On 24 April 1750, William Hogarth put his painting *The March to Finchley* up for auction, the proceeds from which were to go to London’s Foundling Hospital. What happened next, according to the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, was that a “certain lady” discovered herself “the possessor of the fortunate number” and decided to present the painting to the Hospital. She was dissuaded, however, from doing so directly, “some person [having suggested] what door it would open to scandal, were any of her sex to make such a present.”

One possible rationale behind the prudent suggestion could be the subject matter of the painting. The central characters in the painting are a handsome grenadier about to depart to battle, his jealous wife, and his young mistress. According to Justice Welsh, Hogarth’s friend, the younger woman is “debauched, with child, and reduced to the miserable employ of selling ballads, and who, with the look full of love, tenderness, and distress, casts up her eyes upon her underlip, and with tears descending down her cheeks, seems to say, ‘sure you cannot—will not leave me!’”

The painting intended as a gift to the public charitable institution thus depicted a working-class woman pregnant with an illegitimate child—a potential inmate of the same institution (the Foundling Hospital was designed to shelter children of unmarried working-class women, liable to be abandoned in the street or murdered shortly after birth by their desperate mothers). The situation was ambiguous, but it was not this ambiguity that informed the reaction to the generous lady’s initiative. In fact, we know that the lady (her name remaining unknown) handed *The March to Finchley* over to the artist, and Hogarth gave it to the Hospital in his own name; it was gladly accepted and proudly exhibited in the General Court Room. It was specifically the gender of the donor,
independently from the dubious erotic charge of the painting, that
provoked the fear of scandal in the auction participants.

Notably, any mention of the lady philanthropist was erased from
the two other contemporary accounts of the auction, one provided
by the London Evening Post on the first of May, 1750; the other by
the Minutes of the Court of Governors on the ninth of May. The London
Evening Post reported:

Yesterday Mr. Hogarth’s Subscription was closed, 1843 Chances being
subscribed for. The remaining Numbers from 1843 to 2000 were given
by Mr. Hogarth to the Hospital for the Maintenance and Education of
exposed and deserted young Children. At Two o’Clock the Box was
open’d, and in the Presence of a great Number of Persons of Distinction,
and the fortunate Chance was drawn, No. 1941, which belongs to the
said Hospital; and the same Night Mr. Hogarth deliver’d the Picture to
the Governors. His Grace the Duke of Ancaster offer’d them 200 l. for it
before it was taken away, but it was refus’d. 6

According to the Court of Governors, “The Treasurer acquainted
the General Court, that Mr. Hogarth had presented the Hospital
with the remainder of the tickets Mr. Hogarth had left, for the chance
of the picture he had painted, of the March to Finchley, in the time of
the late Rebellion; and that the fortunate number for the said picture
being among the tickets, the Hospital had received the same picture.” 7
Neither the Post nor the Court of Governors thus chose to
mention that it was the “certain lady” who, upon drawing a fortunate chance,
decided to give up her prize for the benefit of the Hospi-
tal. In fact, the story was edited so carefully that there was no room
left for the depiction of the generous outside donor; in the Post’s
report, the fortunate number is said to turn up among the tickets
belonging to “the same Hospital,” but the lady vanishes without a
trace.

To appreciate the peculiarity of this story, we have to remember
how assiduously the champions of the English infanticide-preven-
tion campaign had courted the support of gentlewomen at the early
stages of that campaign. Inspired by the prominent role played by
women in the establishment and functioning of French, Italian, and
Dutch Foundling Hospitals, the tireless English “projector” Thomas
Coram made the participation of “Ladies of Quality” a cornerstone
of his anti-infanticidal crusade. 8 It was by his instigation that in 1735,
twenty-one upper-class women signed a petition to the King about
the need for a Foundling Hospital in London. This made it possible
for Coram to start his next petition by pointing out “That many

Lady’s of Quality and Distinction [are] deeply touched with Concern
for the frequent Murders committed on poor Miserable Infant Chil-
dren at their Birth by their Cruel Parents to hide their Shame and
for the Inhumane Custom of exposing New born children to Perish
in the Streets.” Later Coram would claim that in effect the whole
campaign for the opening of the Hospital had been the initiative of
the ladies, who were later supported in their noble undertaking by
gentlemen. 9 In November 1739, at a public ceremony inaugurating
the official establishment of the new charity, Coram opened his
speech with the following paean to the ladies:

It is with inexpressible pleasure, I now present your Grace, as the head
of this noble and honourable Corporation, with his Majesty’s Royal
Charter, for establishing an Hospital for exposed children, free of all ex-
 pense, through the assistance of some compassionate great ladies, and other
good persons (italics mine). 7

The early history of the Foundling Hospital was thus marked by the
commitment to include the women and even to go as far—as least
rhetorically—as to present them as the primary moving force be-
hind the establishment of this public charity. In the light of this his-
tory, the account of the 1750 auction, with its fear of scandal
surrounding the initiative of the anonymous lady, looks like a puzz-
ling aberration.

To unravel some parts of this puzzle, we have to reconstruct the
historical context of the London Foundling Hospital from the early
1740s, when after the first excitement from receiving the public
imprimatur in the form of the Royal Charter and taking in its first
groups of illegitimate infants, the Hospital found itself faced with
the everyday problem of defending both its moral outlook and its
continuous claim to public financial support (which, until 1756,
came exclusively in the form of private donations). It turns out that
the story of Hogarth’s painting was not an isolated accident; on the
contrary, it was only too representative of the general exclusion of
gentlewomen from the public role in the affairs of the Hospital since
the 1740s. Several scholars have inquired into the exclusionary gen-
der politics of the infanticide-prevention campaign at the mid-cen-
tury; I intend here to take their explanations further and situate the
gendered history of the Foundling Hospital in the broader context
of the development of the eighteenth-century public domain. Thus,
in what follows, I discuss several possible explanations for the exclu-
sion of women from the governance of the Hospital in the 1740–50s
and consider these explanations in relation to the recent feminist
revisions of Jurgen Habermas’s paradigm of the bourgeois public sphere. I conclude my argument about the importance of a broader cultural contextualization of the gender politics of the eighteenth-century infanticide-prevention campaign by showing how these politics informed and were in turn informed by the works of contemporary fiction. Here I first consider briefly the reference to the Foundling Hospital in Tobias Smollett’s Peregrine Pickle (1751) and then discuss in detail the allusions to infanticide and illegitimacy in Samuel Richardson’s novel The History of Sir Charles Grandison (1753–54). I argue in particular that we could read Richardson’s portrayal of illegitimacy as indicative of his ambivalent take on the issue of female philanthropy. On the one hand, his novel appears to articulate emotional reasons behind the reluctance of “Ladies of Quality” to lend their names to the Hospital starting from the 1740s; on the other, Grandison stops short of giving to this reluctance an unqualified moral imprimatur. Richardson evokes a cultural fantasy in which the bastard children and their mothers—whose claims to financial and emotional support regularly threaten the stability of the upper-middle-class household—could be neutralized and removed from the immediate ken of the jittery legal family. This ideal (that is, from the point of view of the Grandison women) arrangement both demands a vigilant female attendance on the family—interrupted by independent excursions to the public domain (including the domain of public philanthropy)—and commends men who build and support public charities in which transgressing women and their base-born children could be confined and reformed.

THE “SHELTER FOR BASTARDS”

As several contributors to this volume have pointed out, infanticide was a publicly acknowledged problem in eighteenth-century England. Toni Bowers notes that “abandoned or exposed children—in Augustan slang, children who had been ‘dropped’—constituted a social presence that could not be ignored: their bodies, dead or (barely) alive littered London and the countryside.” To farm an infant out to a “killer-nurse” or to abandon it shortly after birth were often the only options available to an unmarried woman who anticipated being ostracized (and often physically punished) for burdening her parish with a “bastard,” and had no means for supporting a child on her own. Looking back at the “Age of Reason,” the nineteenth-century historian William Burke Ryan wrote that London parks, ditches, and garbage heaps were the typical places where onlookers could come across dead infants. Those strolling close to waterways could expect to see the bodies of drowned children, as the Thames was the favorite depository for unwanted infants. Hogarth’s 1739 engraving, Heading to the Subscription Roll, unapologetically lists some of the methods for disposing of such children: stabbing, drowning, and abandoning them in common pathways in hopes that someone would pick them up. B. Nebot’s 1741 painting, entitled Captain Thomas Coram, depicts the founding father of the Foundling Hospital coming across a pitiful-looking infant left on a roadside (to Coram belongs the famous complaint about the “daily sight of infant corpses thrown on the dust heaps of London”). Even though, as Keith Wrightson observes, only a few women among those with the “stringent rational motive to commit infanticide” actually did, the abandonment and murder of newborn children remained a tragically constant feature of the social landscape of the British Enlightenment.

As early as in the 1680s, William Petty published a series of essays suggesting that England needed a publically funded institution dedicated to saving lives of unwanted illegitimate children of working-class women. Later the same argument was advanced by Joseph Addison, Daniel Defoe, Bernard Mandeville, Thomas Bray, and others. In a much-quoted 1713 article in The Guardian, Addison wrote that “Milan, Madrid, Lisbon, Rome, and many other large towns” have already built great hospitals and thus have ensured that “many are by this means preserved, and do signal services to their country.” Bray conferred in 1728, noting that “a Hospital for the Reception of Poor Cast Off Children” would turn such children into “useful Members of the Commonwealth,” instead of being “like Warts and Wrens, and other filthy Excrecencies defacing and weakening of the Body Politic.” In his Generous Projector or a Friendly Proposal to prevent Murder and other enormous Abuses by erecting an Hospital for Foundlings and Bastard-Children (1731), Defoe bewailed the negative effect that infanticide was imagined to have on British demographics:

Thus is the World [robbed] of an Inhabitant, who might have been of use; the King of a Subject; and future generations of an Issue not to be accounted for, had this Infant lived to have been a Parent.

Thus, by the first decades of the eighteenth century, infanticide became a touchstone of national self-definition: were British citizens to stand and watch helplessly as their country’s precious human re-
sources were being depleted while other countries (mostly Catholic ones, too) worked to resolve their infanticide problem.

Still the idea of a “shelter for bastards” was so controversial that it took even the hyperactive Coram almost two decades (from 1722 to 1739) to put it into practice. Finally, in 1741, the Foundling Hospital admitted its first group of infants. Initially, the admission of children was “regulated by the funds of the Hospital, which being derived from private subscriptions and legacies of benevolent individuals only,” were limited. In 1756, Parliament agreed to support the Hospital financially on the condition that the governors would take in all children brought to its gates. From the demographic and economic point of view, this arrangement was a disaster: staggering mortality rates and exorbitant costs soon demonstrated that this “national effort to conserve infants for the state was ill-advised.”

Out of 14,994 children admitted before 1771, only 4,400 “lived to be apprenticed out”—the mortality rate thus was more than seventy per cent. The policy of indiscriminate admission was given up in 1771, along with the parliamentary support, and after that the Hospital operated on a more modest scale, taking in about twenty new children every year.

Though failing to fulfill its foundational promise of increasing the number of “useful members of the commonwealth,” the Foundling Hospital came to occupy a prominent place in the cultural life of the British Enlightenment. By the mid-century, it emerged as a genuinely contradictory cultural phenomenon that not only embodied the best humanitarian impulses as well as the complicated social ambitions of eighteenth-century Englishmen but that also reflected the deep-seated class and gender anxieties of the time. It was the first national joint-stock charity, the model for other philanthropic institutions that mushroomed in the 1740–1760s—such as the Lying-In Hospital, Magdalen House, Marine Society, Lock Hospital—and whose presence allowed Fielding to pay, in 1752, “a compliment to the present Age for two glorious Benefactions... that to the use of Foundling Infants and that for the Accommodation of poor Women in their Lying-In.” The Hospital’s pledge that it would provide the Empire with “useful citizens”—the much needed soldiers and workers—responded to fears about the rumored depopulation of the country and appealed to the English sense of patriotism. Its overwhelming dependence on private donations offered to city merchants a gratifying opportunity to reconcile their “new-found wealth with the dictates of Christian and classical morality,” by creating a “public sphere united by bonds of sympathy and benevolence—a body to which everybody possessed of a modicum of education and property might ostensibly belong.” Its carefully selected location and architectural outlook, the prominent social position of many of its Governors, and its much publicized contributions to national arts—the Foundling’s annual art exhibition was a precursor of the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture—turned a visit to the Foundling Hospital into “the most fashionable morning lounge in the reign of George II.”

The art exhibition was a brilliant stroke. Not only did it attract potential donors to the Hospital and generate positive publicity, but it also subtly contributed to the impression that the Hospital was open to—nay, welcomed—public scrutiny. As David Solkin points out, “if people were to be persuaded to part with their money, strategies had to be devised to bring them on to the premises, so that they could see concrete evidence of [an important] task well done.” In fact, Michel Foucault’s succinct characterization of the underlying principles of the eighteenth-century insane asylum—“Surveillance and Judgment”—rings equally true for the Foundling Hospital.

Gentlewomen and the Foundling Hospital

And yet in spite of the high social profile of many of the Hospital’s Governors and donors and its willingness to submit to rather troublesome public scrutiny, the Hospital never managed to shed its associations of sexual and social transgressiveness. The grinding that the “shelter for bastards [encouraged] irresponsibility and licentiousness” continued unabated, taking different forms as the century went on. In 1740, Coram complained in a private letter that when an acquaintance of his requested his wife to hand over some money to the Hospital, she replied that “she would by no means encourage so wicked a thing.” It was widely rumored that its cham-
pions wanted to swindle the public into paying for the upkeep of their own illegitimate children; the 1750 pamphlet, The Scandalized, A Panegyri-Satirico-Comic-Dramatic Poem claimed that Coram conceived of the Foundling Hospital because he “had many a Lass grapp’d under the Lee.” In 1760, when several other charitable institutions copying its joint-stock model were opened in London, the Foundling Hospital was often presented by its ill-wishers as part and parcel of a larger confederacy aimed at debauching the nation’s morals. As a popular pamphlet entitled Joyful News to Batchelors and Maids: Being a Song, in Praise of the Foundling [sic] Hospital, and the London Hospital in Aldersgate-Street [one of London’s Lying-In Hospitals] proclaimed, “young Maids may safely take a Leap in the dark with their Sweethearts; and if they should chance to be with child may go to Aldersgate-street and lie-in, and when their month is up, they may go to the Foundling Hospital and get rid of their Bantling, and pass for pure Virgins.”

The history of the “Ladies of Quality’s” involvement with the Foundling Hospital is symptomatic both of the Hospital’s and the “Ladies’” ambiguous position in the eighteenth-century public sphere. On the one hand, Coram made a point of presenting the campaign for the opening of the Foundling Hospital as initiated and strongly supported by upper-class women. Furthermore, after the establishment of the Hospital, prominent upper- and middle-class women actively participated in its affairs by serving as inspectresses of the country nurses hired by the Hospital to take care of the young children. Among those who took upon themselves to monitor, without any remuneration (or more important for the present argument, any public ado) the work of country nurses were Martha Vansittart (“one of the beauties of the court of George II [whose] father, Sir John Stonehouse, had been a Privy Councillor and Comptroller of the Household to Queen Anne”), Anna Maria Poyntz (the maid of honor to Queen Caroline, whose husband was a ‘Privy Councillor and at the accession had been ‘high in favour and confidence of the new King George II,’ and who had been appointed Governor to the Duke of Cumberland, the king’s then nine year old son”), and Juliana Dodd (whose brother was “a great friend of Mrs. Thrale and Miss Burney” and whose husband was a close friend of Horace Walpole—one of the Hospital’s early Governors). It was Juliana Dodd whose persuasive arguments, in September 1759, led the Governors to abandon the contemplated initiative of paying the nurses an extra three pence a week to enable them to buy the children’s clothing themselves instead of receiving it from the Hospital. The surviving correspondence between the Hospital’s inspectors and its Governors attests to the crucial role played by women, such as Vansittart and Dodd, in the functioning of the charity.

On the other hand, once there was no Coram to drag them into the spotlight, women ceased to lend their names to the public support of the Hospital altogether. The “March to Finchley” episode appears less surprising when we look, for example, at the list of the Hospital’s Governors and Guardians printed at the end of John Brownlow’s 1858 account of the early days of the London Foundling Hospital. Running up to the year 1857, it contains close to a hundred names—none of them female. It seems that the pattern of demographic uniformity of the Hospital’s governing body, established somewhere in the 1740s, continued to hold well into the nineteenth century, long after the Foundling Hospital had lost its prominent cultural standing both as an emblem of “British Benevolence” and as an ever-available object of titillating accusations.

Several historians have commented upon the fact that gentlewomen seemed to be remarkably reticent about lending their names to the support of the Hospital starting from the second part of the century. So Ruth McClure notes that “over the years many women contributed generously to the Foundling Hospital, visited it, served as godmothers to its children and as inspectresses of its country nurses, and offered suggestions to improve the conduct of its affairs, but none of them ever sought to participate officially in its administration.” McClure’s explanation for it is that “English women, accustomed to the burden of governing a public charity, might have refused nomination to official position had they been asked.” She also suggests that it is likely that the Governors of the Hospital were reluctant to include women in its governing body, thinking “their new project sufficiently controversial without risking any additional criticism that disregard of the customary ways of doing things might provoke.”

Neither of these two reasons strikes me as completely satisfactory. First, it is difficult to agree that English women would consciously shun the burden of governing a public charity; in fact we know that they participated actively and publicly in affairs of other charities founded at the same time. Second, the argument about the Governors thinking “their new project sufficiently controversial without risking any additional criticism that disregard of the customary ways of doing things might provoke” does not work if we ask what were the models that the Governors presumably had in mind and did not want to disregard. As a matter of fact, in the 1730s, the public charity was still a novel institution in England, and the Foundling Hospital
had no native models to imitate; in order to find out more about the “customary” ways of doing things, Coram had to look abroad. Through his friend, Thomas Bray, Coram knew that in France “even Princesses and Duchesses, and other Ladies of the Prime Nobility of Paris, to the Number of Two Hundred and above have associated themselves, and entered into a Confraternity to manage [L'Hopital des Enfans-Trouves],” and he was eager to follow the continental way of advancing the project. We can only second-guess what would have happened had Coram not become estranged from the Hospital in the early forties; perhaps his presence would have resulted in a more balanced representation of women in the governing body of the charity. At any rate, the exclusion of women from the “responsible participation in the government of London Foundling Hospital” did not agree with the customary ways of doing things: it presented a rupture both with the existing European tradition and Coram’s earlier insistence that “Ladies of Quality” should constitute the vanguard of the infanticide prevention campaign.

A different explanation is offered by Donna Andrew in her important study *Philanthropy and Police: London Charity in the Eighteenth Century*. Andrew comments upon the “surprising absence of female subscribers among the published subscription lists” (subscriptions being an important source of money for the Hospital) and adds that out of twenty-one women who signed the 1735 petition to the king, not one gave publicly, “that is to say in her own name, to the charity, once it became incorporated.” The latter information modifies McClure’s earlier statement that “over the years many women contributed generously to the Foundling Hospital.” Contribute they did, but many of them not in their own names, but rather, as Andrew points out, through “their husbands or other near male relatives.”

Even more important, we now know that women were absent both from the list of governors and guardians and from the published subscription lists. If the former could be explained, as McClure suggests, by English women shirking the unfamiliar burden of governing a public charity, what about the latter? Was signing a subscription list also a novel burden singularly unappealing to English women? Not so, Andrew contends: English women were willing to subscribe openly to other charities; a number of them supported the already mentioned City of London Lying-In Hospital and the British Lying-In Hospital, as well as the Lying-In Charity, the Marine Society, and the Magdalen House. It was specifically this charity that seemed to scare away potential female philanthropists. Or, as Andrew puts it, “since women were commonly held to be the arbiters and bastions of public morality, they may well have been hes-
scholars as Felicity Nussbaum, Nancy Armstrong, and Ruth Perry as the mid-eighteenth-century valorization of domesticity, which presupposed the general retirement of women from the public sphere into the domain of the family. The change in the public attitude toward gentlewomen’s participation in the affairs of the Hospital coincided suggestively with what Nussbaum characterizes as the peak of the eighteenth-century “cult of motherhood,” or the new cultural conviction that the “domestic woman [had] power to shape the public realm, particularly the nation, through procreation and education.”47 What this development could mean in practical terms was that a good female citizen was defined as a devoted wife and mother, and not as an aspiring philanthropist offering her unsolicited gifts to the Hospital. Furthermore, as Perry argues, an important condition of the mid-eighteenth-century “colonization” of the female body—the appropriation of women’s reproductive services for the “nation and the empire”—was the repression of women’s active sexuality. “Maternity came to be imagined as a counter to sexual feeling, opposing alike individual expression, desire, and agency in favor of a mother-self at the service of the family and the state.”48 As the service to the state could be relayed only through the service to the family, female philanthropy—the activity that benefited the state by bypassing the family—could be easily construed as indicative of the woman’s indifference toward her “primary” duties of wife and mother, a certain flightiness of character, and perhaps even certain looseness of morals signaled by her social forwardness.

There is a danger, of course, in smoothing over the immense complexity of what was happening in the domain of public philanthropy at mid-century and claiming that women were withdrawing en masse from the public realm and refocusing their attention on the family (and, in fact, a number of recent feminist revisions of the Habermasian paradigm of the eighteenth-century bourgeois public sphere have questioned our tradition of rigid gendering of “public” and “private” spheres of influence).49 Again, we have to remember that the Foundling Hospital was rather exceptional—if we compare it with other charities at mid-century—in its total lack of public female support. It could be that as the first institution of its kind in eighteenth-century England, it retained its cultural shock value more tenaciously than did other Hospitals (such as the Magdalen House) founded after it, and that as such it came to embody—more than the other charities—anxieties about the role of women in the public sphere. It could also be that the principle of anonymity adopted by the Foundling Hospital (i.e., the mothers could just disappear without a trace after depositing their children at the Hospital, whereas at the Magdalen, the physical retention of women “having been once drawn in, and betrayed by the perfidy of men”) somehow implied their greater accountability) appeared to substantiate the continuous harping that the Foundling Hospital made it possible for a certain type of female opportunist to carry on unchecked her “depredations upon mankind,”50 making this charity thus appear particularly antagonistic to the interests of well-to-do married women. We recognize the articulation of this sentiment in the satiric passage from Tobias Smollett’s Peregrine Pickle (1751) in which several ladies of quality attempt to decide the fate of a young woman who had married for love against the wishes of her family (thus forfeiting her inheritance and provoking her father’s implacable enmity) and whose husband died soon after leaving her a destitute widow with twin infants. One lady recommends placing the infants in the Foundling Hospital; another is convinced that once they enter the Hospital, their mother would be freed for seducing rich young men and thus destroying the emotional and financial well-being of good families.

My lady duchess concluded that she [the young widow] must be a creature void of all feeling and reflection, who could survive such aggravated misery; therefore did not deserve to be relieved, except in the character of a common beggar, and was generous enough to offer a recommendation, by which she would be admitted into an infirmary, to which her grace was a subscriber; at the same time, advising the solicitor to send the twins to the Foundling-Hospital, where they would be carefully nursed an brought up, so as to become useful members of the commonwealth. Another lady, with all due deference to the opinion of the duchess, was free enough to blame the generosity of her grace, which would only serve to encourage children in their disobedience to their parents, and might be the means not only of prolonging the distress of the wretched creature, but also of ruining the constitution of some young heir, perhaps the hope of a great family; for she did suppose that madam, when her month should be up, and her brats disposed of, would spread her attractions to the public, (provided she could profit by her person) and, in the usual way, make a regular progress from St. James’s to Drury-lane. She apprehended, for these reasons, that their compassion would be most effectually shewn, in leaving her to perish in her present necessity; and that the old gentleman would be unpardonable, should he persist in his endeavors to relieve her. A third member of this tenderhearted society [said]: “Let the bandlings . . . be sent to the hospital [and she would take the mother as her servant.]”51

It hardly matters to the lady duchess and her friends that the young woman in question used to be married and that the children
are legitimate: their admission to the Foundling Hospital would automatically activate the scenario of the “fallen” woman being freed to continue her depredations upon “great families.” And since the second lady either belongs to or ambitiously identifies with “great families,” her warning about the threat represented by a “madam” whose “brats” are taken off her hands appears to spell out the reasons that a woman of quality should not support the Foundling Hospital.

The passage is ambivalent in ways perhaps not consciously intended by Smollett, manifesting a certain difficulty of deriving any clear-cut ideological “message” from the works of eighteenth-century fiction focusing on illegitimacy. On the one hand, the narrator has no sympathy for the cruel trio and clearly disapproves of their sentiments, including the second speaker’s view of the Foundling Hospital as a charity that enables prostitution, ruins the hopes of great families, and thus does not deserve the support of gentlewomen. On the other hand, by letting us know that one of the callous ladies is a “subscriber” to an “infirmary” (which appears from the context to be the Magdalen House!), Smollett seems to uphold—whether intentionally or not—the notion that the women who subscribed to charities substituted that kind of ostensible “public” kindness for the more genuine “private” compassion. Indeed, we learn that when, “shocked at the nature . . . of this ungenerous consultation,” Peregrine rushes to the house of the poor woman with a gift of twenty pounds, he meets there the celebrated Lady V., “who having heard by accident of [the] deplorable situation of [the] young widow, had [also] immediately obeyed the dictates of her humanity . . . and come in person to relieve her distress” (431; emphasis mine). The “private” altruism of Lady V. is thus contrasted to the “public” philanthropy of the lady duchess, leaving the reader in no doubt as to which constitutes true benevolence, but also (I am returning now to the earlier argument about the ambiguous position of women in the eighteenth-century public domain) strengthening the notion that something was seriously amiss with the hearts and minds of ladies who flaunted their support of philanthropic institutions instead of assisting those in need quietly and privately. Note that even the good old argument about raising the children of the Hospital into “useful members of the commonwealth” acquires sarcastic overtones when adapted by the lady duchess. There is something incongruous, the narrative seems to imply, in a woman’s mouthing this ostensibly “male,” ostensibly “public” political catchphrase. A woman should express her compassion not by par roting impersonal slogans of the infanticide-prevention campaign but by doing what Lady V.—this “angel ministering to the necessities of mortals”—does: relieving the miserable widow “in person,” softening into the “inchanting tenderness of weeping sympathy” while fondling one of the poor babes on her knee, and thanking another kind giver—Peregrine—“with such look of complacency . . . that his whole soul [is] transported with love and veneration” (431). Lady V. seems to be the epitome of the proper domestic woman, “educating,” so to speak, young men in noble sentiments, or, in this case, “approving” the young man for following his best impulses.

If we want to complicate even further this already complicated passage, we may remember that Lady V. is not exactly the most “domestic” of women and Peregrine not the best of men. She has earlier given birth to an illegitimate daughter (who died in infancy), and he is illegitimate (though he himself does not know about it) and highly promiscuous—a bastard who sires bastards all over Europe and who would not hesitate to rape any current object of his passion. Smollett’s novel thus seems to respond subtly to the stale set of accusations still raised now and then against the Foundling Hospital, namely that those who supported the Hospital did it primarily because they hoped that it would save them the expense of caring for their own bastards. Of course, Lady V. would never stoop to leaving her child at the Hospital, and neither would Peregrine, with his—however warped—notion of “honour,” but it is nevertheless significant that the two people who could have—at least hypothetically—benefited from the “services” offered by this institution prefer a private to an organized benefaction. The Foundling Hospital thus occupies a double position in Peregrine Pickle. On the one hand, supporting a public charity does not automatically render the supporter a good person—in the case of a woman, it actually seems to indicate her callowness. On the other hand, slandering the Foundling Hospital—e.g., implying that it breeds prostitution or benefits rich fornicators—marks the slanderer as narrow-minded and obdurate, her accusations groundless. For a woman, at any rate, to be on the safe side in the world of Smollett’s novel, it is better neither to assist nor condemn a public charity, limiting herself to private ecleemosynary acts, preferably witnessed—approved and emulated—by a man.

Broadly speaking, the same advice applies to the women in Richardson’s The History of Sir Charles Grandison, in which the issues of infanticide, illegitimacy, and philanthropy are considered almost exclusively in terms of their potential impact on a middle-class family, or rather on that complicated hybrid of upper-class wealth and titles and middle-class sensibilities that constitutes the Grandison clan.
Read in the context of the eighteenth-century infanticide-prevention campaign, Richardson’s last novel articulates emotional reasons why an upper- or upper-middle-class woman would be wary of publicly supporting a philanthropy that appears to sponsor illegitimacy and to absolve sexually transgressing females from the consequences of their liaisons, at the same time that (the novel) frowns on the private lack of charity and indiscriminate demonizing of bastards and bastard-bearers.

**Infanticide, Illegitimacy, and Property in *Sir Charles Grandison***

In *Grandison*, the topic of infanticide comes up where it is least expected: in the letter that Sir Charles’s sister Charlotte (the “Lady G.”) writes to her in-laws, Aunt Selby and Lucy. Charlotte is pregnant with her first child and mortally afraid of her impending labor; but over the incorrigible wit, she manages to interface her dark par- turitional forebodings with racy jokes. At the close of her letter, she invites Aunt Selby and Lucy to “come early that [she] can shew [them her] baby-things,” so that later they “may be able to testify that [she] had no design to overlay [her] little Marmouset” (3:358). Charlotte alludes here to one of the most popular lines of defense used in infanticide trials—the “benefit-of-linen.” If an unmarried mother of a dead infant could prove that she had prepared all the necessary linen well before a baby was born (which showed that she had intended to keep the baby), the case against her would be summarily dismissed. Charlotte, a married, rich, upper-class female; who ostensibly has nothing in common with women typically accused of infanticide nor with the ignominious realities of the infan- ticide courtroom, appropriates the rhetoric of that courtroom with surprising ease. Worse still, she expects that her addressees, the middle-aged dignified lady and the young inexperienced girl, both leading a sheltered existence in provincial Northamptonshire, would also know about the essence of the “benefit-of-linen” defense: otherwise the joke would fall flat. That they do and that they are expected to think that the joke is risqué is seen from the reaction of Harriet (Charlotte’s sister-in-law), who copies Charlotte’s letter for her grandmother Shirley (the audience keeps expanding) and observes dryly that the note is in Charlotte’s “usual stile” (3:358). So topical a reference to infanticide may seem out of place among lords and ladies of refined sensibility (though everybody gets the joke), and it must have contributed to some of Richardson’s contemporar-
sexually prompted financial indiscretions, he keeps his beloved son, Charles, abroad for many years, thus setting into motion Charles's Italian "entanglement"—the source of much grief to the main female character of the story, Harriet Byron. Finally, to make matters worse, Sir Thomas abandons one kept mistress in pursuit of another—a sixteen-year-old Miss O'Brien—brought up by her covetous relatives "with a notion that her beauty would make her fortune" (1:353). Sir Thomas dies unexpectedly, just when the young Miss is ready to enter his keeping ("500L a year for her life" [1: 354])—and only his death prevents the further disintegration of the family fortune.

Next to one prodigal patriarch is another: Lord W., an uncle on the mother's side of the Grandison family, lives in sin with the "deplorable" Mrs. Giffard—a woman whose lack of "birth" and "education" is compounded by her lack of "moderation" (1:358)—and thus squanders the estate which Sir Charles, Caroline, and Charlotte are supposed to inherit. One more Grandison, Sir Thomas's nephew, Everard, finds himself imposed upon by a "cast mistress, experienced in all the arts of such, and acting upon the secret influences of a man of quality [who], wanting to get rid of her, supports her in a prosecution commenced against [Everard] for performance of covenants" (2:442). Another family, the "ancient" and deserving Mansfields, suffers because of the indiscretion of their maternal uncle who, at the age of seventy, marries his servant and leaves his property to her two children, fathered, in fact, by another man.

Richardson makes a point of portraying the young Grandisons as almost unrealistically vulnerable to the financial damage that could be inflicted by illegitimate children and their mothers. On the one hand, under British law, illegitimate offspring could not inherit property at the expense of legitimate heirs, and being the first-born son seems to ensure Sir Charles' position as the sole heir to the parental estate. On the other hand, there were many ways, in practice, to divert money and property from legitimate children. First, there were *inter vivos* settlements, that is "the transmission of property or goods during the lifetime of the bequeather." Sir Thomas engages in *inter vivos* transmissions when he pays for Mrs. Oldham and her children and when he agrees to bestow 500 pounds a year upon Miss O'Brien. Second, the whole estate could be whisked away from the firstborn son if it was held by his father *in fee simple* rather than in strict settlement. Strict settlement meant that the current owner of the estate was but a life-long tenant keeping the property for his eldest son (who in turn would keep it for his eldest son), with no right to will, or lease, or mortgage it except for purposes explicitly discussed in the settlement. Sir Thomas Grandison holds his Irish estate "in fee"—Richardson is very particular about this point—which gives him the right to squander it, the right that he, unfortunately, is only too quick to exercise when he borrows money upon this estate to pay his "debt of honour" (1:329), that is, the debt incurred by whoring. That Sir Thomas's borrowing money upon his Irish estate is severely detrimental to his son is clear from the money-lender's insistence—which goes against the set of standard procedures—that Sir Charles should be made aware of the deal and even join his father in the security.

Richardson does not specify whether Sir Thomas's second, British, estate is held in fee simple. One telling detail, however, leads us to suspect that it is. Sir Thomas falls ill just before signing "the releases"—the legal forms guaranteeing Miss O'Brien her 500 pounds per year. The person who "posts down, on the first news he [has] of [his master's] being taken ill, hoping to get him to sign the ready-drawn up releases" is one Mr. Bever, his "English steward" (1:355). We do not know for sure whether the new annual expense of 500 pounds would make Sir Thomas borrow money upon his English estate, but the presence of his corrupted "English steward" suggests that the second estate is also held in fee and thus can be spent on the future illegitimate children of Miss O'Brien. It should be noted that after the mid-seventeenth century, it was rather unusual for a prominent aristocratic family to have *all* its estates in fee. Besides, the personality of Sir Thomas' "frugal" father strongly suggests that he would take care to tie his "profuse" (1:310) son to the strict settlement. Richardson meanwhile was "reasonably well informed about the legal issues" surrounding the strict settlement. Balancing between being explicit on the matter and making his story improbable, he hints darkly that, *in principle*, the younger Grandisons could meet the same fate as did the nieces and nephews of Lord Mansfield or the author's own friend, Elizabeth Midwinter, whose father managed to disinherit her altogether, leaving the family property to the illegitimate son he had with his servant.

It is not surprising, then, that Charlotte is uniformly harsh in her judgment upon the designing females of inferior class standing, whom she sees as preying upon upper-class families. Having made clear what she thinks of this "tribe" of women, she almost flies at her best friend Harriet, who dares to contradict her and pity the unfortunate Mrs. Oldham and her illegitimate children. "Be quiet, Harriet," snaps Charlotte, "Would you be as tame to a husband's mistress, as you seem favorable to a father's?" (2:505) Because Char-
lotte’s father, and her uncle, and her cousin—pretty much every single one of her male relatives, excepting her superman of a brother—have proved susceptible to the charms of designing female interlopers, her marriage and pregnancy make her sharply aware of her own and her future child’s vulnerability to illegitimate pretend ers to family fortunes. It is in this context that her reference to the infanticide trial could be read as an indirect expression of her desire to see such women apprehended and penalized for their sexual mis deeds.

Richardson did not necessarily agree with Charlotte’s uncompromising condemnation of the “tribe” of kept women. As we know, he actively supported both the Foundling Hospital and the Magdalen House, and he became a Governor of both charities in 1754 and 1758, respectively. Much as he detested the practice of keeping mistresses, his narrative strives to differentiate between the custom itself—which he held as evil in principle—and the “unhappy women . . . drawn [into it] . . . by the perfidy of men” (2:356)—a differentiation not always sustainable in a novel representing so vividly the destructive consequences of illicit love affairs for the legitimate family, Chaber’s insightful diagnosis of Charlotte’s infanticidal joke as expressing fear of being trapped in the exploitative marriage economy should not thus occlude the larger meaning of this joke within the novel’s consistent attempt to safeguard and sanctify this economy. Though replete with the “bloody ordeals” of childbirth and grounded in female conformity, domestic space is figured in Grandison as indefinately appealing and warranting a vigilant protection against illegitimate intruders who have the capacity to destabilize it.

The novel’s take on female philanthropy—which is what led us into the discussion of Sir Charles Grandison in the first place—is grounded in the conflict between its two ways of looking at “fallen” women and their illegitimate offspring: are they “unhappy women” (2:356) and their children “unhappy innocents” (1:366), or are they “creatures” (1:370) of that infamous “tribe,” and their children “living proofs” of their “disgrace”? (1:366). Are they too be pitied or castigated? Supported with the services of the Foundling Hospital and the Magdalen House or driven to commit infanticide? And if they are to be pitied and supported, what role if any should gentle women—legally married wives and mothers, standing to lose from the “creatures’” depredations—play in this charitable endeavor? The novel does not provide an unambiguous answer to any of these questions. On the one hand, its main heroine, Harriet, consistently expresses her compassion toward the “fallen” women and their children. First, she censures Mr. Greville for abandoning his mistress whom he “brought with him from the Wales” without giving her “sufficient [means] for a twelvemonth’s scanty subsistence” (1:25)—and we can only guess what Charlotte would have said to this sentiment of her friend. Second, Harriet applauds Sir Charles’s behaving generously toward Mrs. Oldham and allowing “her an annuity, for the sake of her sons by his father,” and she generally expresses such interest in the fate of the late Sir Thomas’s mistress that it prompts Charlotte to observe, in her arch manner, that “our Harriet is strangely taken with Mrs. Oldham’s story” (1:375). Finally, it is Harriet who brings up the concept of philanthropy and proceeds to defend the women’s right both to use this trendy neologism and to partake in the activity that it denotes. Insisting that her love for Sir Charles Grandison stems from her desire to “promote and share in [his] glorious philanthropy,” she writes an aside directed at her loving but still rather misogynistic uncle Selby: “Yes, my uncle! Why should women, in compliance with the petition of narrow-minded men, forbear to use words that some seem to think above them . . . ?” (1:389) On the other hand, Harriet’s position as a budding female philanthropist particularly compassionate toward illegitimate children and their mothers is compromised because she is fated to marry the only man on Earth who is guaranteed not to keep mistresses and sire bastards. Since Harriet is not to know the fears of an average wife, her generosity of spirit is ultimately worth less than Charlotte’s—were Charlotte to be so liberally inclined—and thus cannot be perceived as the official if unavoidably idealized “viewpoint” of the novel.

What further undercuts Harriet’s hankering after philanthropy is that, although present during the third volume’s famous exchange concerning public charities, in which Sir Charles describes his scheme for “An Hospital for Female Penitents” (2:356)—the novel’s version of the Magdalen House—she does not say a word and functions more like a stenographer locked in Sir Hargrave Pollexfen’s closet in an earlier episode than a participant in the conversation. By this time Harriet, as Jerry Beasley has pointed out, is well on her way in falling completely “under Grandison’s influence,” becoming “changed” and “diminished,” and gradually losing “the marks distinguishing her identity from Grandison’s: her sharp vocal inflections . . . , her relative independence . . . , and her autonomous personal narrative.” Harriet’s days of speaking up for kept women, their children, and glorious philanthropies are over by the end of the second volume.

The History of Sir Charles Grandison thus by no means condemns the philanthropic efforts of its age or voices doubts about their efficacy
and moral outlook. Neither does it say explicitly that upper and upper-middle-class women should not support the charities directed at easing the lot of illegitimate children and their “unhappy” mothers. At the same time, it makes two points about such support, neither of which is very encouraging. First, it makes us understand why Charlotte, for example, would rather imagine a working-class woman exposed and punished for her sexual transgression and infanticide than support the institution designed to “preserve” such a woman from her “desperate crime” in hope of returning her to the path of virtue. Charlotte is fed up with sexually attractive women of inferior class standing and their illegitimate children—the source of the ceaseless drain on her family’s emotional and financial well-being—and because of this she is likely to acquiesce to the view of the Foundling Hospital as an “immoral” charity freeing female opportunists for continuous deprivations upon mankind. Again, Richardson does not say that such a view is correct, but, via Charlotte, his last novel provides tacit emotional validation for the absence of gentlewomen from the lists of public supporters of the Hospital.

The history of Harriet’s relationship with Sir Charles Grandison strengthens this validation. Throughout the first and second volume, Harriet remains vocal about her compassion for illegitimate children and their mothers. In the third volume, Sir Charles subsumes her charitable impulses under his own expostulations about the “Hospital for Female Penitents.” From that point on, the novel makes clear, whatever philanthropic inclinations Lady Grandison may have, they would have to be expressed in private, into the kindly ear of her husband, who will then have the option of making them public and seeking other men’s approval of them. To make up for this loss of her independent voice, the novel glorifies the implicit political power presumably exercised by Lady Grandison. As her husband observes, it is virtuous wives who move their men to “purchase and build for them; travel and toil for them; run through, at the call of . . . King and Country, dangers and difficulties; [to] at last, lay all [the] trophies [and] acquirements, at [their wives’] feet; enough rewarded in the conscience of duty done” (3:248). It is virtuous wives, then, who move their men to “purchase” a suitable ground, to “build” a Foundling Hospital, and to support it with their subscriptions and gifts of valuable paintings. The March to Finchley will be exhibited in the General Court Room, attesting to the joint effort of British men and women to support “glorious Benefactions,” but the lady must vanish.

I am grateful to Elizabeth Heckendorf Cook, Robert A. Erickson, Anita Guerrini, Ruth Perry, Ellen Pollak, Robert Markley, Jennifer Thorn, and Everett Zimmerman for commenting on earlier versions of this paper.
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