737) did hit his daughters while they were young and did exert control over them as young adults, although not without a consideration for their wishes. For example, when Blundell went to fetch his daughters home from the convent school they attended in France, his elder daughter, then aged 19, refused to go home because she wished to stay and become a nun. Her father was annoyed and insisted she return to England; but conceded that if, after a period at home, she still wished to become a nun, she could do so. Morris also inflicted some slight physical punishment, but did not regard it as very effective:

Mr Nooth [son's tutor] telling my Son [aged 12] his Fault three or 4 times in Holding his Pen, & he committing the same again I struck him a slap on the Hinder Part of his Head with the Palm of my Hand; But that did not make him mend it.
(Morris, 1659-1727, p.91).

Richards' method of disciplining his son resulted in a quarrel with his wife:

This evening, I beat Jack for his bad [behaviour] in play, upon that A. wife showed herself so insolent that I put her out of the room (100).

One month later, he wrote:

At table I had words with A. about my son John, [Jack] which became at last very high, and the next day after dinner she began to renew the quarrel violently.
(Richards, 1660? -1721, p.106).

The other diarists recorded alternative methods of discipline. C. *Mather was the first to articulate any abstract concept of discipline:

The first Chastisement, which I inflict for an ordinary Fault, is, to lett the Child see and hear me in an Astonishment, and hardly able to beleieve that the Child could do so base a Thing, but beleieving that they will never do it again. I would never come, to give a child a Blow; except in Case of Obstinacy or some gross Enormity.

To be chased for a while out of my Presence, I would make to be look'd upon, as the sorest Punishment in the Family (vol. 7, p.535).

He described an example of his method of discipline:

My little son Sammy [4 years] did not carry it so kindly to his little sister Lizzy, as I would have had him. I chid him for his Crossness, and gave her a Peece of Pomecitron, but would give none to him to punish him for being cross to her (vol. 8, p.44).

*Mather, in theory, wished to have total control over his offspring:

I first begett in them a high Opinion of their
Father's Love to them, and of his being best
able to judge, what shall be good for them.

Then I make them sensible, tis a Folly for
them to pretend into any Witt and Will of
their own; they must resign all to me, who
will be sure to do what is best; my word must
be their Law.

(vol. 8, p.535).

In practice, *Mather did not possess such authority; for example,
against his father's wishes, Samuel underwent inoculation and
*Mather had a lot of trouble from his elder sons. He did tell one
son to leave home; but later asked him to return. *Mather would
intervene on a child's behalf if he thought a punishment too harsh:

My little Son waits upon his Grandfather every
Day, for his Instruction, as well as upon other
Tutors and Teachers. This day I sent him on
an Errand, where the Person imposing on his
flexible Temper, detained him so long, that his
Grandfather was displeased at him, for coming
so late; and his Punishment was, that his
Grandfather, did refuse to instruct him, as he
use to do. The Child unable to bear so heavy a
Punishment, as that his Grandfather should not
look favourably upon him, repairs to me, full of
weeping Affliction. Hereupon, I applied myself
with a Note, unto my Father, as an Advocate for
the Child. I pleaded all that could be said by way
of Apology for the Infirmity of the Child. I asked,
that I might bear the Displeasure due for it because
of what had passed relating to it.

(*Mather, 1663-1728, vol. 7, p.583)

Briggins (1672? -1717), while dying, wrote a letter of advice to his
daughters, as earlier diarists had done to their offspring. He
wished them to obey their mother, keep the faith, not to be
extravagant and to help one another. Erskine (1680-1754) must
have been against extreme forms of punishment, resolving as he
did "to be kind" to his children (290). Housman (1680? -1735)

scolded her daughter of 7 years of age for forgetting "to return Thanks to God for her Food" (80) and Morris was annoyed with his 13-year-old daughter for refusing to do as he asked.

My dear Daughter Bettey refus'd to speak French with Mrs Keen; & I taking it unkindly from her, She fell into Tears, & continued grieving in that way even after she came home, so long that I was doubtful of her hurting her constitution: & upon her being sorry for Refusing what was desir'd from her & promising it should be otherwise another time, I forgave her & she was extremely pleas'd with the reconciliation.

(Morris, 1659-1727, p.58).

Manuscripts. Pledger (1665-?) and Rule (1695? -?) gave some indication of their modes of discipline for this period. Pledger's daughter at the age of 4 was very ill and was going to be sent away for her health. Pledger asked God "to prevent her leaving any ill words or actions" (7) while away from home. Rule was upset by the behaviour of his children, particularly their "insuffarable Sloth" with respect to their education (37).

Child diaries. Isham's diary gives another example of the type of control that fathers would like to exert in theory; but did not achieve in practice. While abroad, at the age of 7, Isham wrote to his father telling him he had had his hair cut. His father replied:

I am satisfy'd with the reasons you give me for cutting off your hair, but you might have writ to me about it before you had done it, and ask'it my leave.

(Isham, 1687-1735, p.187).

Ryder (1691-1756) believed in theory "that children ought from gratitude to behave so as to make their parents as easy as possible" (215). In practice, he often quarrelled with his father, although Ryder did regard the latter as "a very fond father to me" (49).

Autobiographies. Fretwell and Pledger both recalled receiving physical punishment - the latter, harsh treatment. Fretwell noted that he was sent to school but:

I suppose I did but continue here a few days, for growing weary of my book, and my dame not correcting me as my mother desired, she took me under her own pedagogy untill I could read in my Bible.

(Fretwell, 1699-1772).

Pledger (1665-?), in his unpublished manuscript, wrote: "I suffered very great severities from 2 mothers in law [stepmothers]" and complained that he was wrongfully accused of faults (2).

Clegg recalled his parents intervening when they did not approve of his behaviour. He was away at a private school, but neglected his studies for a love affair. When his parents were informed by one of the teachers, they removed him from the school and sent him to college earlier than he would have gone. Stout's father, like many of the parents in these texts, wished to leave his children advice. Stout recalled that, when his father was dying:

he called us all, his children, before him, & gave us exhortations to live in the fear of God & in duty & obedience to our mother, & brotherly kindness to each other (73).

Stout and his sister reared two of their brother's children and Stout remarked:

my sister was as careful to nurse and correct them as if they had been her own children.
(Stout, 1665-1752, p.142).

Discussion

For the period 1650-1699 there is an increase in the proportion of diarists who reported inflicting physical punishment, ranging

from a slap to a "whipping"[→]. However, the latter appears to have been inflicted on rare occasions and, as Richards' diary shows, both parents may not necessarily agree with the use of physical punishment as a disciplinary technique. Stone (1977), among others, has suggested that Puritan parents were particularly severe disciplinarians. In the texts studied here, of those who recorded administering a whipping, *Sewall was a Puritan, Blundell a Catholic, Morris belonged to the Church of England and *Byrd and Richards followed a religion but did not specify this in their diary. In addition, another Puritan, C. *Mather, did not believe in physical punishment. It is at least equally likely that it was the personality of the parent which determined the method of discipline, rather than religious beliefs, or an interaction between the two.

As with the previous 50 year period, there seems to be a wide gap between theory and practice. Parents in theory may have wished to have totally submissive offspring - although there is no evidence in the texts to suggest they wished to "break the will" of their children - but, in practice, they did not achieve that aim. Some parents also sympathised with a child's distress (see Heywood and C. *Mather) and therefore it seems highly unlikely they would "batter" their children.

In general, there appears to have been remarkably little change from 1500-1699. The same range of disciplinary techniques are found in each period - apart from 1500-1549 where the sample size (2) was so small. There is one development, though, the emergence of an abstract concept of discipline (C. *Mather). This corresponds with the results obtained in Chapter Five which showed that the first abstract concepts of childhood and of the nature of the parental role appeared in some 17th century Puritans. This could either be due to the impact of the non-conformist

[→] When the diaries which reported punishment are studied, then there is a significant difference between the number of diarists recording the infliction of physical punishment for the period 1600 - 1649 when compared with the sample for the period 1650 - 1699, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 3.98, p < .05$.

religions, forcing man to re-evaluate his existence and/or the influence of the Puritan conduct books. (It is equally likely, of course, that the latter merely reflect normal practice.) The most popular of these works - Gouge (1622) - warned that though parents should "correct" their offspring when necessary, they should also be sure that such a punishment was deserved. He also suggested that parents should reprimand before resorting to whipping and they should consider the child - "if he be young and tender, the lighter correction should be used" (536).

1700 - 1749

Diaries. As would be expected from the results contained in Chapter Five, some of the 18th century diarists expressed how they thought a child should be disciplined (Powys, J. Taylor and Woods). All wished to find a happy mean between excess severity and excess indulgence. For example, J. Taylor wrote:

I have thought a deal on 'Train up a child in the way he should go'. I have considered the New Testament precepts on the same subject; and I have endeavoured to practise them I recollected my being a child myself; how I behaved to my father and how he behaved to me. . . . I took notice also of other families in the neighbourhood, and attempted to derive some improvement from them. I laboured to preserve the love, esteem and affection of my children I endeavoured not to overburden them with work I was especially determined to keep them from following any course of sin, and from sinful companions I made a practice of talking with my children, to instruct them to impress their minds I then understood how unreasonable and cruel it was in parents to scold and beat their children for acting in such and such a manner; when they had taken no pains to instruct them that such actions were wrong.

(J. Taylor, 1743-1819, pp.118-120).

Woods described how she believed children should be disciplined:

The love of liberty and independence is strongly implanted in the human mind. How far it should be indulged in the education and conduct of youth, will, by many people, be differently determined. Some parents throw the reins on the necks of their children at a very early period, and hold them with a very slack hand; while others seem scarcely willing to loosen them a little, so long as they are able to keep hold of them. Either extreme, I believe, is prejudicial. Too tight a curb sometimes makes young people fret under it, and produces an impatience to be entirely free, when more gentle discipline might have produced submission.

Little benefit can arise from more compulsion, either in doing or forbearing, further than as it may gain time for the understanding and judgement to ripen; and if they can be kept in the practice of good, and preserved from evil till that time, it will be a great point gained To keep children in the proper state of obedience, without having them stand in too much awe, is sometimes difficult. I have always wished that they should be afraid of doing wrong, but not afraid of me. . . . I am, from judgement, no great disciplinarian; if I err, I had rather it should be on the lenient side. Fear and force will, no doubt, govern children while little, but having a strong hold on their affections will have most influence over them in their progress through life.

(Woods, 1748-1821, pp. 210-211).

Powys (1739-1817) was also against repressing children.

Boscawen, Boswell, Stedman and Thrale did inflict corporal punishment when they thought it necessary. Boscawen's husband "whipped" one of his sons as a young child; but the diary does not give the reason. Boscawen herself would resort to, or at least threaten, physical punishment if she felt she was losing control.

Billy [4 years] is now perfectly recovered [from inoculation], I thank God. Purging discipline all over, but my discipline to begin for it has been slackened so long it is unknown, how perverse and saucy we are, and how much we deal in the words won't, can't, shan't, ect. To-day he would not eat milk for breakfast, but the rod

and I went to breakfast with him, and though we did not come into action, nor anything like it, yet the bottom of the porringer was very fairly revealed and a declaration made by him; indeed he could not but say it was very good milk (179).

Boscawen did not insist on total obedience. For example, her son disliked dancing the hornpipe before strangers:

I have seen him try when I have pressed it extremely, but he has come running back the first step, "Mama, I'm ashamed don't ask me to dance".

(Boscawen, 1719-1805, p.123).

and Boscawen did not force the issue.

Boswell recorded beating his eldest son for telling a lie; but Boswell did not regard himself as a strict father in general. When his son was an infant, Boswell noted:

[1] dreaded that he would be spoilt by indulgence, and had poor hopes of my own authority as a Father.

(Boswell, 1740-95, vol. 11, p.106).

Four years later, Boswell is still regretting his "too little authority" over his children (vol. 15, p.17).

Stedman noted that his 13-year-old son, Johnny, was "terribly leathered for picking apples from the garden which now was Moore's" and four years later Johnny also got a severe lecture for overspending his allowance (314). Stedman, however, did not believe in excessive punishment.

This evening some words happened between Mama and Johnny, [12 years] about his learning, he being today one year at Tiverton School. She said, "Well, what have you learnt in that time?" which he being affronted at answered, "so much in one year as you'd have done in two", when she struck him a black eye which made high words between she and

I, and she was exceedingly ill all night. [The next day] Johnny now begged her pardon to no purpose; and he went crying to school. She and I again fell out about this, and neither of us took any dinner till in the evening the boy came home, and all was reconciled.

(Stedman, 1744-97, p.276).

Stedman also wrote an advice letter to his son, to be opened after Stedman's death. He wished Johnny to be honest and industrious, obey those above him, not to be extravagant and to take proper diet, air, exercise and recreation.

Thrale would strike her offspring if they disobeyed her; but she tended to threaten first. For example, she threatened her two daughters of 6 and 4 with a whipping for going out of bounds. One of her daughters was a sickly, peevish child and Thrale disliked her. Fearing that she would therefore discipline her too roughly, Thrale decided not to teach Susanna at home, but sent her to boarding school when she was not quite 4. Thrale would appear not to be entirely happy with her method of discipline: in 1782, when she had been married for 19 years and had had numerous children, she wrote:

I am beginning a new Year in a new character, may it be worne decently, yet lightly! I wish not to be rigid & fright my Daughters by too much severity (523).

Thrale did allow her daughters autonomy of thought:

[They] were always allowed & even encouraged by me to reason their own way; & not suffer their Respect or Affection for me, to mislead their Judgement.

(Thrale, 1741-1821, p.661).

*Cutler, Wale, Wesley and Young employed pleas and reproaches in an attempt to regulate their offspring's behaviour.

*Cutler's son complained to his father that his farm was too small.

*Cutler replied:

If it is not so large as you could wish, why complain, when it is your lot to be so circumstanced in life? You have all your Father is able to give you.

(*Cutler, 1742-1823, p.125).

and went on to advise his son how to make the best of things. Wale's wife and 17-year-old daughter, Polly, seemed to be in continual conflict for several years:

Mrs. W. in a mild manner talked soundly and freely with her daughter Polly and proposed a reconciliation upon her better behaviour, and a confession of her faults within 24 hours (160).

Three years later:

Daughter Polly having this day behaved rudely and impudently to her Mamma (and that in my hearing) received my reproaches and chastisement (168).

Wale considered that both parties were to blame and that the problem was best solved by Polly going away to school:

The mamma too severe and the daughter somewhat as obstinate and provoking. Have on all sides consented to part.

(Wale, 1701-96, p.175).

Wale also wrote a letter to his son advising the latter to ensure he always kept his word. Wesley (1707-88) noted that his children "readily received my warnings" without specifying what these warnings were (139). While away from home, he wrote to his children requesting that they should rise early and study regularly, that his son should improve his Latin and his daughter should stop wearing shoes with high, narrow heels if they were making her fall. He concluded his letter by saying he hoped his children would accept his advice. Young felt that it was his

daughter's duty to be obedient as he had her best interests at heart.
(Bobbin, 14 years, was refusing to take some medicine.)

But, my dear Bobbin, you ought to bring some circumstances to your recollection; the expense I have been at is more than I can afford It is surely incumbent upon you to consider, that when a father is doing everything on earth for your good, yet you ought from feelings of gratitude & generosity to do all you can for yourself.

(Young, 1741-1820, p.271).

Cooke, Day, *Hicks, Lettsom, Mascall, *May, Mill and J. Yeoman wished their offspring to be "dutifull" and not spoilt. For example: *May (1748-1812) wrote to his children while he was away from home "that they must behave extremely well" (121); Mill (1712-1805) remarried after his wife's death because he was "afraid my Children would be spoiled thro' want of proper discipline" (29); Day (1747-1826) was "thankful for the present privilege we enjoy of dutifull affectionate children" (156); and J. Yeoman (1748-1824) wrote to his daughter at school: "I hope that You are Improved and You pay Attention to what Your Mistress tells You. . ." (7).

Douglas, *Hiltzheimer and *Stiles gave examples of allowing children a degree of autonomy. Douglas' 10-year-old son was annoyed at being placed in a lower form than he expected at school.

He grumbled and pouted and I desired to change the subject, which I could not prevail in till he had consoled himself by recollecting that he is the youngest or one of the youngest in his own form, and there are in it boys of or near 15.

(Douglas, 1743-1823, p.213).

Six months later Fred was involved in a rebellion at school, siding with the rebels. Douglas approved of his son's behaviour as the rebellions was almost universal at the school and although he would not have liked Fred to have been the ring leader, neither

did he want to see Fred stand apart from a general act of the school.

*Hiltzheimer (1729-98) had to find another school for his daughter "as she will not go to that of her sisters" (56). *Stiles was asked to baptise two children of 14 and 12 years of age.

I addressed the children to this Effect. "Tho' you have a right to Baptism on account of Your Parents yet being come to these years, it is proper that I take your consent also".

(*Stiles, 1727-95, p.419).

Manuscripts. Only one of the parental diarists referred to discipline, apart from Viney (1710? -?) who remarked on a case of abuse: a woman was "taken up for burning a child in ye oven to whom she was step mother" (6). Steuart's diary, however, is mainly concerned with the disciplinary problems she experienced with her young children. Her favourite punishment appears to have been to deprive the children of after dinner fruit.

John [7 years] was getting up from table before his time (which is when the cloth is removed). I desired him to sit down again - but he would not do it for a moment till he had got to his Papa to put him in mind of a Pear he brought from — . He was not allowed to have any of the gooseberries Mag brought down from — nor any plumbs or pears. Seemed more sorry to miss the fruit than that he had done something wrong (92).

Charles aged 4 was punished in the same way for crying often during the night, "his other punishment was not being allowed to come into my bed this morning as he used to do". A few days later John was again to have no "plumbs".

John told a fib to Charles in the morning about a play thing wch he said was below stairs, tho' it was under his arm he seemed to feel the punisht a little - it was very mild however - but that was because he has heard such little fibs

said by older people & was not so much to blame as for other ones - but if, he falls into the same fault now that he has heard so much about it he must be severally punished (92).

The next week it was Margaret's turn (aged 9) to be deprived of her plums. Stuart had asked Margaret twice to get her shoes from the nursery, but:

Margaret replied "they're not in the nursery" & added low "I tell you" wch I did not hear but John told it and she did not deny it. She cried very much when she found I was angry & was to expose her by not allowing her to have a plumb after dinner I think by what she said - nothing of the kind will happen again - it is very unusual with her to be impudent (92).

Steuart would also send, or at least threaten to send, a child to bed for being "impudent" or behave coolly towards that child, and at times resort to coaxing, although she did not approve of this method.

John behaved very ill at going to bed - he wanted to sit up later - I almost coaxed him to go quietly because he was very sleepy but I was wrong. I think I must give him a Punishment if this happens again (93).

John was whipped on one occasion and generally Steuart found it difficult to devise an effective punishment for him.

It is very difficult to find a punishment for him as he receives it with a sort of indifference & good humour that makes it quite thrown away upon him.

(Steuart, 1723-1808, p.94).

At times Steuart ignored her offspring's behaviour: for example, John and Charles were fighting; when Margaret dissolved into tears "because John was to get all his lessons first" and when John cried loudly when his demand for bread to be put under his pillow was refused.

Child diaries. Only one text contains any evidence on parental discipline and control. *Fithian believed that: "The Duty of a Child to a Parent, is Obedience, Love, & all kinds of Regard". At the age of 20, he wrote to his father, asking for permission to go to college:

Relying on the Affection of a Parent, I have in this manner, with all due Submission, but at the same time with the strongest Desire of obtaining my Purpose, attempted to intreat your Encouragement & Assistance in getting me put to School.

(*Fithian, 1747-76, p.1).

The three other child diarists of this period (*Eves, J. *Holyoke and *Phelps) who described their home life, did not mention discipline. From the information contained in their diaries, they do not appear to be as submissive or hold their parents in the same awe as did *Fithian. There was no mention of corporal punishment in any diary.

Autobiographies. Three autobiographers recalled receiving physical punishment in their childhood.

I do not recollect having had any other valuable principle impressed upon me by my Father except a strict regard to truth, which he impressed upon my mind by a hearty beating at an early age, when I lied, and then talking of the dishonour of lying.

(Boswell, 1740-95, vol. 14, p.20).

I was early inclined to folly and full of pranks, for which my mother often corrected me.

(*Evans, 1731-98, p.5).

From Stedman's autobiography, it appears that he was harshly treated as a child.

I was teached blindly to obey, without consulting either my feelings, or my senses All this

may be intended for the best, and term'd good education, but I shall ever insist, that nothing can be worse than never to consult a child's motives or desires which not only makes them miserable, but ten to one must end in making them bad men (23).

He gave examples of the strict obedience required of him: to eat whatever he was given and that he was once told to drown a live mouse but, as he felt unable to kill it, he substituted a dead one and was then whipped for telling a lie. He was also whipped for stealing.

I became a young thief, of four years old, and stole thimbles, silver tea-spoons, tobacco boxes, money and handkerchiefs, yet without knowing the value of either, at the tender age of four years. I was nevertheless so unmercifully whipt that I was cured of the disorder.

(Stedman, 1744-97, p.8).

Stedman believed he was so severely treated because his mother preferred his younger brother who was not subjected to such a strict discipline.

*Bailey, in her memoirs, wrote of her husband:

He had ever been sovereign, severe and hard with his children, and they stood in the greatest fear of him.

(*Bailey, 1746-1815, p.33).

*Bailey's husband also wished to form an incestuous relationship with one of his daughters and, on her refusal, hit her, either with a horse whip or stick - *Bailey described such punishments as "barbarous corrections" (40).

Fletcher recalled receiving other forms of punishment. She wrote that at the age of 8 years:

I was oppressed beyond measure with the fear of sin This was followed by temptations

unspeakable afflicting The consequent effect of these temptations on my temper, drew one me so much anger and reproach from my parents, as made me weary of life.
(Fletcher, 1739-1814, p.7).

Fletcher later became a strict Methodist against her parents' religious inclinations. As she refused to promise that she would not attempt to convert her younger siblings, she was asked to leave home. Wright (1711-62) recalled that he wished to study astronomy and with his mother's help bought a number of books. His father, however, did not approve and burnt all the books he could find - although when Wright went to London to continue studying his father did send him money.

*Griffith did not think his parents had a great deal of authority over him:

My godly parents were very careful to prevent my falling into evil company; notwithstanding which, I frequently, without their knowledge, found such, and joined them in those vanities which are incident to youth.
(*Griffith, 1713-76, p.5).

Whitefield (1714-70) similarly recalled his "debauched" youth

Five autobiographers recalled receiving nothing but kindness as children:

I can truly say, it was seldom that an angry word was ever spoken in my father's family - by parents, brothers, or sisters, against me So that I passed the morning of my days in peace and contentment.
(*Bailey, 1746-1815, p.11).

Day (1745-1841) described the friendly relations which existed between his father and himself and also mentioned that his frequent demands for money while at university were met by his father. Lettsom (1744-1815) referred to the "tenderness" of his

parents (16) as did J. Taylor (1743-1819) who remembered "the superlative kindness of my family and my mother" (6). (D. Taylor, older brother of John, recollected, however, that their father was stern and kept his children at a distance.) Finally, Young (1741-1820) noted of his mother: "her kindness and affection for me had never failed during the course of her whole life" (126).

Discussion

As with the earlier time periods, these texts reveal the large amount of individual variation: from parents such as Woods who did not think children should be compelled to obey, to parents such as Boscawen and Steuart who exerted considerably more control over their offspring - the former by physical punishment, if necessary, and the latter by the use of deprivation. A few diaries contain evidence on more rebellious children (such as that of Wale) and so reveal that children were not totally in awe of their parents. It does seem as if British parents were stricter than the American - none of the latter noted inflicting physical punishment.

Again it is the autobiographies which contain evidence on more severe forms of discipline, particularly that of Stedman who would seem to be very bitter about his upbringing. However, it is only 17% of the autobiographers for this period who recalled receiving physical punishment and, in the case of Boswell, it would appear to have been only one whipping. Thus, though some children were treated harshly, they were a minority and not, as many historians have argued, the majority. In addition, the child diarists (the youngest of whom was aged 14) did not refer to physical punishment - as punishment to a child is a salient event, if it occurred it is likely that it would be recorded in the diary. It is possible though that these child diarists were too old for physical punishment - it

appears to be the younger children who were subjected to such discipline - but, even so, they would not seem to be in awe of their parents (apart from *Fithian).

It is interesting that the emergence of articulated policies of discipline (Powys, J. Taylor and Woods) would not appear to have any effect on the way children were treated. Although these three parents did all consciously wish not to spoil or be too severe with their offspring, it seems from the texts that this is precisely what parents, who did not possess such policies, were also doing (for example, Boswell and Douglas).

1750 - 1799

Diaries. *Bayard, Fox, Fry, Hamilton, *Huntington, *Shippen, Sandford and Trench described how they thought children should be reared - generally in an affectionate atmosphere with some restraints. *Bayard considered herself to be an exception from the usual type of parent with regard to this. When visiting a friend *Bayard remarked:

She has two sweet Children and manages them after my system, which I was so much blamed for at home; but these are a proof that gentleness is by far the best, with reasonable tempers.

(*Bayard, 1769-?, p.96).

However, with reference to the other diarists, she may not have been so exceptional. *Huntington, for example, wrote:

I do not like the punishment of whipping, unless when the child exhibits strong passion, or great obstinacy. It ought to be the last resort. Neither do I like those punishments which are chiefly directed to the selfish principles of our nature, as depriving a child of cake, sweetmeats, & co. I should rather aim to cherish feelings of conscious rectitude, and the pleasure of being beloved. I would have a child consider his

parents' declaration that he is not good, his worst punishment (109).

*Huntington listed those punishments which she considered to be suitable if a child "has done very wrong":

I would tell him he must not stay with mamma, or must not take a walk, or see the company, or that he must eat his dinner alone; and all, because he is not good enough to be indulged in these usual privileges. But there are some cases in which the use of the rod is indispensable.

(*Huntington, 1791-1823, p.109).

Fry, in a list of "Questions for Myself", asked herself:

Hast thou been a tender, yet steady mother with thy children, making thyself quickly and strictly obeyed, but careful in what thou requirest of them? (115).

She did try to subdue the will of her children:

My little — [either aged 6 or 4] has been very naughty; his will I find very strong: oh, that my hands may be strengthened rightly to subdue it (137).

but felt that she was not strict enough, compared with other mothers:

I am sensible I do not apparently manage them [her children] so well, as many others do their children I sometimes indulge them too much when young, I mean when very little, and perhaps their nurses do so too.

(Fry, 1780-1845, pp.151,169).

Trench believed that:

Chastisement, whether in the form of whipping, caning, slapping, ear-pulling, hair dragging or any other uncouth and barbarous shape, never can produce good in private education; and many of the wise are doubtful of its having a favourable effect, even in public schools.

(Trench, 1768-1837; 1837, p.69).

Trench thought that suitable punishments were: a slight fine, a temporary privation and a word or look of displeasure. She also regarded the use of "shame" as a disciplinary technique as a "hazardous experiment" (1837, p.69) contrary to C. *Mather in the 17th century. She believed that a child should see that no punishment is intended to be vindictive, but is an act designed to prevent him hurting himself and/or others.

*Alcott, Macready, Rathbone, Rumney, Strutt and Wilberforce all referred to the use of physical punishment. *Alcott took over the disciplining of his two daughters of 2 and 3 years because he did not think their mother was firm enough.

Today I have been more than usually observant of their conduct at home while under the supervision of their mother. Some habits, I regret to say, have been permitted to attain a strength and fixity that will require no small degree of skill, delicacy, and yet force of discipline to remove - more than the mother will be able to put forth in the fondness and timidity of her heart.

(*Alcott, 1799-1888, p.46).

His resolve to assume responsibility for the control of his children's behaviour led *Alcott to inflict a certain amount of physical chastisement, particularly in dealing with his volatile younger daughter Louisa. However, as the children became older, *Alcott advised and scolded them rather than used physical punishment as a means of discipline.

Macready appears to have been fairly strict with his children. For example, he wrote: (the "offence" was not described)

Before I came down my tenderness was put to a severe trial by my dear child [4 years] repeating the offence for which I had punished her yesterday. I felt there was no alternative, and I punished her with increased severity. It cut my heart to look upon the darling little creature's

agony, as she promised to be good. I ordered her to be put to bed, and came downstairs in low spirits. God bless the dear child - my heart dotes on her, and I would weep with her, while I make her suffer; but I love her too well to bring her up with false indulgence (vol. 1, p.115).

Later he recorded:

I was obliged to punish my dear Willie [2 years] for obstinacy and ill-temper. I love these children so fondly that I must be cautious lest my affection lead me into extreme indulgence which can only terminate in their unhappiness and my own bitter self-reproach (vol. 1, p.171).

At times his own state of mind affected how he treated his offspring.

I came into the drawing-room, wishing to vent my confused and tumultuous thoughts for mere relief. I sent the children, rather abruptly and pettishly to bed, which I should not have done, but I was suffering very much, and had lost command of myself.

(Macready, 1793-1773, vol. 2, p.47).

Rathbone (1761-1839) noted that her 15-month-old son was "whipped in the night for violent crying" (53). Strutt's 6-year-old daughter was "naughty" while the family was camping:

I took her by the hand into a tent pitched by the side of the house and there I reasoned, and inflicted with my open hand, alternately, till I observed her mind received the warm kind, pathetic, parental observations I addressed to her. And then after this very painful exercise of my duty I sent her in to her mother, and all in the house esteemed me a cruel man. But I rejoiced in the parental exertions I had made (95).

Strutt was not so strict with his older offspring. For example, when his 13-year-old son was leaving for boarding-school, Strutt

desired John when he was packing his trunk not to take anything he did not want, and unfortunately

he rejected those books I wish he had always with him.

(Strutt, 1765-?, p.69).

Some diarists used alternative methods of discipline. Burney prayed nightly with her young son. In general this was a recapitulation of the errors and naughtiness or the forbearance and happiness of the day:

and this I find has more success in impressing him with delight in goodness, and shame in its reverse, than all the little or great books upon the subject.

(Burney, 1752-1840, p.224).

Calvert tried lecturing her 12-year-old daughter whom she thought talked too much:

It went to my heart to be obliged to lecture her; she means nothing wrong, but the love of talking is so strong in her that I think it necessary to check it whenever I can.

(Calvert, 1767-1859, p.56).

Steadman resorted to persuasion when he discovered his sons had spent their pocket money on playing cards, of which he disapproved. He first expressed his disapproval of such amusements, persuaded his sons to sell their cards to him at prime cost and then threw the cards in the fire.

*Adams, *Alcott, Jones and Sandford advised their older offspring. For example, *Adams was sent as a diplomat to Russia and wrote a letter of advice to his two sons who were left behind in America and Jones intended to write a letter of advice for his children to be opened after his death. When his son was starting university, Sandford wrote to him asking him to never forget the purpose for which he was at Oxford, to proceed steadily and resolutely without deviating and to be cautious and slow in forming friendships. Reynolds and Watkin noted that they

disapproved of their children's behaviour; but mentioned no methods of discipline used. For example, Reynolds (1780? -1803) wrote: "John not always so good as he should be, but not to find fault with on the whole" (165) and Watkin (1787-1873) that "the boys trouble me by their violence, rather, however from thoughtfulness than bad intentions" (189).

Hardy and Skinner wanted a great deal of respect from their older children:

Later this Evening a most painful scene took place between Louisa and me on the score of Mr MaGregor [sister's suitor] as she was still too positive in her own opinion, and quite forgot that it was to her Mother that she was speaking.

(Hardy, 1789-1877, p.164).

Skinner continually clashed with his eldest son, regarding him as "undutiful and ungrateful" and finally wrote Owen a letter:

After the insults which you have this day coolly and premeditatedly offered to your Father - a Father who has overlooked and forgiven similar insults several times, it is incumbent on that Father to tell his son that his own peace of mind requires that his feelings should not again be put to the trial of fresh insults. He is therefore come to the determination of again quitting his own house; but as he cannot do so for any long period without great loss - there being no-one who will superintend the tything and farming concerns in his absence - he has to request nay more, to command his son to leave him. This Father, however outraged, will still consider the interests of his son as far as the purchase of a commission will go; he moreover will request his Grandmother to receive him for a time till steps can be taken to accomplish this end, and however repugnant it may be to his Father's better judgment. But it is decided by his Father never again to be exposed to similar insults from a son who eats of his bread and drinks of his cup, and yet abuses the benefactor who has sustained him from his youth up until now, and

was his best and only true friend.

(Skinner, 1772-1839, p.165).

Skinner continually reprov'd and admonish'd both of his sons for their idleness, their inability to choose a suitable career and their lack of respect for him. He was one of life's misfits - Skinner annoyed everyone with whom he came into contact - and finally committed suicide, firm in the belief that he was the one wronged against rather than the instigator of the disturbances.

Manuscripts. Only one diarist referred to discipline, and then in an indirect way:

I thought when parents send children to school how desirable they might have such Teachers that was indeed concerned that they [children] might be patterns in best things, that learning might come as a second.

(Rowntree, 1765? -?, p.26).

Child diaries. None of the diarists made reference to physical punishment; but instead recorded various other methods of parental control. *Cowles, at 14, was being sent to school in town but:

Mama is something unwilling I should go, for fear that the pleasures of the world and its fashionable enjoyments will gain an ascendancy over me and raise ambitious views and lead me to the circle of an unthinking crowd.

(*Cowles, 1785-1803, p.26).

*Shippen, at 15, often quarrell'd with her mother. After one quarrel her father wrote to her:

Have you persuaded yourself that your dear Mamma knows better than you & that it is your duty to obey her cheerfully always, altho it may sometimes seem hard. She loves you & wishes to make you one of the finest women in Philadelphia this should excite your love & gratitude & I flatter myself does.

(*Shippen, 1763-1841, p.72).

The British child diaries contain similar information. Wynne recorded that her 4-year-old sister

went to bed without any supper because she gave the cook such a smack that for two hours she could not open her eye (vol. 1, p.19).

and she also gives some indication of the kind of control her parents exerted over their offspring. For example, she wrote of a new acquaintance:

It is a pity but it is her mother's fault that she has very bad manners and has brought her up badly so that what she does is always in bad taste (vol. 1, p.108).

When staying in another household, Wynne found the children too noisy:

It is impossible to do anything that demands attention when the children are so rowdy and it is of no use to bid them to be quiet for it is as if one spoke to the wind, they take no notice. One comes in with a chair as his carriage, pulling it after him with a great noise, another escapes with cries from the blows of his brother If it was my children or my sisters I would certainly have shown them the door for it is unsupportable (vol. 1, p. 19).

In addition, she wrote:

My little sisters were found a keeping a very impudent conversation with the Boys they are no more to play with them (vol. 1, p.186).

However, Wynne was obviously not in awe of her parents. At the age of 17, she went out for a long ride with the groom and was very late back.

Papa was rather angry for it and had made a great noise because Mamma had let me ride with Charles alone. At length Papa's Passion passed a little and we amused ourselves very well this evening (vol. 1, p.180).

Wynne would also quarrel with her mother if the latter was unable to take her to a ball or party. However, it appears that her father anyway would overrule Wynne at times:

I had a little discussion with Papa for the music I am to play Thursday and he will have my harpsichord sent there, which vexes me exceedingly, as it is a pity to spoil that good instrument. But as it makes him very angry I am afraid it must be so.

(Wynne, 1779-1857, vol. 2, p.35).

It would seem as if parents did possess greater authority over their older offspring than they would today. Backhouse, aged 21, wrote:

In the evening, owing to my father's obliging us to come in sooner than I liked, I fell into a sulky mood in my own mind, growling over the misery of parental restraint. I sometimes feel my want of freedom rather galling.

(Backhouse, 1787-1850, p.12).

The next year Backhouse complained about her mother forbidding her to go to a party. Nevertheless Backhouse was allowed some autonomy. For example, she wished to be an artist; but her parents, as Quakers, were opposed to paintings. Despite their opposition, they fitted a workroom for her "where I am to unfold my talents (if I have any) without interruption" (6). Fitzgerald had her own household; but was still expected to obey her mother. For example, one evening she did not visit her mother before going to a ball and the next day her mother:

told me how very much displeased she was with my behaviour to her. I certainly was very much in the wrong, and shou'd have refused going with the Duchess as it prevented me going to my Mother.

(Fitzgerald, 1765? -1826, p.31).

Fitzgerald was extremely upset at this incident, noting that she cried all night at the thought of being disrespectful to her mother. J. Allen (1757-1808) regarded his father as "unreasonable" and, at 20, complained of "not being able to do hardly anything without incurring his Displeasure" (54). Strutt (1796-1873) also referred to the almost continual friction which existed between him and his father.

Three diarists, all American, give specific instances which reveal that they were not repressed by their parents or held them in awesome respect. *Condict enlisted her mother's help to get rid of a suitor who was pressing her to go to town with him. *Condict pretended her mother had forbidden her to go:

So I winkt to her to say No for She was
Present so She told him it would Not Doe.
(*Condict, 1754-79, p.49).

*Fairfax wrote to her father at age 11 telling him she thought he should have her younger brother inoculated and sent to school and that he was to send her his decision. *Winslow (12 years) reprimanded her parents for their delay in sending a requested hat.

The black Hatt I gratefully recieve as your
present, but if Captain Jarvise had arriv'd
here with it about the time he sail'd from
this place for Cumberland it would have been
of more service to me, for I have been oblig'd
to borrow.

(*Winslow, 1759-1779, p.17).

*Gallatin was prepared to go against his father's wishes if these opposed his own, although he hoped his father would not find out:

We go to one of the students balls on Sunday
night. I must keep this quiet as I fear father
would be much annoyed.

(*Gallatin, 1796-1876, p.97).

Four child diarists revealed that they were very attached to their parents, although their diaries did not contain any direct evidence on discipline (Barclay, Hamilton, Jesup and *Wister). For example, Barclay (1747-1838) described his father as the recipient "of our gratitude, affection and respect"; Hamilton (1756-1810) similarly referred to her "beloved mother" and *Wister (1761-1804) to her "dear parents".

Autobiographies. Three writers recalled receiving physical punishment as a child - Grant's autobiography contains information on a particularly cruel rearing. As young children she and her siblings either had their ears boxed or were rapped with a thimble. As they grew older, they were shut in dark cupboards for any misdemeanour or whipped. Grant did not like milk; but they were forced to eat whatever they were given, even though the milk made her sick. Her father supervised the breakfast, whip in hand, and Grant recalled being whipped as many times as was necessary for her to finish the food. If any child still refused to eat, the same food appeared at every meal until hunger forced the child to eat it - Grant remembered often being "faint with hunger". Grant did not have a high opinion of her upbringing. With reference to the care given to children, she wrote: (her mother did not visit the nursery)

In those days it was the fashion to take none;
all children alike were plunged into cold water,
sent abroad in the worst weather, fed on same
food, clothed in the same light manner (56).

She then described the horror induced by cold water bathing in winter:

a large, long, tub, stood in the kitchen court, the ice on the top of which had often to be broken before our horrid plunge into it; we were brought down from the very top of the house, four pairs of

stairs, with only a cotton cloak over our night-gowns, just to chill us completely before the dreadful shock. How I screamed, begged, prayed, entreated to be saved all no use, Millar had her orders (56).

Despite the repressive discipline, Grant did recall more happy times. For example, playing with her father after dinner:

Whatever the play was it was always charming, and redeemed all troubles no longer the severe master, he [father] was the best of play fellows.

(Grant, 1797-1830, p.61).

Backhouse and Robinson, though subjected to physical punishment, recalled a much less severe discipline. Backhouse wrote:

I was born of parents possessing so many virtues that of so loving their children, that while giving them every indulgence proper for them, they did not withhold salutary punishments.

(Backhouse, 1787-1850, p.2).

Robinson similarly noted:

I had a happy childhood. The only suffering I recollect was the restraint imposed upon me on Sundays, especially being forced to go twice to Meeting; an injurious practice, I am satisfied. To be forced to sit still for two hours, not understanding a word, was a grievance too hard to be borne, I was not allowed to look into a picture-book, but was condemned to sit with my hands before me, or stand, according to the service. The consequence was that I was often sent to bed without my supper for bad behaviour at the meeting Once I recollect being whipped by my mother for being naughty at Meeting (5).

Robinson did not consider that his parents had much control over him:

I was an unruly boy and my mother had not strength to keep me in order. My father

never attempted it.

(Robinson, 1775-1867, p.3).

Three autobiographers, though giving no specific examples, recollect a repressive upbringing. *Bacon (1781-1820) noted that his father was severe and that he was afraid of him and Knox (1790? -?) also wrote that she and her siblings were very strictly reared. Trench was orphaned at the age of 4 and was reared by her grandfather for a few years. He was confined to a chair, and so the care of Trench was given over to servants.

I shall not dwell on the cruelties I suffered, possibly from the best intentions; but they have imposed me with a deep horror of unkindness to the young, and of that is fierce and despotic in every shape (1862, p.4).

Trench's grandfather was kind to her and in adulthood she could not understand why she did not complain to him of her ill-treatment. However, after her grandfather's death, she was adopted by a friend from whom:

I never heard the tone or saw the look, of reproach, I cannot remember even that of mildest reproof.

(Trench, 1768-1837; 1862, p.7).

Other autobiographers described alternative forms of discipline and control. Capper (1755-1827) and her brother became Quakers while away at school and were not allowed to return home until they had changed their religion. Notwithstanding this ultimatum, they refused and, after their father's death, their mother accepted their religious beliefs. Fenimore-Cooper's (1789-1851) diary includes a memoir of one of his daughters, Susan. She recalled that her father usually brought back presents for his children when he had been away. On one occasion, Susan was given four dresses and then asked to give each one away. She

described feeling extremely upset at the request; but, on doing as she was asked, was greatly hugged and kissed. (This kind of training in renunciation reappears, in a much more severe forms, in Hare's autobiography in the next century.) *Hull (1765-1834) recalled that his mother reproved him for "levity" and that he "replied to her in rather unhandsome terms" which upset her" (242). Opie wrote that she was frightened of beetles, frogs and skeletons as a child.

My mother, who was as firm from principle as she was gentle in disposition, in order to cure me of my first fear, made me take a beetle in my hand, and so convince myself it would not hurt me. As her word was law, I obeyed her, though with shaking frame; but the point was carried, and when, as frequently happened, I was told to take up a beetle and put it out of the way of being trodden upon, I learnt to forget even my former fear.

(Opie, 1769-1853, p.12).

Townsend wrote of his childhood:

I owe much to the love and care of an affectionate mother, not only for her regard to my personal safety, but also for her instructions and admonitions. Well do I remember standing at her knees to repeat Dr. Watt's hymns and kneeling to say my prayers, which was often very irksome to me, and which I therefore tried to evade by the most frivolous excuses. As a proof of her regard to my religious interests, I recollect that on one occasion, when I had committed a great fault, and then told a falsehood to conceal it, (having the strongest possible conviction of my guilt) She kept me fasting in my chamber till I confessed my sin.

(Townsend, 1757-1826, p.3).

Weeton wrote that her mother used to be proud of her learning ability; but after her father's death which left them in impoverished circumstances, her mother:

began to think that I should be entirely ruined for any useful purpose in life in my inclinations for literature were indulged and treated all my efforts this way with a decided discouragement.

(Weeton, 1776-1850, p.14).

Three autobiographers gave some indication of how they were reared. F. Gray thought her father possessed a great deal of "tender affection" towards his offspring. In addition, she wrote:

My parents were careful in guarding me against what might be hurtful to me in morals or general habits.

(F. Gray, 1751-1826, p.21).

I was blessed with tender parents, who watched over themselves and their families with religious care, endeavouring to keep us out of unsuitable company and to protect us from harm.

(Hagger, 1758-1840, p.432).

My mother was very attentive to our manners. We were taught to be very respectful, especially to older persons and to ladies. If we received a book or anything else from her hand, a look of acknowledgement was expected, with a slight inclination of the head, which she returned. In a word, she wished to form our manners to a standard at once respectful and polite. We must not interrupt any one who was speaking and never speak in a rude, unmannerly way. We were taught always to give place at door or gate to another person, especially if older The family manners in those early times were superior in some respects to those which are often observed at the present day. The blunt reply to a parent, without the addition of sir or ma'am to yes and no was then unknown, except among rude and unpolished people. The change is not an improvement.

(*Silliman, 1779-1864, p.14).

The editors of *Silliman's diary also included the recollections of *Silliman's children regarding their childhood. His eldest daughter wrote:

My earliest recollections are of a loving, sympathising and reasonable parent. I cannot recall any instance of impatient or unjust treatment at his hands (360).

Another daughter wrote:

Among my earliest recollections of my dear father, his unwearied patience and affectionate care of his little children, is vividly impressed upon my memory.

(*Silliman, 1779-1864, p.362).

From the evidence contained in the diaries, it appears that parents, particularly fathers, regarded it as their duty to advise their offspring. Two autobiographers noted receiving advice from their father and all seemed to appreciate the advice, even if they did not accept it at the time. On the death of his father, Belsham (1750-1824) wrote that he had lost "an earthly friend, guide, instructor and counsellor" (68). *Warren (1778-1856) also remarked on the death of his father that "the loss of his advice and aid was very much felt" (130). J. Scott regretted rejecting his father's advice. He received a letter from his father while at university:

concerning his most earnest dissuasions from vice, especially those vices which he believed me to be most prone to. So just and tender were his observations that I regret I have thrown them to the flames. Would that his advice had been more fully followed and acted upon.

(J. Scott, 1792-1862, p.49).

Many writers remembered the kindness with which they were treated by their parents. For example, B. *Cutler (1798-1863) wrote of his mother "thirty-eight years of unchanged and fervent affection have I experienced from that mother" (163). L.*Dow (1777-1834) recalled that "My parents . . . were very tender toward their children" (1). *Tucker (1775-1806) was reared by

her grandmother and recollected nothing but "her tenderness at an age when I most wanted protection" (312). Some British autobiographers recalled similar treatment. For example, E. Fox (1793-1861) wrote "I was seldom checked or chided at home" (6); Holland (1770-1845) that her parents left her "from fondness and inactivity to follow my own bent" (158) and Moore (1779-1852) recalled that his "youth was in every respect a most happy one" (vol. 1, p.115). F. Shelley was greatly indulged as a child and, in fact, thought her mother was not strict enough:

She was not judicious in the management of her "lambkin" (as she used to call me), a name which I resented, as I felt that I had much more of the lion than the lamb in my disposition. I disliked her impetuous caressing, and early learnt to allow myself, as a favour to her, to be kissed, and not, as is usual with most children, to receive a caress as the reward of good conduct and maternal affection. Although my mother spoiled me, there was a strong sympathy between us, and I liked to sit on her knee and listen to the old Scottish Jacobite ballads, and the sweet poetry of Burns.

(F. Shelley, 1787-1873, p.1).

Shelley's upbringing would appear to have been markedly different from that of Grant, despite living within a decade of one another. (See also the autobiographies of *Bethune, M. Fox, Owenson, Turner and Watkin.)

Discussion

There is more preoccupation revealed in the 18th century texts (both American and British) with the nature and function of discipline than in the earlier texts. Those writers who considered discipline in the abstract would appear to be advocating a middle way between severity and indulgence. As with the earlier periods, the majority of parents would seem to be following similar guidelines

even though they did not consciously articulate such a concept.

A greater percentage of British (12%) than American (4%) diarists used physical punishment and a larger proportion of British than American autobiographers recalled a repressive upbringing.^e It does seem as if British parents wished to exert more control over their offspring than American. The phenomenon that has already been noted - that increased evidence on physical punishment and strict discipline is found in the autobiographies - occurs again. In addition, as with the earlier time periods, the child diarists did not mention severe punishment at all. It would seem as if only a minority of children endured a strict discipline and an even smaller minority endured a cruel regime. Grant's autobiography is the first text to describe actual cruelty. Her parents would appear to have been influenced by such theorists as Locke (1699) who proposed cold water bathing as a means of hardening children, although her parents did carry such a theory to its extreme by insisting that the children were plunged into cold water outside.

The great variation in disciplinary practices is again striking - from the harshness of Grant's rearing to the complete freedom and indulgence of that of Holland and Shelley. Parents employed a wide range of disciplinary techniques, whipping being only one of the methods they had at their disposal and it does not seem as if it was the most commonly used method of punishment.

1800 - 1849

Diaries. *Judson, *Lawrence, *Longfellow and *Todd described their views on discipline without recording any actual punishment. For example, *Judson, when extremely ill, wrote that if she died her children:

(e) There is no significant difference between the number of American diarists recording the use of physical punishment when compared with the British sample, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 1.29$, $p \gg .05$. There is also no significant difference between the number of American and British autobiographers recalling a repressive upbringing, $\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.26$, $p \gg .05$.

will be in trouble and I cannot help them;
they will sin and I cannot teach them and
discipline them.

(*Judson, 1817-54, p.300).

*Lawrence (1814-86) believed children should be prepared for adult life and therefore taught his children how to use tools and to garden, how to look after a horse and, by giving them generous allowances, taught them the use and value of money. *Longfellow (1807-82), with reference to the quotation 'Suffer the little children to come unto me' wrote: "After that benediction how can any one dare to deal harshly with a child?" (383). *Todd believed that a boy needed:

a firm decided government over him to
which his will shall bow without any reserve
and with cheerfulness.

(*Todd, 1800-73, p.285).

*Alcott, Cobden-Sanderson, Gaskell, *Hayes, *Lovell and *Walker reported inflicting physical chastisement. For example:

New Year's Day is made remarkable by my
solemnly spanking my child [5 years] .
Miss C. and others assure me it is the only
way to cure her wilfulness. I doubt it; but
knowing that mothers are usually too tender and
blind, I correct my dear in the old-fashioned
way Her bewilderment was pathetic, and
the effect, as I expected, a failure. Love is
better; but also endless patience.

(L. *Alcott, 1832-88, p.360).

*Lovell gives a very detailed account of the methods she used to train her daughter, Caroline. The diary will be quoted from at some length because it reveals the insistence on obedience by *Lovell and also her realisation of her own child's temperament. The diary in its detail and techniques of discipline is very similar to that of Gaskell.

When Caroline was about a year old it became necessary for me to teach her her first lesson in obedience. The shovel and tongs seemed to fascinate her and she would take them and carry them around the house. I forbade her to touch them. She seemed perfectly to understand me, but continued to get them. I tried various ways to dissuade her from her purpose and finally concluded the best method was to divert her attention to some other object But she had yet to learn obedience. When she was nearly two years old she one day took a cushion out of a chair and was bringing it across the room. I told her to carry it back and put it in the chair. She did not obey, and after repeating the requisition several times, to no purpose, I felt obliged to use corporal punishment. She had never before heard of such a thing and of course knew nothing about it. So that it was some time before I could make her understand that there was any connection between the correction and the fault. But she finally yielded (52).

After this, *Lovell merely referred to the smack and Caroline obeyed. At 3-years-old Caroline wished to stand on a coffee pot despite her mother telling her not to as this would spoil it.

She persisted in doing it and at the same time saying, "Daughter don't feel able to stand on the floor". I was obliged to shut her up in the bedroom before I could get her to obey me (55).

*Lovell thought that her daughter at the age of 5

was generally obedient and easily governed, but there seemed to be a nervous impetuosity in her nature that sometimes led her into disobedience. For example, if she was jumping over a cricket and I said, "Caroline, don't jump over it again", she would in an instant be over. The impulse seemed to have been given and her quick and active temperament nerved for the effort, and the prohibition was unheeded. But she was always sorry, and I made allowance for her peculiar temperament, which to a stranger might appear like indulgence. We never but once, except in the first instance, were

obliged to correct her for refusing to do what was required of her. In all other cases it was for this impulsive kind of disobedience. We wished to train her to a habit of implicit obedience with our directions, and on this account we frequently had occasion to correct her in such a way as we thought would best promote this object (84).

For example, when *Lovell saw Caroline drawing the ashes in the fireplace, she told Caroline to come to her; but Caroline ignored her mother.

I felt afraid that I had been too lenient with her in former instances of disobedience, and thought I must now do something that would make an abiding impression on her mind. I took her into another room and expressed my regret on account of her disobedience, and told her that I would have to whip her now as she had disobeyed in the same way several times and I feared she would again She seemed very penitent she entreated me not to inflict it, [whipping] saying she would try to remember and obey immediately in the future. I considered her request and told her I would excuse her if she thought she should remember. As she never liked to have any one see her when she had been crying, I told her she might stay in that room until she had dried her tears so that she could look pleasant and then she might come out (85).

A few months later Caroline refused absolutely to say "Good Morning" to a visitor. She was sent to her room and, as she still refused, smacked. Then, as she continued to say "No, I shan't", her father eventually threatened to hit her with a stick and at that Caroline gave in. Her parents regarded the saying of "shan't" with great distress:

It seemed as if the enemy had her completely in his power, and was trying to effect her ruin This was to us one of the most painful events of her life. It showed us the depraved state of the unrenewed heart, even of a gentle, lovely, and generally obedient child.

(Lovell, 1809? -?, p.88).

*Walker would seem to have "whipped" her children on a regular basis. She noted that, as soon as her 10-month-old son:

is put on the bed he begins to frolic and I often have to whip him to make him be still (136).

*Walker, though, did not insist on total obedience. For example, when Cyrus at 20 months asked for something and refused, at his father's request, to say "please", his parents did not press the point although they were annoyed at Cyrus going to sleep with a "smile". Later, when her son was aged 4 and daughter 2½ years, *Walker remarked:

I had occasion about sunset to give my children a little whipping upon which, Miss Abigail ran off towards the lodges, bawling and calling "father, father, come home, mother whipped me".

(*Walker, 1814-97, p.176).

A number of British diarists also revealed a concern for obedience. Cobden-Sanderson wished to rid his 18-month-old son of "bad habits" and make his "will supple" (vol. 1, p.246). Therefore Richard was whipped for crying when put to bed and occasionally during temper tantrums. Cobden-Sanderson did change his method of discipline after he realised he had punished Richard for crying, when the latter was actually ill. Richard had been placed on a small table to stop crying. Once he had done so, he was taken out to the garden where

he was very fretful; and falling to crying again, I upbraided him. Alas, blind and brutal, I did not know that he was not well (vol. 1, p.249).

Richard was ill with fever for a few days and once he had recovered, his father wrote:

He has gusts and wells of passion, but we bear with him and let him alone, and presently he emerges from the storm cloud radiant amid tears

and with lips out-stretching for a kiss.

(Cobden-Sanderson, 1840-1922,
vol. 1, p.250).

Gaskell wished to teach her young daughter self-control at an early age. For example, at 14 months:

When she does become angry now we look grave (not angry) and sometimes put our hands before our faces, which always attracts her attention and by so doing stays her little passion (17).

Gaskell was puzzled how to discipline Marianne at 2 years of age.

The usual one [punishment], putting the little offender into a corner, had no effect with her, as she made it into a game so the last we have tried is putting her into a high chair, from which she cannot get out, and leaving her there (always in the same room with one of us) till some little sign of sorrow is shown (17).

At 3 years Marianne was punished by being left in a room by herself for five minutes or so and was also slapped for the first time.

Gaskell had been trying to make Marianne repeat some letters of the alphabet but Marianne refused. Eventually her mother slapped her hand every time she refused until Marianne said the letter.

Gaskell was, however, worried about this mode of punishment:

Still, I am sure we were so unhappy that we cried, when she was gone to bed. And I don't know if it was right. If not, pray, dear Marianne, forgive us (32).

Gaskell thought Marianne was still "obstinate" at the age of 4 so that:

we have been obliged occasionally to give a slight whipping. It has been done sorrowfully and gently, and has never failed in making her more obedient, without producing the least resentful feeling.

(Gaskell, 1810-65, p.35).

Hare included in his autobiography some extracts from his mother's journal, revealing her insistence on obedience. When Hare was $2\frac{1}{2}$ years she wrote:

After dinner to-day, on being told to thank God for his good dinner, he would not do it, I would not let him get out of his chair, which enraged him, and he burst into a violent passion. Twice, when this abated, I went to him and tried partly by encouragement, partly by positively insisting on it, to bring him to obedience (16).

Hare remained in the dining room until he had said what was required of him. Nine months later, his mother referred to Hare's habit of asking "why".

If it be in reference to something he has been told to do, I never at the time give him any other reason than simply that it is my will that he should do it. If it refers to something unconnected with practical obedience, it is right to satisfy this desire of knowledge as far as he can understand (18).

On Hare at the age of 5 his mother wrote:

Augustus would, I believe, always do a thing if reasoned with about it, but the necessity of obedience without reasoning is specially necessary in such a disposition as his. The will is the thing that needs being brought into subjection.

(Hare, 1834-1903, p.28).

The editor of Johnston's diary included some extracts from her mother's journal. These reveal that Johnston's parents also disapproved of any signs of rebellion, although they were nowhere near as harsh as Hare's mother. Her mother wrote that at the age of 3:

[Priscilla] attempted to rebel against her father's will, and I remember my distress on seeing him strike her rather sharply when in his arms, and her screams in consequence; but it had the best effect upon her will, and I do not

think she ever disobeyed him afterwards.
(Johnston, 1808-52, p.iv).

Allen, Bain and *Prentiss all insisted on implicit obedience from their young offspring, although they did not record using physical punishment to achieve their aim. Allen noted how difficult it was to rear one's own children:

It is one thing to look upon their errors and failings as a disinterested party but quite another to do for the best as each occasion arises for the varying dispositions of children and their different temperaments As little as possible correct them before others; speak to them privately on any matter. Loud reproof may sometimes provoke to wrath instead of leading to repentance, though of course there are occasions when instant rebuke is needful.

(Allen, 1813-80, p.111).

Allen further believed that a parent should not "wound the spirit of a child, or alarm a child in manner or speech". She also provided an example of her discipline. When her 5-year-old son hit his brother, Allen was "touched by the penitent look on his face" and prayed with him for forgiveness. Later she noted that she "felt this time I had been helped to decide it best to persuade rather than to use severer measures" (93). These diarists, however, relaxed their control over their older offspring. Bain (1803-83), for example, did not approve of the theatre; but although she objected to her children going to see plays, did not stop them.

*Duncan, Guest and Hanover wished to retain a great deal of authority over their older offspring. *Duncan, for example, wished to suppress the independent thinking of her daughter:

my eldest [14 years] my pride & hope gave me some trouble. She did not feel well & then there

were several circumstances which made me feel badly that she was not willing to attend school because she disliked the Teachers. I trembled for her independent feeling.

(*Duncan, 1808-76, p.77).

*Duncan gave her daughter the choice of returning to school or to be a "Millenor" - she chose the former. Guest's 22-year-old daughter visited friends without telling her mother.

I think these things wrong. While she remains under my roof I must be responsible and keep her with me, and prevent independent action I reproved her and she was insubordinate; and so we did not speak for the whole time of our Canford sojourn, after which I condoned the offence.

(Guest, 1812-?, 1952, p.107).

Hanover (1819-1901) continued to exert control over her eldest daughter even when the latter married and moved to Prussia. She wished to know every detail of her daughter's life and constantly advised her how to behave.

Other diarists, however, possessed considerably less authority over their offspring. Alford, Cunningham, Palgrave, de Rothschild, K. & J. Russell, Tregelles and W. *Walker tried such methods of discipline as scolding and lecturing. For example, W. *Walker wrote:

[1] Lectured my children on morals and good breeding, warning them against various immoralities.

(W. *Walker, 1800-74, p.172).

Alford, Palgrave, de Rothschild and Tregelles all regret speaking harshly to their children. To his daughter while he was away from home, Alford wrote:

I know I sometimes speak harsh words to you, dearest, but I should not do so; we must try

to bear one another's burdens and make allowances for one another.

(Alford, 1810-71, p.214).

I fear that I am too hasty with my dear children

(Tregelles, 1806-84, p.75).

J. Russell did not regard outbursts of temper in children as being very serious; but he did find that his 7-year-old son sorely taxed his patience:

Frank has been troublesome this morning & depressed me a good deal. Having his clean white suit on, the first thing he did was to cover, his trousers with mud (out with the children). It seems Eliza wanted him to go to some place or come home, & that he refused and went down in the dirt when she pulled him. I should think it was partly her fault, but as he was so dirty I told him to go & write his copy-book till I came to fetch him out, to stay in my room. When I came back soon after I found he had not staid there, but gone out to the hall to amuse himself. I therefore told him to do a little more writing, which he refused. However, I insisted he should do it before he had his dinner. He was exceedingly obstinate, threw his copybook into the fireplace, & co. I left him a little, & when I came back found him ensconced comfortably under a table. I told him if he would not come out I must take away some grasses he had gathered, & as he would not I at last did so very reluctantly. Then he began to be so unhappy that I was afraid he wd make himself ill, so I offered to take him out wh at once put him in a good humour, & he promised me to write when he came home I hope he will not often be like this (505).

Unfortunately for Russell, though, Frank seemed determined to be as annoying as possible. He kicked a ball about the dining-room although told not to, until he broke a window; refused to obey any orders or requests of others while insisting his own demands were met; threw a stone at their hostess and, finally, when told by

Russell not to call him a "beast", Frank did so, non-stop for half an hour. In the last case Russell believed "a good boxing of the ears wd be far the best treatment" though he does not actually inflict it. Both parents appeared to be at a loss how to control their son; Russell wrote to his wife:

Obedience is not the most important; but surely they [children] must be prevented from doing things wh. injure themselves or others & be taught that some little deference is due to others wishes instead of requiring every body to defer to theirs. Public schools are of immense value in this way & for some I think almost indispensable. As to managing a boy like Frank by love I do not believe in it, as he loves you more than anyone & yet you know how angry he is when you oppose him.
(J. Russell, 1842-76, p.511).

Collins, *Hayes and *Lieber tried advising their offspring. Collins (1818-1908), for example, on going to America for a lecturing tour, wrote a letter for his children to be opened after his death, exhorting them "earnestly to love and cherish and to obey" their mother (132).

Owen and F. Russell encouraged their children to show independence of thought. Russell wrote to her daughter of 15:

Every day will now bring you more independence of mind, more capacity to understand, not merely to adopt the thoughts of others, to reason and to form opinions of your own.
(F. Russell, 1815-98, p.216).

Occasionally a parent would not punish some particular behaviour even if it annoyed him or her. For example, *Walker's husband would not punish his son for telling a lie, although *Walker (1814-97) would have preferred to do so. Wood was exceedingly exasperated by one of her children's behaviour:

I cannot really conceive of anything more vexatious than G's mingled stupidity and obstinacy over the lesson which I give him daily in Geography - it is a glorious trial of Patience.

(Wood, 1812-60, p.78).

Manuscripts. The only parental manuscript for the 19th century did not contain any information on discipline.

Child diaries. There was again no record of physical punishment in the child diaries, although other forms of discipline were recorded. *Alcott (1832-88) mentioned running away and being tied to the settee the next day to repent and, at the age of 12, being reprovved by her father for selfishness. Caroline and Anna *Richards were reared by their paternal grandparents who, from the diary entries, appear to have been indulgent. For example, on one occasion the two sisters were so noisy:

that finally Grandmother said, "the one that speaks first is the worst; and the one that speaks last is the best". We kept still for quite a while, which gave Grandmother a rest, but was very hard for us, especially Anna. Pretty soon Grandmother forgot and asked us a question; so we had the joke on her (24).

The two sisters did not always concur with their grandparents wishes:

just as I had finished it, [Letter to her father]
Grandmother told me something to write which I did not wish to and I spoke quite disrespectfully, but I am real sorry and I won't do so any more (23).

Another time they participated in a night sleigh-ride after their grandparents had forbidden them to go. The next day their grandparents found out and Richards wrote: "they acted so sober, and, after a while, Grandmother talked with us about it" (55). After Caroline and Anna promised not to go again, the incident was forgiven and forgotten. Their misdeeds were not always discovered, however:

Anna wanted to walk down a little ways with the girls after school so she crouched down between Helen Coy and Pattie Paddock and walked past the house. Grandmother always sits in the front window, so when Anna came in she asked her if she had to stay after school and Anna gave her an evasive answer we just change the subject and divert the conversation into a more agreeable channel (118).

In some respects their grandparents were strict: the sisters were meant to come straight home from school and had to ask permission to go to forms of entertainment - and permission was not always granted. Caroline and Anna did regard their grandmother as strict; but did not seem to mind too much:

Grandmother knows that we think she is a perfect angel even if she does seem rather strict sometimes. Whether we are 7 or 17 we are children to her just the same
(*Richards, 1842-1913, p.124).

Fleming's diary is mainly concerned with her outbursts of temper and railings against authority. At the age of 7 she wrote:

I confess that I have been more like a little young Devil than a creature for when Isabella went up the stairs to teach me religion and multiplication and to be good and all my other lessons I stamped with my feet and threw my new hat which she made on the ground and was sulky and was dreadfully passionate but she never whipped me but gently said Marjory go into another room and think what a great crime you are committing letting your temper git the better of you but I went so sulky that the Devil got the better of me but she never never whip [s] me so that I think I would be the better of it and the next time that I behave ill I think she should do it for she never does it but she is very indulgent to me (40).

A few months later:

I am going to tell you that in all my life I never behaved so ill for when Isa had me go out of the

room I would not go & when Isa came to the room I threw my book at her in a dreadful passion & she did not lick me but said go into the room & pray (73).

The only other punishment Fleming recorded was being fined 2d every time she bit her nails. At times her tantrums were ignored:

To Day I have been very ungrateful and bad and disobedient Isabella gave me my writing I wrote so ill that she took it away and locked it up in her desk where I stood trying to open it till she made me come and read my bible but I was in a bad humour and red it so Carelessly and ill that she took it from me and her blood ran cold but she never punished me.

(Fleming, 1803-11, p.43).

Hanover (1819-1901) was left alone in her room as a punishment. Johnston (1808-52) at 14 taught her younger brothers and sisters and was scolded for being too strict with them. Ramés (1839-1908), at the age of 11, hoped her father would not be angry with her for neglecting her diary. C. de Rothschild thought her mother was not strict enough with her 13-year-old sister:

It really makes me sorry to see the impertinent answer that Annie often gives to Mamma at the slightest provocation for them.

(C. de Rothschild, 1843-1931, p.86).

Both sisters were enraged by a restraint which their mother wished to impose on them. Annie refused to let her mother read a letter she was writing:

I really could not it pained me to see how angry Mamma looked but I would not show it (89).

Lady de Rothschild then said she would now read all their letters.

I was dumbstruck & could not say a word but tearfully left the room; I told it to Connie who continued arguing a long time about it, saying

she intended never writing, that she much preferred not writing at all to being subjected to such rule. That it was unjust, ridiculous: & we both rose to a pitch of furious indignation which I could hardly restrain.

(A. de Rothschild, 1844-1926, p.89).

The threat was later withdrawn. K. Russell (1842-1874) provided some indication of how she regarded parental discipline. At the age of 18, while alone in the house, she wrote:

I do not like being here alone & yet I do not mind it so much. I am afraid it is selfish it is because no one finds fault with me. I should learn to bear reproof better - if I was more humble I should.

(K. Russell, 1842-74, p.97).

*Long and *May noted receiving advice from their parents.

*Long's father wrote in his journal:

John Davis [aged 11], wake up! Perform your duties better. Let not your time be wasted and lost. Consider. Can these bright days and rich opportunities of your boyhood return to you? If you do not improve them in acquiring knowledge and in fitting yourself for a useful and happy life, will it not cause you bitter remorse as long as you live?

(*Long, 1838-1915, p.41).

While away at college *May wrote:

What can be more cheering than a letter from my dear mother, and what excellent advice she gave me. I must always follow her counsels and admonition, for in them are found peace and happiness.

(*May, 1840? -?, p.23).

Cambridge criticised his own behaviour; but does not state whether this incurred any punishment. For example, at 15, he wrote:

Yesterday I fear some more bad behaviour showed itself I was violent, hasty, and indeed might also say did everything that was wrong.

(Cambridge, 1819-1904, p.12).

Many diarists appear to have had an informal relationship with their parents. Gladstone (1847-1927) could criticise and disagree with her parents. Shore's own wishes were respected: for example, when asked to throw away some of her things in preparation for moving house, Shore threw out a model boat:

However, papa and mamma, to console me for the loss of my steam-packet, which cost me thirteen pennies, very kindly indeed gave me sixpence apiece, and papa offered me a shilling for every stuffed bird I should throw away, but I would not for a guinea.

(Shore, 1819-39, p.25).

Wortley (1837-1922) appeared to do exactly as she pleased, even if her activities caused her mother a great deal of anxiety: for example, going up on deck during a squall and walking behind the Niagara Falls. Fowler, Gilpin, *Harker, Johnston and Timms referred to the great affection they felt for their parents.

Autobiographies. Ten of the autobiographies contain information on physical punishment and, of these, eight were British. The two American autobiographers did not describe severe punishment. *Lennep recalled that at the age of 6 she often lied and her father said he would punish her the next time she lied. When she did, she was sent to her room and the next morning hit on the hand by her "distressed" father. *Philips (1806-89) did not note receiving any physical punishment; but as he described his father as "harsh", it is probable that he did receive some.

In contrast, the British texts, particularly those of Cooper and Hare, described a considerably harsher disciplinary system.

Cooper recalled only an exceedingly unhappy childhood:

I and my sisters were brought up with great severity, moral and physical, in respect both of mind and body, the opinion of our parents being that, to render a child obedient, it should be in a constant fear of its father and mother.

(Cooper, 1801-85, p.51).

Hare was adopted by an aunt who seemed to be dominated by two religious friends, both of whom advocated an extremely harsh system of discipline for Hare. From the age of 4, Hare was not allowed to play with toys or other children. He was shut up in his room on bread and water for two days as a punishment "to break my spirit" and was often whipped with a riding whip by his uncle.

In the most literal sense, and in every other, I was brought up at the point of the rod! My dearest mother was so afraid of over-indulgence that she always went into the opposite extreme (26).

Other methods of repression were also employed. Hare was not allowed to express his own wishes or make a noise while playing. He always had roast mutton and rice pudding for dinner and, based on this, a new discipline was thought of for Hare when he was 5:

The most delicious puddings were talked of, - dilated on - untill I became, not greedy, but exceedingly curious about them. At length le grand moment arrived. They were put on the table before me, and then just as I was going to eat some of them, they were snatched away, and I was told to get up and carry them off to some poor person in the village.

(Hare, 1804-93, p.27).

Under the authority of his mother's friends, the regime became even worse. Hare was not allowed anything at all which gave him pleasure; if he liked anything or anybody, it was removed.

Other British writers of this period, on the other hand, recalled less severe punishments. The editor of Bright's diary included a memoir of Bright's son. He wrote that his father was against harsh punishment but:

he never hesitated to administer corporal punishment to his children when he thought they deserved it. He was eminently just, and for this we all admired him and never questioned his decisions.

(Bright, 1811-89, p. xii).

Epps wrote:

I understand from those who knew me then, that I was peevish and fretful: so much so, that my father felt obliged to testify to the fact of my being his child, by using correction, remembering doubtless, what the wise man saith, "Spare the rod", ect.

(Epps, 1806-69, p. 29).

His father also wanted to create in Epps a feeling of self-reliance and courage. Therefore, from an early age, Epps slept in a room by himself, right at the top of the house. However, after Epps woke in a great fright one night, believing he saw the devil looking in the window, his room was changed. Lucas described his mother:

She was strict in the management of her children, and sometimes did not spare the old-fashioned implement of birch, once considered so efficacious in the bringing up of youth. Though she never used it with passion and soon healed the wound with tenderness.

(Lucas, 1804-61, p. 21).

Müller (1805-98), at the age of 17, travelled round the country without paying any bills and was finally imprisoned. His father came to collect him, paid the debts, and beat him "severely" when they returned home.

Allen and Cavendish recalled the harsh treatment they received from a nurse and a governess respectively. Allen, as a child, was looked after by a cruel nurse who frightened all the children with horror tales and hit them frequently. None of the children considered telling their parents of the cruelty. Cavendish recalled the severe treatment meted out to her by her governess: whippings, being taken for walks with her hands tied behind her back and put between doors. However, parental discipline was much more lenient; of her mother, Cavendish wrote:

there was no fear of our getting cowed and spirit-broken while we had that gentle and loving care always over us, though she interfered little directly between us and our governess.

(Cavendish, 1841-1925, p.11).

Acland, *Chace, *Jackson and Sewell recollected that their parents did expect obedience. For example, *Jackson wrote of his parents:

to the day of their decease I should have considered a request or reasonable command as binding upon me as though I was still a boy and subject to their control.

(*Jackson, 1816-1900, p.128).

Sewell described her home as a:

paradise of freedom. My mother insisted indeed upon implicit and instantaneous obedience, but she never fretted us, and she entered into all our amusements.

(Sewell, 1815-1906, p.4).

Acland and Wilberforce both referred to parental advice on how to organise their studies.

Many autobiographers did specifically mention looking back on their childhood with pleasure. *Burroughs (1837-1921), for example, was deeply attached to his mother, although of his father he wrote: "Father knew me not. All my aspirations in life were a

sealed book to him" (106). *Lennep (1821-44), who did receive mild physical punishment, looked back on a "sunny lovely childhood" (80). *Judson (1817-54) recalled "being much petted and indulged during my first years" and also gave an example of overriding her parents' wishes (15). At the age of 16, *Judson wished to attend a dancing school, but her parents refused to let her go. She discussed the subject so often that her father finally forbade her to mention it. At that, *Judson informed her parents she was going to leave home and so her parents conceded to her wishes. *Todd (1800-73) believed he "had one of the kindest and best of fathers" (29). *Colt, *Howe and *Lawrence similarly were very attached to their parents.

Many British texts provided similar evidence. Dawson (1811-78) noted that, despite his father's faults, the latter was always kind to him. Palgrave (1824-97) recalled the "blithesome days of childhood" and wrote a long poem on his recollections of his happy childhood (6). Pollen (1820-92) described his childhood as "Ah! the former days! the sweet harmless former days" (5). Trant (1800-44) wrote of her father: "He has indeed always loved me far, far better than I deserved" (5). (See also the texts of Kingsford, F. Russell, Tregelles and Wood.)

Only one autobiographer referred to the disciplining of his own children. Lucas did not approve of corporal punishment; but found that the behaviour of one of his sons caused him to inflict it. Lucas described his eldest son at the age of 7 as:

a trying, though, in some respects, a gratifying child. . . . He is also impertinent and very apt to answer again and recriminate when reprimanded. Occasional corporal punishment appears the most effective procedure, but it is very unpleasant resorting to it.

(Lucas, 1804-61, p.164).

Discussion

A greater proportion of parents, American and British, used physical punishment and also insisted on total obedience in this period than in the 16th and 17th centuries - it is the British autobiographies, though, which recall the harshest treatment. This agrees with part of Stone's (1977) argument that parents in the early 19th century were imposing a stricter discipline on their children than in the 18th. However, clearly only a minority of children did experience such a discipline, although for some, such as Cooper and Hare, this increased severity did amount to cruelty.

Was this insistence on obedience and conformity part of a reaction to the rapid changes which were taking place in society - the change from a rural to an industrialised society? Perhaps some people wished to restore some kind of order to their lives and began by ensuring that they would not rear rebellious children. It is possibly this severity in the early 19th century which has led researchers to believe that parental discipline prior to the 19th century was also severe.

Again, as with the 16th and 17th centuries, there is an enormous variation in the strictness of discipline imposed by parents, ranging from J. Russell who was unable to control his son's behaviour to Gaskell and *Lovell who were constantly trying to ensure that their young daughters would be implicitly obedient; and from Allen who did not wish to "wound the spirit of a child" to Hare's mother whose mode of discipline was designed to break Hare's spirit.

1850 - 1899

No American text for this period contains any relevant information.

Diaries. The texts of the late 19th century reveal a reduction in the severity of discipline imposed on children when compared with the early 19th century. Seven diarists referred to discipline and only one to physical punishment. Waugh (1903-66) recorded striking his 14-year-old daughter after she broke his "acme" chair for the second time. Brabazon and Gurney did wish their children to be obedient. Gurney, for example wrote of her offspring:

The children were implicitly obedient. I don't remember any instance of obstinacy that we did not overcome without trouble, but once a command was given it had to be obeyed. The great point was never to make anything obligatory that could not be easily and well carried out Let the little ones understand from the very first that the parents' 'No' means 'No' and the parents' 'Yes' means 'Yes'.

(Gurney, 1851-1932, p.35).

Four British diarists did not describe actual punishment, but their diaries provide an indication of the type of discipline they imposed on their offspring. Hochberg was annoyed at her son's shyness:

I felt really at one moment when he spoke in a whisper with his hat in front of his mouth, that I would like to go up and give him one shake.

(Hochberg, 1892-1914, p.195).

Hutchinson had decided when his son was born that comics would never enter the house. Unfortunately his son's wishes upset Hutchinson's plans: "how insidiously the dashed things come". Hutchinson was unsure how to solve another problem:

I agree entirely that indiscriminate giving of money, or of presents, to children may well be the sowing of seeds ruinous to their characters and disastrous to their futures. But of, instead, direct payment for work done I am not so sure.

There is a danger that way, too, and as grave a one - the danger of implanting the idea that service of whatsoever sort must be paid for.

(Hutchinson, 1880-?, p.230).

Weymouth wished to be able to advise his 14-year-old son:

I must, somehow or other, utilize my own experience, to prevent him making the mistakes I, and so many others have made I should like to be able to write to Antony in such a way that he accepts my advice and acts on it, Anyhow I'm going to try.

(Weymouth, 1895-?, p.112).

White described her stepdaughter arguing with her father:

When we were sitting at table an argument began in which Molly, as usual, held her own against her father, cheerful, obstinate and positive. Her father, neither cheerful, obstinate nor positive, but clinging to the last shred of faith in his better judgement, mildly querulous, attempted a defence. One by one, however, his defences were swept down: 'he did not know this; he did not know that'. At last he was driven against the wall. 'My dear Molly', he burst out, 'I don't know nothing about everything!'

(White, 1877-?, p.47).

Child diaries. Four diarists referred to home discipline.

The Bowen children (1864-1920) would appear to have been strictly reared. They were largely confined to the nursery and schoolroom and their parents were aloof - the children, in fact seemed to be afraid of their father. Nevertheless, despite these restrictions, from the evidence contained in the diary, the children did not appear to be repressed. They had frequent holidays and plenty of time to play and they did not mention any specific punishment. Colt (1916-?), at the age of 17, noted a scolding from his father for omitting to write his usual weekly letter and also wrote that his

father would be "foaming" if Colt failed an exam he was about to sit. His half-term report was bad and his father was annoyed. However, as the end of term report was better, Colt did not have to do any school work during the holidays. King-Hall (1893-?) did not seem to regard his parents with awe, writing while he was at college: "I shan't wear a knickerbocker suit so its not much good sending one" (338). Knightley, at the age of 14, had been asked to an outdoor party; but as it rained she had been refused permission to go. She went anyway and an hour or so later was handed a note from her mother:

Louisa, you will come away directly you receive this. You ought not to have gone, and if you are at tea, you will come away all the same.

(Knightley, 1842-1913, p.5).

Knightley described her father as the "kindest of men" in spite of "occasional displays of severity" (6).

Autobiographies. In marked contrast to the autobiographies of the early 19th century, these texts contain no evidence on physical punishment. Three autobiographers recalled other forms of punishment. Agate (1877-1947) remembered "being perched on a chest-of-drawers for punishment" (28); Mildmay (1850? -?) was deprived of cakes or jam at teatime for any misbehaviour and Gurney wrote:

My earliest impression was made upon me by my own mother. I can well remember her punishing me for my violent temper, as a very tiny child, and in a way which I never forgot. She took me into a large, unused bedroom, and told me to remain there till my passion was over, and then closed the door quietly. At first I remained furious, and then feeling absolutely foolish I thought the best plan would be to go downstairs, which I did, deeply ashamed of myself and I dont think I ever gave way to such temper again.

(Gurney, 1851-1932, p.18).

It does seem as if children, at least in some families, were expected to be obedient. Hutchinson (1880 - ?) wrote that "Sons did what their fathers told them in those days" (74) and Mildmay (1850? -?) remembered that "obedience to parents was then not not only taught, but also practised" (9). However, in other families, the parents had less control. Cummings, for example, believed that:

Ours was a family - not uncommon I imagine, at any time, in which the parents were under the tolerant surveillance and patronage of the children.

(Cummings, 1889-1919, p.76).

Horler wished to leave school at the age of 14:

My father, quite evidently, was puzzled; he did not know what to do with me. But my determination was far stronger than his arguments: I had my own way.

(Horler, 1888-?, p.29).

Hochberg (1873-?) recalled that "no one could have had a happier, freer, more joyous youth" (9) than she had and Waugh (1903-66) wrote that he was never shouted at or threatened at home.

Discussion

The level of discipline in this time period seems to return to the same level of severity as in the 16th to 18th centuries. Thus it seems that the period 1800-1849 was atypical in the severity of the discipline to which children were subjected. The strictness seems merely to have been a response to the initial upheaval caused by industrialisation and once people had accommodated to this, discipline became more lenient.

The lack of information on discipline in the American texts is striking. It seems that American parents of this period were not concerned with regulating their offspring's behaviour to any great

extent and certainly were less concerned than the British parents. This was due, perhaps, to the effects of the American Civil War of 1861-65. This war finally ended British influence in America and thus American parents may have decided to reject the British method of rearing children. In addition, perhaps American parents, after the Civil War, consciously wished to rear more independent and less controlled children as they believed this was fitting to the creation of a new nation. (This is also suggested by Bremner, 1970-73.)

2.2

Discipline in School^v

There can be no doubt whatever that severe flogging was a normal and daily occurrence in the sixteenth and seventeenth century grammar school.

(Stone, 1977).

Much less information is available on discipline in school than on discipline in the home. No relevant information is available for the period 1500-1549; no manuscript and very few American texts referred to school discipline. Table 13 shows the number of sources which made reference to school discipline.

v. This section includes the treatment of apprentices.

Table 13: Number of Sources containing Information on Discipline in School

Time period	Source											
	Diary			Child diary			Autobiography			All		
	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample	A	B	% of sample
1550 - 1600	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	33	0	3	14
1600 - 1650	0	1	4	1	0	9	0	3	75	1	4	12
1650 - 1700	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	3	9
1700 - 1750	0	1	2	1	0	11	0	3	17	1	4	5
1750 - 1800	1	6	9	1	3	14	1	7	21	3	16	12
1800 - 1850	2	0	3	3	3	13	3	8	34	8	11	12
1850 - 1900	0	1	8	0	3	50	0	2	17	0	6	18

1550 - 1599

Diaries. Only one diarist referred to school discipline. Ward (1571-1643) regretted "my little pity of the boy who was whipt in the hall at college" (103).

Autobiographies. Forman (1552-1601) recalled that his school teacher "beate him" for not learning some of his work (14) and Norwood (1590-1620) wrote that he was apprenticed to a master who treated him harshly.

1600 - 1649

Diaries. Woodforde referred to school discipline in her diary and she seemed to believe that her son should accept whatever punishment was due to him.

This evening I had the cutting news that my second boy was in rebellion at the college of Winton, where he and all his companions resolved not to make any verses, and being called to be whipped for it several of them refused to be punished, mine amongst the rest if they do not, they must be expelled. God I beseech thee subdue their stubborn hearts, and give them grace to repent and accept of their punishment due to their fault, and let them not run on to ruin

(Woodford, 1638-1730, p.15).

Her husband went to the school and their son was persuaded to accept the punishment.

Child diaries. Not all teachers would appear to have had control over their pupils. *Taylor at 16 wrote of his teacher:

Mr. Graves, not having his name for nought, lost the love of the undergraduates by his too much austerity, whereupon they used to strike a nail above the hall door-catch while we were reciting to him, and so nail him in the hall.

(*Taylor, 1642-1729, p.15).

Autobiographies. Three texts referred to school discipline. Evelyn (1620-1706) recalled that it was intended he should go to Eton, but he "was so terrified at the report of the severe discipline there" that he refused to go (vol. 1, p.5). Josselin noted he was never whipped at school:

I thank god for his goodness to me insomuch
as for not saying my lessons I remember not
that I was ever whipt.

(Josselin, 1616-1683, p.2).

Martindale received corporal punishment from one school teacher, but his father did not approve.

This [punishment] I concealed; yet at last it
came out, & mightly offended my father, but
the Schoolemaster crying "peccavi" and
promising to do so no more, all was well
again.

(Martindale, 1623-86, p.14).

1650 - 1699

Diaries. The diaries of Grange and Morris provide information on school discipline, and they were both against severe punishments. The tutor of Grange's son complained about the boy's "perverseness". Grange was annoyed:

As to the perverseness of the poor young child,
it rarely is unconquerable in a boy so very
young, if proper methods be taken. I know the
boy had a wantonness, as such of his age use to
have, and is more plyable by persuasion than by
rough treatment. But Cumming's crabbed
peevish temper made him use the last method,
and often to beat him severely for trifles, and
sometimes when the boy was more in the right
than he, till I put a stop to it, and now he says
himself the boy does well. Lord be thanked he
learns well and would learn better if he had a
more painfull and better temper'd master.

(Grange, 1679-1754, p.72).

Morris' son complained of the harsh treatment he received at school and his parents wrote a letter to the headmaster about it. However, as his son was still being punished severely, Morris went to the school.

He [teacher] profess'd to me, He had not given him above three Lashes at a time since I talk'd with him about it: He said also I should tell his Mother he would Whip him no more. I answered him, then all would be spoil'd that way: No I did not desire that; But only moderate Correction, which to him a Good-Natured & Flexible, though Lazy, Boy I hoped would be effectual. I desired also he would keep him in the School at Playtime when the other Boys were at Liberty. He said that would [be] no manner of Punishment to him. For he would sit in his Chamber by himself many hours together. However, I answer'd it might be grievous to him when he was forc'd to do so.

(Morris, 1659-1727, p.104).

Autobiographies. One autobiographer mentioned the treatment he received at school. Fretwell (1699-1722) wrote that, at one school he attended, his teacher, though good, was "too severe, tho' I was never whipt at school by any of my masters" (185).

Discussion

The picture given by the 16th and 17th century texts is much less dramatic than the one put forward by Stone (1977). Corporal punishment was inflicted in schools; but not every pupil was subjected to it. In addition, most parents would appear to disagree with severe punishment and were prepared to intervene on their child's behalf (Grange and Morris). This finding contradicts Ariès (1962), who argued that pupils were severely beaten at school because their parents wished them to be so disciplined.

1700 - 1749

Diaries. One diarist, a school teacher, described the discipline imposed at her school; Minor faults were generally overlooked, but "when actual sin was committed" it was written down and discussed at the weekly meeting. At these meetings, Fletcher noted "we always adapted our conversation to the little criminal" (61). If the children continued to disobey:

we would then add unto our words correction; making them feel pain, that the impression might be strong and more lasting; and that they must never resent or resist these corrections, for it was more painful for us to give, than it could be for them to receive them.

(Fletcher, 1739-1814, p.56).

Child diaries. *Baldwin, aged 17, recorded the punishments meted out at his college:

At night, Nichols, Holliok, and Brewster were publicly admonished for having a Dance at Milford, and for their general conduct. Bull, for going to Milford without liberty and for his general conduct, was ordered to depart from College and to live under the care of some minister at a distance till he should show signs of reformation and be fit to take a degree.

(*Baldwin, 1745-75, p.445).

Autobiographies. Three autobiographers referred to the punishment they received at school. Boscawen (1719-1805) recalled "I never was whipped at school" (89), whereas Boswell (1740-95) wrote "I cannot say that I found my Punishments, when at School to be pleasant (vol. 1, p.60). Stedman recorded both the punishment he received at school and his father's reaction to it:

I was again put to learn English with one, MacWilliams, a soldier, and regimental schoolmaster, who, for a very paltry offence, almost tore one of my ears from off my head,

and which so prodigiously incensed my father, that he not only again took me home, but would have effectually kild the military pedant had he not begg'd for mercy on his knees.

(Stedman, 1744-97, p.9).

Discussion

There would appear to be little change from the earlier centuries - some pupils were whipped, some not. Again, at least some parents would not tolerate any cruelty to their child (see Stedman's diary). In addition, as *Baldwin's and Fletcher's diaries reveal, whipping was not the only punishment inflicted, milder methods generally being tried first.

1750 - 1799

Diaries. Seven diarists described school discipline. Calvert's daughter was at boarding school and was often taken out by her mother. While visiting Isabella (aged 11) one morning, Calvert noted:

I had the inexpressible mortification of hearing that she had been very pert to Mrs D. who requested that I would not take her. I actually shed tears I was so hurt, but I applauded Mrs Devis for informing me, and I trust this will be a useful lesson to Isabella, she cried the whole time I was in the room.

(Calvert, 1767-1859, p.24).

Other diarists were less than happy about the discipline imposed on their children. Hardy (1789-1877) was very concerned when she discovered that the governess had been beating her youngest daughter "most cruelly" (71). Moore did not think that the teachers at his daughter's school understood her temperament. He visited:

my dear Anastasia, whom I found in trouble. Great complaints against her from the Schoolmistress for inattention to her lessons. Perceived the schoolmistress had mistaken her disposition, and supposes that it is obstinacy prevents the child from answering what she knows; when, in fact, it is the confusion arising from a strong feeling of reproof or disgrace that puts all her ideas to flight and makes her incapable of anything while she is in that state. Lectured my dear little girl very gravely as I walked with her to meet her mama, who also was as serious as she could be about it, though feeling all the while, with me, that the schoolmistress had (as she herself used to do) mistaken the child's disposition (vol. 4, p.132).

In addition, Moore also recorded his son being punished at school. He received a:

Letter from Tom's schoolmaster, confessing that he had given our poor little fellow an over-severe beating one day, for a supposed offence of which he afterwards found the child to be innocent. The fellow's confessing it is something, though the marks all over the child's body sufficiently tell the tale. Little Tom [11 years] very manly and sensible about it.

(Moore, 1779-1852, vol. 6, p.49).

Holland (1770-1845) did not describe the discipline her children received at school; but she was worried when her son was about to start Eton because "the world of a public school he will find very different from that of the world seen from under the parental roof" (236).

Three teachers recorded their own methods of discipline. When *Sewall took over his school he wrote:

I found that I could not get along without a stricter discipline - consequently I laid down my rules, but some of the large scholars did not feel willing to come under the regulations, and have this day while out of school threatened to ignore me as I have just heard from a friend

to the school.

(*Sewall, 1797-1846, p.33).

Harrower was responsible not only for the education of his two pupils but also for the care of them. He would use corporal punishment, with the boys' father's approval. For example, he wrote:

one night in the Nursery I wheep'd Billie
[aged 5] for crying for nothing and she
[Billie's mother] came in and carried him
out from under me. Some nights after he
got into the same humour and his Papa The
Col: hearing him Call'd me and Asked why
I cou'd hear him do so and not correct him
for it; Upon that I told him how Mrs Dainger-
field had behaved when I did correct him. At
that he was angry wt her.

(Harrower, 1773-76, p.96).

Jones wrote of his four pupils:

My happiness with regard to my little Boys is
very great. The eldest is rather opinionative,
yet I can easily manage him. The two
middlemost are possess'd of amazing Sensibility.
Whatever home reproof I may give either or all
of them upon occasion, it never causes any
Variance which lasts many moments. They
never seem to bear the least resentment, nor
can I: we always sit down to dinner together on
the most loving Terms.

(Jones, 1755-1821, p.29).

Child diaries. Evidence on school discipline was provided by four child diarists. None described severe treatment. For example, at Litchfield school, the pupils, all girls, received credit marks for doing well and lectures for doing badly or any misbehaviour. As *Sheldon described:

I heard Miss Pierce tell our faults, had the
pleasure to hear her say she had seen no fault
in me for the week past.

(*Sheldon, 1788-1889, p.44).

The diaries of Bower, *Chandler and *Robertson described the enjoyable time the diarists had at school or university. *Chandler (1753-86), for example, noted the various tricks he played on tutors and also referred to a class rebellion.

Autobiographies. Five autobiographers recalled the punishments they received at school. Three were subjected to physical chastisement. W. Scott wrote:

I was indifferently well beaten at school;
but I am now quite certain that twice as
much discipline would have been well
bestowed.

(W. Scott, 1771-1832, p.322).

F. Shelley went to school at the age of 8:

Marks of approbation and of disgrace, were pinned on our frocks. I seem to have been always in disgrace! I was wilful, headstrong, and determined to have my own way. The youngest sister of Miss Dutton, who kept the school, took me in charge, but in spite of violence and smacking, she could not subdue me. On one occasion she hit me over the shoulders with a wooden case full of pens. They flew out over the room in all directions, much to the merriment of my companions, who left their books to pick them up, and restored them to their owner with mocking curtseys. After this the elder sister, a delicate gentle creature, took me under her care, and I shall never cease to remember her kindness, her judicious management, and the strong affection which she inspired.

(F. Shelley, 1787-1873, p.5).

Corporal punishment was again employed at Townsend's school; he described the steward as a "rigid and vigilant disciplinarian". However, it was possible to gain a reprieve for this form of punishment. Townsend (1757-1826) recalled that he was due to receive a whipping for "profaning" the name of God; but instead lost his privileges (5).

Owenson (1780? -1859) wrote that at her school the disgrace of doing wrong was usually substituted for punishment. *Silliman described the school discipline he experienced:

The discipline of our almost infant school was parental and not severe discipline. The rod was rarely or never used; but milder methods were employed (19)

*Silliman gave an example of one of these "milder methods"; although it is arguable that, at least from the child's point of view, this punishment was not in the least milder. *Silliman recalled that one boy and girl, for whispering and playing indoors, were made to walk home as yoke-fellows by means of a double yoke of willow branches fastened to their necks.

The little girl, not at all abashed, addressed her shrinking companion by epithets of endearment: he was compelled to bear the sly titter of his school-fellows, - a punishment not soon forgotten.

(*Silliman, 1779-1864, p.19).

Moore, O'Connell and Robinson described the general discipline at their school, although they were not punished. Moore (1779-1852) recalled that his first teacher drank heavily and then whipped the pupils for disturbing his slumber. O'Connell (1775-1814) wrote that he was not beaten at school, although he was the only one in his class who was not - due to the fact that he paid attention. Robinson (1775-1867) would have wanted to go to grammar school but he "had heard that Mr. Lawrence was a flogging master" and was therefore glad not to go.

Discussion

As with the previous time periods, although parents did wish their offspring to be subjected to some discipline and control while at school (see Calvert's diary), they did not approve of severe

punishment (Hardy, Holland and Moore). Individual school teachers did vary in the type of discipline they imposed. For example, Harrower did whip his pupils whereas Jones did not. There still seems to have been very little change in the range of school discipline which children experienced. Although some were physically punished at school, many others were not. It appears that the likelihood of receiving corporal punishment was increased if a boy was sent to a British public school.

1800 - 1849

Diaries. Two diarists, both American teachers, described their methods of discipline. *Howe ran a school for the blind, in which corporal punishment was forbidden, although he did cane two pupils who set fire to the school building for the second time. *Ward was quite different. After a few weeks teaching he noted "I got a whip this morning, but I hope I shall have no occasion to use it". His hope was not realised as he described whipping a few pupils and also slapping another, causing the boy's nose to bleed.

Then John Bush told me that the parents
did not wish me to punish their children in
this manner.

(*Ward, 1841-1931, p.90).

However, *Ward carried on, writing that he whipped one pupil for running away from school and was going to whip another but the pupil ran away. He also kept some pupils in detention. He did not use his whip all the time: for example, on one occasion he wrote: "I whipped with my palm too savagely" (91). This would seem to mean that he merely slapped a pupil.

Child diaries. Six of these texts contain information on school discipline. Three child diarists, two of them at Eton, recorded

receiving physical punishment at school. *Long (1838-1915) wrote: "I was ferruled for chewing boxberry leaves at school" (16). M. Gaskell and Selwyn referred to the "floggings" inflicted at Eton. For example, Gaskell wrote:

He [teacher] first flogged one of the collegers, then called for me. I begged him to give me my first fault. He answered that I had committed an error very early. I scarcely refrain from tears but did.

(M. Gaskell, 1810-?, p.3).

Three diarists noted other forms of punishment. *Chester (1801-70), attending Litchfield school, was scolded for staying out after nine p.m. She regarded this scolding as "a blast which never no never will be erased from my memory" (154).

*Richards (1842-?) mentioned that she was kept in after school on two occasions; once for laughing and once for whispering in class. Brown (1807-33) attended school in France, and did not have a high opinion of the teacher's authority. She described the pupils jumping over stools, squirting ink, tossing books and dancing on the tables. The most common punishments issued were to make the offenders kneel or wear a black bonnet or write out poems. The other diarists who wrote diaries while at school, did not refer to punishment at all, which does imply that, for them, the discipline was not severe.

Autobiographies. Many of the autobiographers for this period, particularly those at the English public schools, recalled being subjected to very strict, if not cruel, discipline. This parallels the increase in severity in home discipline of the same period. *Howe and *Lawrence both referred to unpleasant school days. *Howe (1801-76) recalled that all pupils were beaten at his school because the principal enjoyed inflicting pain. *Lawrence (1814-86) complained to his father of the harsh, inconsistent discipline

imposed at the boarding school he attended - the teacher pulled the boys' hair and ears. He finally ran away; but at his father's request went back to school. *Chace (1806-?) recollected that, at the public school she and her sister attended, the pupils were expected to bow or curtsy to the teacher every time they stood before in her class. *Chace and her sister, however, were Quakers and such obeisance was against Quaker principles. On refusing to curtsy, the girls were threatened with a whipping; but by the intervention of their father the next day, they were eventually excused from curtsying.

The British writers described much harsher treatment. Acland (1809-98) attended a private school, presided over by a severe master: the pupils were whipped for arrears in work and for being the last one down in the morning. Acland spent five years there and felt he was being "crushed". Bright was sent to a highly recommended Quaker school; the teachers were again strict, inflicting "harsh if not barbaric" punishments. He was forced to take a cold bath once a week; regarding it with the same horror as Grant (see section 2.1);

I cannot describe the terror which seized and afflicted me on the mornings when I had to undergo the inevitable plunge.
(Bright, 1811-89, p.6).

His parents removed Bright from the school and also began an inquiry into the state of other schools. Cooper wrote of his school:

The memory of that place makes me shudder; it is repulsive to me even now. I think there never was such a wicked school before or since. The place was bad, wicked, filthy, and the treatment was starvation and cruelty.
(Cooper, 1801-85, p.39).

Cooper was, however, sent to Harrow at the age of 12 and there he spent much happier school days. Epps described his protective measures for the punishment he received at school:

In the holidays, in order to prepare my hands for the stripes they were to receive during the next half-year, I every day gave myself twenty stripes on the hands with a switch. Also having heard that our gardner had acquired a thick skin by the use of the spade, I took to digging hard in my father's garden.
(Epps, 1806-69, p.46).

Unfortunately, Epps efforts were all in vain - the teacher merely hit harder when he saw that the punishment did not hurt and wound a "cobbler's cord" round the cane to make it more painful. Epps thought that the canings at his school were too frequent and severe - they were often given for trifling faults. Hare (1834-1903) attended two schools. The first was private and presided over by a "cruel" schoolmaster who caned so often that the pupils were in terror of him. After this, Hare went to Harrow where he recalled some masters who caned for the least fault, because they enjoyed inflicting pain. Lucas (1804-61) was also sent to two schools. In the first the schoolmaster's wife used to pull the pupils' hair and hit them on the back of their hands with a hair brush; the second Lucas regarded as an improvement, but recalled "castigation was always going on". Sewell (1815-1906) recalled that physical punishment was not used at her school; but a repressive disciplinary system was still employed. No talking of any kind was allowed in school and, if three mistakes were made in a lesson - a hesitation counted as a mistake - the girl had to do another; marks of disgrace such as "brown paper ass's ears" were put on the offender and she then had to stand in front of the class. Sewell herself was punished for telling a lie: she had to stand in front of the class wearing a special gown and a "liar's

tongue", feeling very ashamed and disgraced.

Pollen (1820-92), however, recalled, that despite the image of brutality which Eton had, he had nothing but "delightful memories" of it.

Discussion

The quotation from Stone (1977) could be more appropriately applied to the early 19th century than to the 16th and 17th centuries. The British public schools would seem to have regarded strict discipline as necessary for the education of boys. However, if Guest is typical, not all parents would agree. When her son was about to go to Eton she wrote:

When I thought of all the sorrow and temptation my poor boys would have to go through in that place I quite shuddered and prayed that assistance might be granted them from above. It seems a sad prospect, but everybody says it is the only way to bring up boys; and what is to be done! How can I a poor weak woman, judge against all the world?

(Guest, 1812-?, 1950, p.164).

There is a marked sex discrimination in the discipline to which boys and girls were subjected - the former were much more likely to be caned or whipped. Of the six child diarists, it was the three boys who described receiving physical punishment at school.

1850 - 1899

Some schools still imposed a harsh discipline during this period but there would seem to be a reduction in severity.

Diaries. Traherne taught at a public school and discussed the discipline there:

it is far easier to make a boy work through fear than it is through love of work: to rouse enthusiasm in the work itself is an exceedingly arduous business. The difficulty is that I hate the idea of caning a boy almost as much as some of the staff relish it. They satisfy a sort of bestial lust by lashing a small boy and hearing him yell. They would be horrified at the suggestion, but I am certain that this is true On the other hand, I firmly believe that there is a type of boy who can understand no other form of treatment. I only wish such types would not come under my jurisdiction.

(Traherne, 1885-1917, p.27).

Traherne's views brought him into conflict with the headmaster who regarded Traherne as being too lax in punishing.

Child diaries. King-Hall and Newbolt referred to the canings at the educational establishments they attended. King-Hall was at a naval college where "floggings", if rare, were brutal:

Yesterday a chap got a flogging for swearing, they tie you down to a horse (gym) they then flog you in front of yr term some cadets faint for it draws blood sometimes so the Dr. is always there.

(King-Hall, 1893-?, p.336).

Newbolt (1863-1941) remarked on the "slogging" - the laying about with a cane to keep order - at his public school. Colt (1916-?) wrote that canings were rarely inflicted at his school, instead lines were given.

Autobiographies. Horler and Waugh referred to school punishment in their autobiographies. Horler recalled the beating of one boy for stealing a sheet of notepaper which he had intended to replace:

I watched, incredulously, W— undo his trousers, pull them down, lift up his shirt, kneel against the form and have his head imprisoned between the sergeant's legs. The

sergeant, I was glad to see, had tears in his eyes.

(Horler, 1898-?, p.21).

This "birching" also drew blood and marked the start of Horler's hatred of "practically all schoolmasters". Waugh's (1903-66) experiences were less severe. He first went to a day school where the teachers "were mild enough, but I had never before been shouted at or threatened" (82). There were very few beatings at this school; they were generally reserved for "outrageous" behaviour. At his boarding school, discipline was also fairly mild; three strokes was the normal punishment and Waugh believed "There was seldom any injustice" (106).

Discussion

As with discipline in the home, in the late 19th century, the severity of punishments lessened in the schools, although some whippings were still severe.

3.0

CONCLUSION

The information provided by the sources reveals that parents, through the centuries studied, have tried to control, or at least regulate, their children's behaviour. Various methods have been employed to achieve this objective: physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, advice, lectures, making the child feel ashamed and remonstrations. The method used to discipline a child would appear to vary according to the parent rather than the time period (with the possible exception of the early 19th century) - in every century strict and indulgent parents appeared. British

parents would, however, appear to be stricter than American. It would also appear that physical punishment was used to discipline the younger offspring, while parents tried to advise and reason with adolescents. Parents did tend to wish, in theory, to have a great deal of authority over their children, but in practice they did not achieve that aim. At least some parents believed in a reciprocal parent-child relationship: they would have the best interests of their children at heart and, in return, expected their children to be obedient. For example, *Jefferay in the 16th century, Josselin in the 17th, Young in the 18th and Weymouth in the 19th.

The evidence does not agree with the arguments of such writers as Ariès (1962), de Mause (1976) or Stone (1977) that children were harshly, even cruelly, disciplined, but reveals that brutality was the exception rather than the rule. There was, however, a definite increase in severity in the early 19th century, particularly in Britain. During this period some children were subjected to intense brutality at home and even more so at school. The autobiographies of this period (especially the upper class ones) in particular document the ill-treatment endured by children (those of Cooper, Grant and Hare describe the harshest discipline). These autobiographies differ significantly from the earlier ones in their descriptions of the discipline that parents applied. For example, it is one thing to recall the general method of discipline as did G. Mildmay (whipped to "inculcate virtuous principles") and Norwood (prayed to escape beatings during the week) in the 16th century, and another to give detailed, specific examples of cruelty as did Grant and Hare in the early 19th. It should be remembered though that only a minority of children in the early 19th century were cruelly treated.

The autobiographies consistently contain more evidence on physical punishment than any other source of evidence. This poses problems for such authors as de Mause (1976) and Stone (1977) who have relied mainly on autobiographies to reveal the strict discipline meted out to children in the past. Apart from the fact that other autobiographers of the same time period recalled nothing but happy childhoods, when the autobiographies are compared with other sources of evidence, especially the child diaries, it can be seen that severe discipline was not widespread. There is also the problem of how accurate autobiographies are - the writer's memories of his childhood are affected by hindsight, and memory is, in itself, extremely selective. Nevertheless many autobiographers did recall specific instances of harsh discipline and in these cases it does seem that the picture given by the autobiographer is accurate.

There would also appear to be no link between attitudes and behaviour. For example, in the 17th century, Heywood, Housman and C. *Mather all regarded children as being full of Original Sin; but none recorded administering physical punishment - C. *Mather, in fact, specifically spoke out against it. In the 19th century, Allen, *Lovell and *Walker viewed their offspring as depraved; the last two used physical punishment as a means of discipline whereas Allen did not. In the 18th century Boscawen and Wynne both intended to take great care of their offspring. This wish resulted in Boscawen resorting to whippings to ensure her children would be obedient, whereas Wynne was less concerned with obedience and did not mention inflicting any whippings.

Apart from the early 19th century, there would appear to be considerable continuity and homogeneity in methods of discipline. Rather than one century standing out as being noticeably cruel or kind, it seems instead that there was a great deal of individual

variation in methods of discipline. The severity of the early 19th century appears to have been very atypical. It was merely a reaction to the rapid changes in society and the increased severity in school was perhaps due to the English public school cult. The evolutionary theories on parental discipline are not supported - rather than kind methods of discipline evolving through the centuries, a wide range of variation in discipline existed at any one time. It was perhaps the existence of harsh discipline in the 19th century which led to such theories. Parents did seem to be concerned with trying to form their child's character. Newson and Newson (1976), in their study of child-rearing methods, reveal that parents of this century also attempt to control their children's behaviour in order to make them (children) socially acceptable. Thus, regulating a child's behaviour appears to be a fundamental aspect of the parental role and therefore parents will be concerned with discipline. However, it seems that the protective nature of parental care inhibits most parents from enforcing their authority with brutality.

The use of the term "whipping" is also of interest. It seems to be the blanket term used to cover a wide range of physical punishment regardless of whether an implement was actually used. *Ward stated he whipped with his "palm" and *Lovell threatened to whip her daughter with a stick when the term "beat" would be more appropriate. In some cases an implement was mentioned - Boscawen, Grant and *Ward for example; but in many cases it appears that the parents were using only their hands. The term "spanking" did not appear in the texts studied till the 19th century (*Alcott's diary). The word "whipping" does conjure up images of severe punishment when perhaps this was not the case. Thus there is a problem of the meaning of words in texts from previous centuries and this should be considered in any

assessment of past child-rearing methods. The use of implements was not confined to previous centuries; Newson and Newson (1976) discovered that, by the age of 7, 75% of modern British children had been hit with or at least threatened with an implement. These implements varied from a wooden spoon or slipper to a cane or belt. Thus, if the term "whipping" did mean the use of a whip or stick, then it would still be impossible to argue that past parents were more cruel than 20th century parents are.

REFERENCES

- Ariès, Philippe (1962): Centuries of Childhood; Jonathan Cape, London.
- Bremner, Robert, ed. (1970-73): Children and Youth in America; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Gouge, William (1622): Of Domesticall Duties; John Haviland, London.
- Locke, John (1699): Some Thoughts Concerning Education; A. & J. Churchill, London.
- Lyman, Richard (1976): "Barbarism and religion: late Roman and early medieval childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp.75-100.
- McLaughlin, Mary (1976): "Survivors and surrogates: children and parents from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.101-182.
- de Mause, Lloyd, ed. (1976): "The evolution of childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood, Souvenir Press, London, pp.1-74.
- Newson, John and Newson, Elizabeth (1976): Seven Years Old in the Home Environment; George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London.
- Plumb, J. (1975): "The new world of children in eighteenth century England"; in Past and Present, vol. 67, pp.64-93.
- Robertson, Priscilla (1976): "Home as a nest: middle class childhood in nineteenth-century Europe"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 407-431.
- Sears, R. (1975): Your Ancients Revisited. A History of Childhood Development; University of Chicago Press.
- Shorter, Edward (1976): The Making of the Modern Family; Collins, London.
- Smith, Daniel (1977): "Autonomy and affection: parents and children in eighteenth-century Chesapeake families"; The Psychological Review, vol. 6, pp.32-51.

Stone, Lawrence (1977): The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

Tucker, M. J. (1976): "The child as beginning and end: fifteenth and sixteenth century English childhood"; in de Mause, Lloyd, ed. The History of Childhood; Souvenir Press, London, pp. 229-258.